The Roles, Functions, and Responsibilities of the School-Level Research Committee (SRC) in Deped IV-A Calabarzon: Basis for a Research Management Policy Note

Karl Erickson Ebora
Schools Division Office of Rizal, Taytay, Rizal, Philippines

Abstract

The School Level Research Committee (SRC) is the only research committee not included in the Research Management Guidelines (RMG) of the Department of Education. This creates a gap in the management of research in basic education as there is no link between the other research committees, such as the Regional Research Committee, Schools Division Research Committee, and the teacher-researchers. Using quantitative research design, the researcher tried to determine the SRC in DepEd Region IV-A CALABARZON by identifying the teacher/research coordinators' perception of the importance and the extent of the practice of the roles and functions in the research management cycle, managing funds, special provisions, research partnerships, and monitoring and evaluation of the SRC despite the absence of a national policy. The study employed purposive sampling to determine the number of teachers/ research coordinators included in the study, totaling 193. These 193 respondents came from schools with teachers who have approved research under the Basic Education Research Fund (BERF). These teachers/ research coordinators were asked to answer the research instrument in the form of a survey questionnaire. Results of the study showed that the respondents perceived that the roles of the SRC are essential. In terms of practicing their roles, it was found that the SRC practiced to a great extent its roles in the research management cycle, funds management, special provisions, and monitoring and evaluation but practiced to a moderate extent its roles under partnerships. The study results were used as inputs in crafting a policy note that justifies the need to include the

SRC in the RMG policy of the Department of Education.

Keywords - basic education, policy note, quantitative research, Research management, Research Management Guidelines, Schools Research Committee, Research

Introduction

The Department of Education released DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2017 or the Research Management Guidelines (RMG). The RMG aims to strengthen the culture of research in basic education by providing directions in managing research initiatives at the different levels of governance and by improving support mechanisms for research such as funding, partnerships, and capacity building. The scope of the policy also covers instructions for eligible DepEd employees in availing of research funds.

To better implement the aims and the scope of the RMG, different research committees were set up at the different levels of governance. This establishment of research committees is an excellent move to ensure that research management is on the right track. According to Ayala and Garcia (2013), producing quality research and sustaining a research culture does not happen in a vacuum. For a research culture to thrive, it needs a free flow of information, an honest and analytical exchange of ideas, and supportive policy and administrative structures (National Higher Education Research Agenda-2, 2009-2018). This only means that research management requires the workforce to organize, manage, and lead (Project Management Institute, 2013) research initiatives and the furtherance of research culture.

Relatedly, the RMG identified the research committees, their functions, and the members of each committee. At the National Level, there is the National Research Committee (NRC); at the regional level, there is the Regional Research Committee (RRC); and in the Schools Division, there is the Schools Division Research Committee (SDRC) (DepEd Order 43 s. 2015). The NRC is expected to approve research proposals from bureaus, services, and those endorsed by the Regional Research Committee, which cover two

(2) or more regions. For RRC, they are projected to evaluate and approve research proposals and ther related research initiatives for the region and schools divisions, particularly proposals to be funded under the BERF or any other fund lodged in the region. For SDRC, the committee is expected to evaluate and approve research proposals and other related research initiatives from the schools and community learning centers to be funded by the BERF (Basic Education Sector, 2017). All these committees are tasked to perform research initiatives such as spearheading the call for proposals, evaluation of research, approval and granting of available funds for research proposals, forging partnerships for research, and dissemination of results (DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2017).

Indeed, research committees are crucial in the implementation of research initiatives. As the years progress, the roles of the research committees also become more complex and intricate. According to Erno-Kjolhede (2000), research management is full of uncertainty and complexity. Hence, strategies should move to greater consistency across the sector, identify and translate good practice, and harmonize the community so that training and development can be provided to a clearly defined and easily understood community (Green & Langley, 2009).

One of the objectives of the RMG is to provide a common direction in the management of research at the different levels of governance. The policy also harmonizes the research committees, their roles, and functions, as well as the members of the NRC, RRC, and SDRC to serve the teacher-researchers better. However, among the research committees enumerated in the RMG, the research committee in schools was not included in the policy. This creates a gap in the research management as there is no link between the other levels of governance (NRC, RRC, SDRC) and the teacher-researchers regarding the research management.

The situation is also inconsistent with the provisions of RA 9155 or the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, which underscored that the levels of governance in basic education are the national, regional, divisions, schools, and learning centers (district level is now part of the Schools Division Office). The law emphasizes the principle of shared governance, which recognizes that every

36

The Roles, Functions, and Responsibilities of the School-Level Research Committee (SRC) in Deped IV-A Calabarzon: Basis for a Research Management Policy Note

unit in the education bureaucracy has a particular role, task, and responsibility inherent in the office and for which it is principally accountable for outcomes. Yet, the RMG policy did not include the school level among the research committees, which created a gap in the research management process.

Relatedly, since DepEd recognizes the significant roles of research in the policy development process, the non-inclusion of the school-level committees in the RMG has a substantial impact on the policy development of the Department, specifically in employing a "systematic set of activities leading to the development of DepEd policies" (DepEd Order No. 13, s. 2015, p.2). This is attributed to the idea that at the school level, the committee is in charge of initiating, implementing, and overseeing research activities in the school. Their exclusion could mean that no committee will enforce the various activities, disseminate policies, and provide feedback related to research from the learning centers.

Moreover, the exclusion of the school in the RMG impacts the functions of the school head. A provision of RA 9155 states that the roles of the school head include being an instructional leader and administrative manager. As an instructional leader, he shall form a team with the teachers to deliver quality educational programs, projects, and services. Since research results are used to improve practices, a team must manage all the research initiatives in schools. With the absence of the research committee at the school level in the RMG, this function of the school has also been compromised.

With the above being said, there is a need to establish a research committee at the school level because they are critical to the research strategy-making process (Johnson, 2013). However, establishing the school-level research committee will require the definition of new roles and responsibilities to institutionalize research in the Department of Education (Basic Education Sector Transformation 2017). According to Kennett (2014), identifying the committee's various tasks helps researchers and research managers assess how to deploy the resources over the available period. He also stressed that the primary control on how fast work can progress comes from the availability of people and how their efforts can be assigned across the necessary work. As research managers, the

performing their functions in formulating, developing, supporting, monitoring, evaluating, and promoting the research and research-degree activity of the school (Derrick & Nickson, 2014).

Despite the non-inclusion of the school-level research committee in the RMG that resulted in the absence of the link of the research management system at the school level to the other research committees, this study tried to determine the responsibilities, roles, and functions of school-level research committee or the SRC in DepEd IV-A CALABARZON. The results of the study were used as inputs to a research management policy note that specifies the roles and functions of the SRC. This policy note would be submitted to the Central Office and would serve as a recommendation to include the SRC in the RMG. Specifically, it aims to answer the following questions:

1.   What is the level of importance of the roles of the school-level research committee (SRC) as perceived by respondents?
2.   To what extent did the school-level research committee (SRC) perform its functions in terms of:
        a.   Research management cycle,
        b.   managing funds,
        c.   special provisions,
        d.   research partnerships, and
        e.   Monitoring and evaluation?

Literature Review

RA 9155 highlights that the State shall encourage local initiatives for improving the quality of basic education and for the improvement of schools learning centers and to provide how these improvements may be achieved and sustained. As a response, DepEd is mandated to "undertake national educational research and studies," from which it can become part of the basis for necessary reforms and inputs (DepEd Order No. 43, s. 2015). The Department emphasizes research because it sees it as a continuous improvement tool. Through research, lessons from the past can be drawn, and existing education programs can be improved. Thus, DepEd strived to institute research and its utilization in policy and

program development and promote evidence-based policy formulation supported by research studies(DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2017).

Considering the above, the Department sustains its progressive orientation by ensuring that its actions are informed by sound and relevant evidence from research (DepEd Order No. 39. s. 2016). DepEd thrives that all its decision is the research-based, the same reason why the agency tries to develop a culture of research. However, experts assert that the process and management of research are complex and intricate (Erno-Kjolhede, 2000). This is attributed to the advancement of research methodology and other improvements in research management. According to Riol and Thuillier (2016), new research funding methods have generated a strong demand for management procedures that hold research institutes accountable for meeting their obligations, maintaining their reputation, and remaining competitive in terms of their productivity. Because of the many complex processes ascribed to research management, the Research Office's functions and the demands on staff working in Research Management have become increasingly varied (Green & Langley, 2009).

Due to the various tasks and processes in research, there is a clamor for establishing research committees. Green and Langley (2009) defined a research committee as a group that monitors an institution's research activity and may also establish and monitor the Research Strategy. Moreover, the Research Committee was critical to the strategy-making process and was responsible for coordinating activities within academic departments and authorizing the final strategy document. In the Philippine basic education, research committees were set up at each governance level to guide research directions. At the national level, there is the National Research Committee (NRC); at the regional level, there is the Regional Research Committee (RRC); and in the Schools Division, there is the Schools Division Research Committee (SDRC) (DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2017). These research committees manage the research submitted by the teacher-researchers; however, since SRC is not in the RMG, there is a by-passing in the evaluation of research at the school level, which creates a gap in the implementation of the policy as the process skips a level of governance (school). Hence, the

RMG must be reviewed, and SRC must be considered in the policy.

Notably, the research committee at the school level (SRC) is not included among the research committees identified in the RMG. Thus, there is an evident incongruity between government-issued policies. RA 9155 emphasized the principle of shared governance, which recognizes that every unit (Central Office, Regional Office, Schools- Division Office, and Schools) in the education bureaucracy has a particular role, task, and responsibility inherent in the office and for which it is principally accountable for outcomes. Yet, the policy did not include the SRC as research managers, which creates a gap in the Research Management process. Since DepEd recognizes the significant roles of research in the policy development process, the non-inclusion of the SRC in the RMG substantially impacts research management. Looking back, DepEd utilizes participatory methods that consider relevant stakeholders' concerns (DepEd Order No. 13, s. 2015). The schools as the primary sources of research must be included in the procedure while excluding the SRC would mean a deviation from the participatory nature of the policy development in the Department.

While the RMG excludes the SRC in the Research Management Guidelines, leading institutions worldwide recognize the importance of the school-level committees or the SRC. They also enumerated the functions of the committee. The University of Bath (2020) in the United Kingdom and the University of Sussex (2020) have similar views on the roles and responsibilities of the committee of the SRC. Included in the list are the following: (a) the development, promotion, and enhancement of the faculty/ school's research strategy to meet the research objective as articulated in the plan; (b) the identification, monitoring, and promotion of how the faculty/ school can meet current and emerging research opportunities with the particular goals of increasing research income and the quality of research output meeting the other research objective as articulated in the plan; (c) monitoring, review, and improvement of research performance across the faculty/ school including oversight of bids for external funding, including the promotion of multidisciplinary research; analysis of research- related performance indicators, in particular, those used in national research assessment; and

40

The Roles, Functions, and Responsibilities of the School-Level Research Committee (SRC) in Deped IV-A Calabarzon: Basis for a Research Management Policy Note

promotion and sharing of good practice in respect of research.

Indeed, the SRC is critical to the strategy-making process (Johnson, 2012) and the implementation of research in an institution. As a result, creating research committees defines new roles and responsibilities in institutionalizing research in the Department of Education (Basic Education Sector Transformation, 2017). According to Kennett (2014), identifying the various tasks helps researchers and research managers assess how to deploy the resources over the available period. He also stressed that the main control on how fast work can progress comes from the availability of people and how their efforts can be assigned across the necessary work. The SRC, as research managers, are leaders tasked to advance and promote research capability by providing guidance and directions on research initiatives through BERA and resolving emerging issues in the management and conduct of research (Basic Education Sector Transformation, 2017).

To perform their functions better, the committee must know their research management roles. As research managers, the SRC are "servant leaders who serve the researchers so they may concentrate on the research"(Derrick & Nickson, 2014). As leaders, they must understand how to serve the researchers by performing their function in formulating, developing, supporting, monitoring, evaluating and promoting the research and research-degree activity of their institution" (p.27). Hence, as research managers, the SRC are tasked to ensure that their institutions' research programs are on track and provide researchers with a supportive environment, smooth funding flows assistance in identifying appropriate research partners, and administrative support (Research Africa, 2013).

Considering the roles of the research committee, there is no doubt that the SRC plays a crucial role in promoting the research culture in an organization. Undeniably, the research committee is necessary for advancing research culture in any organization because "the Research Committee makes decisions and sets strategy; it does something" (Green & Langley, 2009). Also, including the SRC in the process will better implement the RMG because all levels of governance, from the Central Office to schools, will have their roles and functions in the research management in DepEd. This is more effective than the current practice wherein the evaluation

of research skips the school level, and the teacher-researchers go directly to the Schools- Division level and other higher offices (Regional and National) for research management.

Materials & Methods

Research Design

The study used the descriptive–normative method research design. This method is called descriptive or normative (Kerlinger, 1973). According to Good and Scates (1954), the term normative survey is sometimes used because surveys are frequently made to ascertain the normal or typical condition for practice or to compare local test results with a state or national norm. The present study examined the practices of the roles, responsibilities, and functions of the school-level research committee (SRC) in Region IV-A CALABARZON, which matches the description of the descriptive-normative survey.

Sampling

The researcher used quota sampling to determine the samples of the study. Quota sampling is a non-probability method in which researchers create a sample involving individuals representing a population. In quota sampling, researchers choose these individuals or respondents according to specific traits or qualities (QuestionPro.com 2020). In this study, the researcher identified the specific traits or qualities of the samples. In this research are the following:

a. The sample should be teachers/ research coordinators from schools in DepEd IV-A CALABARZON. Since there is no research committee yet in the schools as per RMG, the teacher/ research coordinators serve as the designated ones in charge of managing research activities in the schools;

b. These teacher/ research coordinators must come from schools with teachers who were recipients/ grantees of the Basic Education Research Fund (BERF) between cycles 2-4. The BERF is the

42

The Roles, Functions, and Responsibilities of the School-Level Research Committee
(SRC) in Deped IV-A Calabarzon: Basis for a Research Management Policy Note

funding mechanism of DepEd, wherein grant recipients were
determined by the research committees such as the RRC and the
SDRC. The school-level research committee (SRC) is not included
because there is no SRC in the RMG.

In using quota sampling, the researcher employed the following
procedures:

a. Figure out the weightage of the group/s.

Using Slovin's Formula, the researcher determined the size of
the sample and the supposed percentage/ proportion per group
at a 3% margin of error. Slovin's Formula is presented below:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

Where:

n= the size of the sample
N= the size of the population
e= the margin of error

The proportion/ percentage of samples per SDO was also determined.
With the help of Slovin's Formula, a minimum of 61% must serve as
samples. To get the proportion/ percentage of samples per group, the
researcher used the formula below.

$$\frac{n}{N}$$

Where n= sample size
N= Total population

b. Select an appropriate sample size.

The 61% of the population is the minimum percentage of samples
that must be included in this study. However, for this research, the
number of samples can exceed as long as the minimum of 61%
is met. Hence, 193 teachers/ research coordinators (64%) from
CALABARZON were chosen as samples of the study.

Table 1
Breakdown of Respondents

Level of Governance	Functions	Population Size	Invited Samples	Percentage	Data Producing samples	Percentage
School	Teacher / Research Coordinators	301	183	61	193	64

c. Conduct surveys according to the quotas defined.
The number of samples identified per group was given the questionnaire/ survey, which was distributed and administered using the Google Form.

Data Collection

This part presents the steps in data collection, which are divided into four parts. This part also includes the construction, validation, seeking permission, and administration of the research instrument and the data-gathering procedures.

Constructing the Survey Questionnaire

The first stage in the development of the instrument was the construction of the questionnaires. The researcher adapted the Research Management Guidelines and other works of literature to come up with the contents of the instrument. The survey questionnaire was composed of two parts: Part I dealt with the importance of the roles and responsibilities of the School level research committee (SRC); and Part II looked at the extent of functions of the school-level research committee in terms of Research management cycle, managing funds, special provisions, research partnerships, and monitoring and evaluation.

Validating the Questionnaire

After constructing the questionnaire, the draft was presented to a group of validators which were practitioners of research

44

The Roles, Functions, and Responsibilities of the School-Level Research Committee (SRC) in Deped IV-A Calabarzon: Basis for a Research Management Policy Note

management in basic education. These validators included the Chief of the Policy Research and Development Division (PRD), DepEd Central Office; the Chief of the Policy, Planning, and Research Division (PPRD), DepEd IV-A CALABARZON; Two (2) Public School Principals, and a Master Teacher II. All the validators were involved in research management as members of research committees at their respective governance levels. In the final version of the instrument, the researcher incorporated the suggestions and recommendations of the validators.

Seeking Permission to Administer the Instrument

Since the research is a region-wide study, the approval of the Regional Director of Region IV-A CALABARZON to administer the examination is necessary. Hence, the researcher prepared a letter that the Regional Director approved for the questionnaire distribution. Likewise, the researcher designed a letter to the respondents (RRC, SDRC, SRC members, school heads, teacher- researchers).

Administering the Instrument

The instrument was accessed through Google Forms. Due to the pandemic's national health crisis, the Google Form was the most convenient way to administer the survey. It is also efficient since it presents the data in Excel Form and allows easy data retrieval. In accessing the instrument, the following procedures must be considered:
1. sending of a letter request to the Regional Director;
2. acquiring the Regional Director's approval of the letter of request;
3. notifying the Senior Education Program Specialists(SEPS) or Planning Officer III regarding the letter of request;
4. distributing the letter request and the Google Forms to the respondents; and
5. collating of the responses.
The respondents can access Google Forms by using the online link bit.ly/SRCmembers.

Data Analysis

The data was interpreted and tabulated through the statistical treatments that best fit the required results. Frequency distribution, weighted mean, and ranking were used to interpret the data. Tables were also used in the presentation of the responses.

Data about the perception of the SRC's importance and extent of the SRC's functions in managing funds; special provisions; research partnerships, and monitoring and evaluation were interpreted using weighted mean.

The weighted mean is the single most typical or representative score that characterizes the group's performance. This is a computational average and is defined as the sum of measurements (X) divided by the number of samples.

Results and Discussion

This part presents the results as well as the discussion of these results. Literature and studies were also used to support the results of the paper.

Table 2
Importance of Roles and Responsibilities of the SRC

Importance of Roles and Responsibilities of the SRC	QD	WM	R
1. Provides directions on research initiatives through the national and local Basic Education Research Agenda.	4.10	I	3
2. Provides directions on research initiatives on other identified priority research areas in DepEd	4.13	I	2
3. Forges partnerships with academic and research institutions, government agencies, and other DepEd offices on education research initiatives and projects.	3.81	I	6
4. Resolves emerging issues on the management and conduct of research at the school level.	4.15	I	1
5. Ensures that cost estimates fall under the existing accounting and auditing rules and regulations.	4.01	I	5
6. Endorses approved school-level proposals to the Division Office for review and inclusion into BERF.	4.09	I	4
General Weighted Mean	4.05	I	

Legend: 4.5- 5.00   Very Important (VI)   QD- Qualitative Description
         3.5-4.49   Important (I)   WM- Weighted Mean
         2.5-3.49   Fairly Important (FI)   R- Rank
         1.5-2.49   Slightly Important (SI)
         1.0-1.49   Not Important (NI)

Table 2 exhibits the importance of the roles and responsibilities of the SRC. The table further shows that the respondents perceived that the roles and responsibilities of the SRC in research management are essential (WM= 4.05). Likewise, their roles such as resolving emerging issues on the management and conduct of research at the school level (WM=4.15, rank 1); providing directions on research initiatives on other identified priority research areas in DepEd (WM= 4.13, rank 2); and providing directions on research initiatives through the national and local Basic Education Research Agenda (WM= 4.10, rank 3) were significant.

It can be gleaned from the results of the current study that the SRC primarily addresses school-research-related concerns and sets the school research directions. Though the RMG did not stipulate the existence of the SRC, several studies and literature affirm that schools must have an existing research committee to perform the abovementioned functions.

Because of the many benefits of having a research committee in an institution, the establishment of a research committee was seconded by Green and Langley (2009). They said that the committee was critical to the strategy-making process and was responsible for coordinating activities within academic departments and authorizing the final strategy document. Likewise, due to the vast and complex roles of research managers, they are recognized as "critical enablers" of research and innovation goals directed at achieving growth, impact, and sustainability (Ivey & Henry 2016).

With the necessity to establish research committees in the different levels of governance- Central Office, Regional Office, Schools Division Office, the RMG is helpful because it already specifies the composition, roles, and functions of the different committees from the National Research Committee of the DepEd Central Office, Regional Research Committee of the Regional Offices, down to the Schools Division Committee of the Division Offices

(DepEd Order 16, s. 2017). Conversely, the ordeal sets in because the RMG did not include the research committee at the school level (SRC) as well as the roles and functions of the committees.

Table 3

Research Management Cycle

Research Management Cycle	WM	QD	Rank
In coordination with the SDRC, assists in the wide dissemination of the call for proposals in the school.	4.27	PGE	1
Evaluates the proposals using the criteria and scoring rubrics stipulated in DO No. 16, s. 2017.	4.23	PGE	5
Contacts the teacher-proponent for clarifications.	4.26	PGE	2
Provides comments, if any, to the proposals, for consideration of the proponent before the implementation of the research	4.21	PGE	6
Discusses with the researchers the status of their studies.	4.19	PGE	8
Provides technical assistance to the researchers based on the feedback from the progress monitoring.	4.25	PGE	3.5
Evaluates the modifications made in the research proposal for their approval.	4.20	PGE	7
Grants a researcher requests for an extension provided that there are valid reasons for doing such.	4.08	PGE	11
Assesses and decides the duration of extension that will not exceed one (1) year.	4.07	PGE	12
Collaborate with the researcher, takes measures to ensure the dissemination and utilization of research results in various settings across governance levels		PGE	10
Provides a venue to actively disseminate results from completed research studies.		PGE	9
Encourages researchers to analyze, consider, and incorporate the results in their practices.		PGE	3.5
General Weighted Mean	4.19	PGE	

Legend: 4.5- 5.00   Practiced to a very great extent (PGVE)
3.5- 4.49   Practiced to a great extent (PGE)
2.5- 3.49   Practiced to a moderate extent (PME)
1.5- 2.49   Practiced to the least extent (PLE)
1.0- 1.49   Practiced poorly (PP)

QD – Qualitative description   WM – Weighted mean
R – Rank

Table 3 displays the extent of the practice of the SRC in terms of the research management cycle.

The table further shows that the SRC practiced, to a great extent, its functions under the research management cycle (GWM= 4.19). Specifically, the committee practiced to a great extent its tasks, such as: assisting in the wide dissemination of the call for proposals in coordination with the SDRC (WM= 4.27, rank 1); contacting the teacher-proponent for clarifications (WM= 4.26, rank 2); providing technical assistance to the researchers based on the feedback from the progress monitoring (WM= 4.25, rank 3.5); and encouraging researchers to analyze, consider, and incorporate the results in their practices (WM= 4.25, rank 3.5).

It can be gleaned from the results that the SRC, in terms of the research management cycle, is primarily concerned with disseminating information and providing technical assistance to the researchers. In DepEd, communication can be a combination of upward and downward. Feedback, policy recommendations, and performance reports generated from the field offices going to the Central Office reflect upward communication. Whereas organizational targets, policy issuances, and memorandum cascaded from a higher office to a lower office signify downward communication of the agency.

Implementing the RMG, being a research management policy, takes a downward form of communication. The rules and regulations specified in the document should be practiced in all levels of governance, from Central Office down to the schools. Hence, the current study results are aligned with the expectations of a downward form of organizational communication wherein the SRC must disseminate research-related information from higher offices such as the Schools Division Office, Regional Office, and Central Office. The committee must also provide technical assistance to teachers from the training provided by the mentioned higher offices.

Meanwhile, several kinds of literature support the findings of the current study. Though the RMG did not stipulate the roles of the SRC, the University of Bath (2020) in the United Kingdom issued a list of roles and responsibilities of the committee. Among the list are the following: (a) the development, promotion, and

enhancement of the faculty/ school's research strategy to meet the research objective as articulated in the plan; (b) the identification, monitoring, and promotion of how the faculty/ school can meet current and emerging research opportunities with the particular goals of increasing research income and the quality of research output meeting the other research objective as articulated in the plan; (c) monitoring, review, and improvement of research performance across the faculty/ school including oversight of bids for external funding, including the promotion of multidisciplinary research; analysis of research- related performance indicators, in particular, those used in national research assessment; and promotion and sharing of good practice in respect of research.

Also, the University of Sussex (2020) released the critical roles of its school research committee. Emphasis is given to the development of activities such as: (a) monitoring the school's progress against the parameters set out by the research committee; (b) receiving and approving department research strategies; (c) facilitating the interaction between departments and schools to promote interdisciplinary research; (d) to manage and the school's engagement with key funding initiatives; and (e) to promote and exchange best practice with the enhancement and management and conduct of research and knowledge exchange activities.

Given the roles of the SRC in the research management cycle, the inclusion of the SRC will help the SDRC to lessen its functions specified in the RMG. Since the school has the first level of accountability in research management (Benner & Sandstrom, 2000), the SRC will greatly help SDRC because there will be a division of labor between the offices. The submitted research to the SDRC will be scrutinized more thoroughly as the schools have already conducted an initial evaluation, ensuring more quality presented research papers. Likewise, the volume of research submitted to the SDRC will be lessened because the SRC has already screened the papers. This interplay between the SRC and the SDRC will make the research management more efficient as the functions are distributed between the offices.

Table 4

Funds Management

	FUNDS MANAGEMENT-	WM	QD	Rank
1	Ensures that the expenses detailed in the research proposals are appropriate and necessary for research.	4.00	PGE	2
2	Ensures that cost estimates fall under the existing accounting and auditing rules and regulations	4.01	PGE	1
3	Prepares and submits reports on the utilization of funds to SDO.	3.88	PGE	3
4	Requests additional funding requirements from the SDO and another possible funding source.	3.62	PGE	5
5	Manages external research funds.	3.64	PGE	4
General Weighted Mean		3.83	PGE	

Legend: 4.5- 5.00   Practiced to a very great extent (PGVE)
              3.5- 4.49   Practiced to a great extent (PGE)
              2.5- 3.49   Practiced to a moderate extent (PME)
              1.5- 2.49   Practiced to least extent (PLE)
              1.0- 1.49   Practiced poorly (PP)
QD – Qualitative description   WM – Weighted mean   R – Rank

Table 4 exhibits the extent of the practice of the SRC in terms of funds management. The table also shows that the SRC practiced, to a great extent, its role under funds management (GWM=3.83). In particular, the committee practiced to a great extent its functions in ensuring that cost estimates fall under the existing accounting and auditing rules and regulations (WM= 4.01, rank 1); in ensuring that the expenses detailed in the research proposals are appropriate and necessary in the conduct of research (WM= 4.00, rank 2); and in preparing and submitting reports on the utilization of funds to SDO (WM=3.88, rank 3).

RA 9155, otherwise known as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, mandated the schools to administer and manage all personnel, physical, and fiscal resources of the school. In this light, research committees play the roles of financial and fiscal managers when it comes to research management (Basic Education Sector Transformation 2017). Looking at the RMG sets how the committees manage the various research funds. The NRC recommends the release of research funds based on monitoring and evaluation reports, including but not limited to the BERF; the RRC

recommends the release of regional research funds and ensures that cost estimates fall under the existing accounting rules and regulations; while the SDRC ensure that cost estimates fall under the current accounting and auditing rules and regulations which is similar to the roles of the RRC. The functions under fund management will have been more accessible if the SRC is included in the RMG because a multitude of research studies will be submitted to the SDRC in the absence of the RRC. Also, the evaluation of research, which is a basis of fund release, can be a joint responsibility of the SRC and SDRC, which in effect, lessen the responsibilities of the SDRC.

Moreover, as financial and fiscal managers, research committees must be able to evaluate research proposals to ensure that they have complied with the requirements of the funding scheme. Benner and Sandstrom (2000) emphasized that research committees can influence research evaluation. Hence, schools should initiate the review of research proposals as they have the first level of accountability among the levels of governance. According to Kenett (2014), before a proposal can be submitted, there will generally be a need to obtain appropriate certification from the institution. This is because part of the responsibilities of a research director in schools is to establish a process for reviewing manuscripts before their submission to publishing outlets voluntarily submitted by school researchers (University of Glasgow n.d).

Table 5
Special Provisions

	SPECIAL PROVISIONS	WM	QD	Rank
1	Observes the highest ethical standards and uphold ethical principles in evaluating and implementing research proposals to protect the learners and communities.	4.49	PGE	3
2	Ensures confidentiality in handling the data of respondents.	4.55	PGE	1
3	Provides consent forms where necessary	4.53	PGE	2
	General Weighted Mean	4.52	PVGE	

Legend: 4.5- 5.00   Practiced to a very great extent (PGVE)
       3.5- 4.49   Practiced to a great extent (PGE)
       2.5- 3.49   Practiced to a moderate extent (PME)
       1.5- 2.49   Practiced to least extent (PLE)
       1.0- 1.49   Practiced poorly (PP)
QD – Qualitative description   WM – Weighted mean   R – Rank

Table 5 presents the extent of functions of the SRC in terms of special provisions. The table also shows that the SRC practiced functions under special provisions to a very significant extent (GWM= 4.52). Specifically, the committee practiced great time functions in ensuring the confidentiality in handling data of respondents (WM= 4.55, rank 1); providing consent forms where necessary (WM= 4.53, rank 2); and observing the highest ethical standards and upholding ethical principles in evaluating and implementing research proposals to protect the learners and communities (WM= 4.49, rank 3).

School research committees are tasked to manage the research plan effectively and efficiently and ensure that accepted research standards of research and ethical behaviors are met (University of Victoria 2021). School-level research committees, therefore, must adhere to legal mandates such as RA 10173 or the Data Privacy Act of 2012, which specifies that the data covered by the law, which includes personal information to be processed for research purposes, intended for a public benefit, shall be subject to the requirements of applicable laws, regulations, or ethical standard.

Regarding data to be used for research purposes, RA 10173 provides more details on handling the information. According to the law, data collected from parties other than the data subject for research shall be allowed when the personal data is publicly available or has the consent of the data subject for research: Provided that adequate safeguards are in place and no decision directly affecting the data subject shall be made based on the data collected or processed. The rights of the data subject shall be upheld without compromising research integrity.

Considering the abovementioned things, the Basic Education Sector Transformation in 2019 released a module for research managers entitled Evaluating a Research Proposal (ERP). The module discusses how research committees practice their role ethically. The document emphasized that the research committees must see to it that: (a) the confidentiality and anonymity of all respondents and their organizations shall be kept to protect them from possible harm or embarrassment; (b) participation in the research is voluntary, and the respondents would be asked of their consent to participate, where the purposes and expectations of the participants

are outlined clearly; (c) the participating organizations will be given an opportunity for feedback and debriefing and shall also receive a summary report of the essential findings and implications to enhance their professional practice.

Table 6

A Partnership Forged by SRC

	PARTNERSHIP FORGED BY SRC	WM	QD	R
1	State universities/ colleges and other academic institutions	3.59	PME	1
2	Non-Government Organizations (NGOs and Civil Society Organizations (CSO)	3.49	PME	3
3	Other Government Agencies/ Local Government Units (LGUs)	3.58	PME	2
4	Partnerships with Indigenous Cultural Communities	3.26	PME	4
General Weighted Mean		3.48	PME	

Legend: 4.5- 5.00   Practiced to a very great extent (PGVE)
           3.5- 4.49   Practiced to a great extent (PGE)
           2.5- 3.49   Practiced to a moderate extent (PME)
           1.5- 2.49   Practiced to least extent (PLE)
           1.0- 1.49   Practiced poorly (PP)
QD – Qualitative description   WM – Weighted mean
R – Rank

       Table 6 shows the extent of the practice of the SRC in terms of a partnership. The table also shows that the SRC practiced to a moderate extent its partnership role (GWM= 3.48). Moreover, the SRC practiced to a moderate extent its partnership with state universities/ colleges and other academic institutions (WM=3.59, rank 1); other Government Agencies/ Local Government Units (LGUs) (WM=3.58, rank 2); and Non- Government Organizations (NGO) and Civil Society Organizations (CSO) (WM=3.49, rank 3).

       Literature suggests that institutions must amplify their network and linkages to advance the research culture. However, the figures show that the SRC did not maximize partnership opportunities. This is similar to the findings of the study of Fetalver (2010), that there was an "average" compliance with the minimum standards on research networks and linkages. Thus he recommended that "the system of research networks and linkages should be given

54

The Roles, Functions, and Responsibilities of the School-Level Research Committee (SRC) in Deped IV-A Calabarzon: Basis for a Research Management Policy Note

much attention and prioritization be it local, national, or international, because developing the research capacity is taking essentially into consideration the effective means and systems of networking and linkage within and outside the academic community" (p.19). Developing and forging partnerships of schools with stakeholders is also consistent with the law. RA 9155 underscores the primary function of the school in terms of networking and linkages. The law emphasized that schools should "establish school and community networks and encourage the active participation of teacher- organizations, non-academic personnel of public schools, and parents-teachers-community associations" (Section 5, par. (E)10). This is also true when it comes to research management. This is because "linkages and networks are effective tools for successful R&D management" (Mani et al. 2010, p.88).

Table 7

Areas of Partnership with the SRC

	AREAS OF PARTNERSHIPS FOCUS ON…	WM	QD	R
1	Capacity building	4.07	PGE	2
2	Resource sharing	3.96	PGE	3
3	Research grants funding	3.61	PME	4.5
4	Research collaboration	4.11	PGE	1
5	Consultancy for government and industry research	3.61	PME	4.5
General Weighted Mean		3.87	PGE	

Legend: 4.5- 5.00   Practiced to a very great extent (PGVE)
       3.5- 4.49   Practiced to a great extent (PGE)
       2.5- 3.49   Practiced to a moderate extent (PME)
       1.5- 2.49   Practiced to least extent (PLE)
       1.0- 1.49   Practiced poorly (PP)
QD – Qualitative description   WM – Weighted mean   R – Rank

Table 7 displays the extent of the practice of the SRC in terms of the areas of partnership. The table further shows that the SRC practiced, to a great extent, its roles under areas of partnership. Mainly, partnership areas will focus on research collaboration (WM= 4.11, rank 1); capacity building (WM= 4.07, rank 2); and resource sharing (WM= 3.96, rank 3).

It can be gleaned from the results that the partnership

focuses on research collaboration, training, and resource sharing. These roles agree with the study of Trindade and Agostinho (2014) about the skills of research managers that include networking capacity, capacity to liaise with the business sector, facilitator, teamwork, flexibility, people-person, soft skills, diplomacy, and conflict management. In the study of Talens (2010), she found that in a private institution, a research network is developed and sustained through external research collaboration with private companies, government institutions, and other universities.

On the other hand, Lumbo and Declaro (2011), in their study entitled Triumphs and Failures in Managing the IPM Program in Occidental Mindoro: Lessons From the Experience of the Apostolic Vicariate of San Jose Livelihood Movement, Inc., proves the many benefits of partnership, particularly in resource sharing. They said that strong linkages with government and non-government organizations made seeking technical and financial assistance easier. The literature only proves that external connections and networking are necessary and part of the roles of the SRC.

Table 8
Monitoring and Evaluation

	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	WM	QD	R
1	Conducts structured monitoring of the research management in the school.	4.05	PGE	1.5
2	Provides feedback for the improvement of the whole policy (RMG).	4.04	PGE	3
3	In coordination with the SDRC, it conducts an annual review of the effectiveness and efficiency of the RMG policy in achieving its objectives.	3.93	PGE	4.5
4	Feedback from the monitoring and evaluation is reported during the Program Implementation Review (PIR) or Monitoring and Evaluation Adjustment (MEA).	3.93	PGE	4.5
5	Provides feedback to the SDRC on approved, ongoing, and completed research.	4.05	PGE	1.5
	General Weighted Mean	4.00	PGE	

Legend: 4.5- 5.00   Practiced to a very great extent (PGVE)
           3.5- 4.49   Practiced to a great extent (PGE)
           2.5- 3.49   Practiced to a moderate extent (PME)
`   1.5- 2.49   Practiced to least extent (PLE)
           1.0- 1.49   Practiced poorly (PP)
QD – Qualitative description   WM – Weighted mean   R – Rank

Table 8 shows the extent of the practice of the SRC in terms of monitoring and evaluation. The table also displays that the SRC practiced, to a great extent, its roles under monitoring and evaluation (GWM= 4.00). Specifically, the committee practiced to a great extent its functions, such as: conducting structured monitoring of the research management in the school (WM= 4.05, rank 1.5); providing feedback to the SDRC on approved, ongoing, and completed research (WM= 4.05, rank 1.5); and providing feedback for the improvement of the whole policy (RMG) (WM= 4.04, rank 3).

Monitoring and evaluation are crucial aspects of research management. Marigmen and Macadaeg (2010) further explained why monitoring and evaluation are vital in research management. They emphasized that research projects were regularly monitored for proper decision-making. They also said that necessary actions were made based on the monitoring activities' results. They further recommended that monitoring and evaluation mechanisms be sustained to provide timely information about the projects and make the necessary managerial adjustments.

In the study of Beerkens (2013), results suggested that management practices affect research productivity positively. Relatively, monitoring and evaluation are crucial aspects of management, as emphasized in the study of Derrick and Nickson (2014). They said that the manager's role in monitoring research includes ensuring staff cooperate in the research effort, maintaining contact with researchers throughout the project, and checking with researchers before making changes in the program that might affect the research effort.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The non-inclusion of the school-level research committee or the SRC creates a gap in implementing the RMG policy. Its absence also hampers the promotion of the culture of research in basic education. To temporarily fill the gap, schools designated research coordinators who perform the supposed SRC functions. The results of the paper are based on the perceptions of these teachers/ research coordinators about the roles, functions, and responsibilities of the SRC.

It was found that the SRC plays a vital role in the research management process, especially in managing the research activities in the school. Though excluded in the Research Management Guidelines (RMG), the committee has taken the responsibility to ensure that research processes are in place and properly managed. They also provided that in performing their roles, functions, and responsibilities, their actions followed the RMG policy. Thus, the inclusion of the Schools Research Committee (SRC) in the Research Management Guidelines (RMG) to standardize the committee's roles, functions, responsibilities, and expected outputs is imperative.

However, it was found that among the practices of the SRC, partnerships, and linkages were performed less compared to the other areas of research management. This impacts the participatory nature of evidence-based policymaking in the Department of Education. The partnership of the schools with state universities/ colleges and other academic institutions, other Government Agencies/ Local Government Units (LGUs), and Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) and Civil Society Organizations (CSO) must be strengthened to help the school not just in research but also in the delivery and implementation of basic education services.

Meanwhile, the low performance in partnerships and linkages can be attributed to the non-inclusion of the SRC in the RMG. Hence, a research management policy note is recommended. This research management policy note will focus on the inclusion of the SRC in the RMG, which highlights the roles and functions, compositions, and partnership and linkages opportunities. Additionally, the SRC's roles, functions, and responsibilities are the areas/ variables identified in the current research under the research management cycle, managing funds, special provisions, partnership and linkages, and monitoring and evaluation. This also serves as a feedback mechanism to determine which among the areas/ variables need technical assistance to implement the RMG better. The results of the study will also serve as inputs to the ongoing review of the Research Management Guidelines (RMG).

Acknowledgment

References

Adoption of the basic education research agenda, DepEd Order No. 39 (2016). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/up loads/2016/06/DO_s2016_039.pdf

Ayala, C., & Garcia, B.H. (2013). Research productivity and utilization in Higher Education Institutions in the CALABARZON Region. *MSEUF Research Studies, 2*(15).

Basic Education Sector Transformation. (2017). *Competency-based learning and development plan for research management*. Basic Education Sector Transformation.

Basic Education Sector Transformation. (2019). *Evaluating a research proposal*. Basic Education Sector Transformation.

Beerkens, M. (2013). *Facts and fads in academic research management: the effect of management practices on research productivity in Australia*. Research Policy (42)9 https:// www.researchgate.net/publication/259095733_Facts_and_ fads_in_academic_research_management_The_effect_of_ management_practices_on_research_productivity_in_Aus tralia

Benner, M., & Sandstrom, U. (2000). Institutionalizing the triple helix: Research funding and norms in the academic system. *Research Policy, 29*(2) 291-301. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/223637945_Institutionalizing_the_Triple_Helix_Research_Funding_and_Norms_in_the_Academic_System

Derrick, G., & Nickson, A. (2014). *Invisible intermediaries: A systematic review into the role of research management in university and institutional research processes. The Journal of Research Administration 45*, 2: 11-45. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1157172.pdf

Erno-Kjolhede, E. (2000). *Project management theory and the management of research projects*. Department of Management, Politics and Philosophy Copenhagen Business School.

Establishment of a policy development process at the Department of Education, Department Order No. 13 (2015). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/04/13/do-13-s-2015-establishment-of-a-policy-development-process-at-the-department-of-education/

Fetalver, M,A. (2010). Determinants of Strengthened Research Capability and Fostered Research Culture in State Higher Education in the Region. *PHILARM Journal*, (7), 25. https://philarm.webs.com/PHILARM%20Journal%20Volume%20\7%20(Complete).pdf

Good, C., & Scates, D. (1954). Methods of research: Educational, psychological, sociological. *Sage Journals*.https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/001316445501500316

60

The Roles, Functions, and Responsibilities of the School-Level Research Committee (SRC) in Deped IV-A Calabarzon: Basis for a Research Management Policy Note

Green, J., & Langley, D. (2009). Professionalising research management. *Higher Education Funding (HEFCE) and the Medical Research Council (MRC)*. https://snowballmetrics. com/wp-content/uploads/2009-professionalising-research-management-2.pdf

Johnson, A. (2013). *Improving your research management. Elsevier.* https://www.elsevier.com/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/754780/ELS_Johnson_book_interior_web.pdf

Kennett, B. (2014). *Planning and managing scientific research: A guide for the beginning researcher.* ANU Press. https://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/p277501/pdf/book.pdf

Lumbo, S., & Declaro, M.Y.A. (2011). Triumphs and failures in managing the IPM program in Occidental Mindoro: Lessons from the experience of the apostolic vicariate of San Jose livelihood movement, Inc. *PHILARM Journal*, (8),1. https://philarm.webs.com/PHILARM%20Journal%20Volume%208%20(Complete).pdf

Marigmen, M., & Macadaeg, E. (2010). Sustainable agricultural technologies and practices development program: Poverty reduction tool. *PHILARM Journal*, (7),1. https://philarm.webs.com/PHILARM%20Journal%20Volume%207%20(Complete).pdf

National Research Agenda 2009-2018. (2009). https://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/sites/default/files/ressources/philippines_national_higher_education_research_agenda.pdf

Project Management Institute . (2013). *A guide to the project management body of knowledge.* Project Management Institute Inc.

Data Privacy Act of 2012, (2011). https://www.privacy.gov.ph/
      data-privacy-act/

Republic Act No. 9155. Governance of Basic Education Act of
      2001 (2001). https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2001/08/11/
      republic-act-no-9155/

Research Africa. (2013). *Being a research manager understanding
      your role and maximizing your impact*. https://www.sarima.
      co.za/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/rm_notebook_01.pdf

Research Management Guidelines, DepEd Order No. 16. (2017).
      https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/
      DO_s2017_016.pdf

Riol, H., & Thuillier, D. (2015). Project management for academic
      research projects: Balancing structure and flexibility.
      *International Journal of Project Organization and
      Managements, 7*(251). https://www.researchgate.net/
      publication/282210826_Project_management_for_
      academic_research_projects_Balancing_structure_and_
      flexibility

Talens, J. (2010). Assessment of the research culture among private
      HEIs in a region: Basis for developing a primer. *PHILARM
      Journal*, (7), 25. https://philarm.webs.com/PHILARM%20
      Journal%20Volume%207%20(Complete).pdf

Trindade, M., & Agostinho, M. (2014). *Research management in
      Portugal: A quest for professional identity.* https://
      files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1022036.pdf

University of Bath. (2020). *Faculty/ school research committee
      terms of reference.* https://www.bath.ac.uk/corporate-
      information/faculty-school-research-committe
      terms-of-reference

62

The Roles, Functions, and Responsibilities of the School-Level Research Committee (SRC) in Deped IV-A Calabarzon: Basis for a Research Management Policy Note

University of Glasgow. (n.d). *School of Education*. https://www.gla.ac.uk/schools/education/ref2021/

University of Sussex. (2020).*School of global studies*. http://www.sussex.ac.uk/global/internal/research/committees/school_research_committee

University of Victoria. (2021). *Duties and responsibilities of directors of research centres*. https://www.uvic.ca/universitysecretary/assets/docs/policies/GV0715_1069_.pdf