



Republic of the Philippines
Department of Education
Region VII, Central Visayas
DIVISION OF CEBU PROVINCE
Sudlon, Lahug, Cebu City



AUG 25 2016

DIVISION MEMORANDUM
No. 493, s. 2016

DIVISION ASSESSMENT OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (SIP)

**To: Assistant Superintendents
Chiefs/Education Supervisors/Coordinators
District Supervisors/OICs
Elementary & Secondary School Heads**

1. This Office announces the conduct of a **Division Assessment of School Improvement Plan (SIP)** in both elementary and secondary schools of Northern Cebu from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM on the following schedules;

DATE	MUNICIPALITY
September 1, 2016	Consolacion
September 2, 2016	Cordova
September 3, 2016	Liloan
September 4, 2016	Compostela
September 12, 2016	Carmen
September 13, 2016	Catmon
September 14, 2016	Sogod
September 15, 2016	Borbon
September 16, 2016	Tabogon
September 19, 2016	San Remigio
September 20, 2016	Medellin
September 21, 2016	Daanbantayan
September 22, 2016	Tabuelan
September 23, 2016	Asturias
September 26, 2016	Tuburan
September 27, 2016	Balamban
September 28, 2016	Pilar
September 29, 2016	Tudela
September 30, 2016	Poro
October 3, 2016	San Francisco
October 4, 2016	Sta Fe
October 5, 2016	Madridejos
October 6, 2016	Bantayan

2. This activity aims to:

- a. assess the crafting of the SIP in both elementary and secondary schools; and
- b. utilize the attached Quality Assessment Tool provided by BEST in assessing the crafted SIP.

3. The following are the Assessors;

ASDS Roseller N. Gelig
Dr. Mary Ann P. Flores
Mrs. Nenita G. Jaralve
Dr. Pamela A. Rodemio
Mr. Jose Gary Napoles
Mrs. Rosemarie Oliverio
Mrs. Juvimar Montolo

Dr. Novie O. Mangubat
Mrs. Jane O. Gurrea
Mrs. Evelyn F. Balang
Mr. Ceasar Restauro
Mrs. Maria Elena T. Paras
Dr. Gerardo S. Mantos
Mr. Isaiash Wagas

4. Schools in Southern Cebu will have a separate schedule later.

5. Transportation and traveling expenses of the Assessors and other incidental expenses relative thereto, shall be chargeable against **Division Funds**, subject to their availability and the usual accounting and auditing rules and regulations.

5. This Memorandum serves as Assessors' Authority to Travel.

6. Immediate and wide dissemination of this Memorandum is desired.


RHEA MAR A. ANGTUD, Ed.D., CESO VI
Schools Division Superintendent

Telephone Numbers:

Schools Division Superintendent: (032) 255-6405
Asst. Schools Division Superintendent: (032) 414-7457
Accounting Section: (032) 254-2632
Disbursing Section: (032) 255-4401
Admin/Legal: (032) 253-7847

Website : www.depedcebuprovince.com
E-mail Add : depedcebuprovince@yahoo.com

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
School Improvement Plan (SIP) Quality Assessment Tool

Output Checklist		Available?	Reviewer Comments
Preparatory Activities			
1	School- Community Data Template		
2	School Report Card		
4	List of SPT members		
3	Documentation of vision sharing		
5	List of SPT with roles and responsibilities		
Assess/Plan			
6	Gap Analysis Template		
7	Priority Improvement Area (PIA) Template		
8	Planning Worksheet		
8.1	Intermediate Outcomes		
8.2	Priority Improvement Areas		
8.3	General Objectives		
8.4	Root Cause		
8.5	Timeframe		
9	Project Team members with roles and responsibilities		
10	Documentation of listening to the voice of the learners		
11	Flowchart of school processes relevant to each PIA		
12	Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix		
13	Annual Implementation Plan		

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
School Improvement Plan (SIP) Quality Assessment Tool

Chapter 1: VMV		Rating	Reviewer Comments
Content		1.0	
1	Clarity and completeness of introduction of the DepEd VMV and how it relates to this plan	1	
1.1	Was there discussion in the chapter about the DepEd VMV?		
1.2	Was there discussion in the chapter about how the SIP is linked to the DepEd VMV?		
1.3	Did you clearly understand the SIP and the DepEd VMV after one reading of the discussion?		
2	Clarity and completeness of discussion of the plans and how these strategically contribute to the intermediate outcomes	1	
2.1	Was there discussion in the chapter about the intermediate outcomes of DepEd?		
2.2	Was there discussion in the chapter about how the SIP is linked to the intermediate outcomes of DepEd?		
2.3	Did you clearly understand the SIP and the intermediate outcomes of DepEd after one reading of the discussion?		
Style and Language		1.0	
1	Compliance with the following requirements:	1.0	
1.1	DepEd style guide	1.0	
1.1.2	Did it leave you the impression that this section was written based on DepEd's prescribed style guide?		
1.2	Template and branding requirements	1.0	
1.2.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section used the correct DepEd logo and placement as indicated in the DepEd branding guidelines (if applicable)?		
1.3	Citation and labeling	1.0	
1.3.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section properly cited its sources using the Chicago Manual of Style or its equivalent as guide?		
1.4	When needed, did this section present the following additional information using the prescribed format	1.0	
1.4.1	Graphs		
1.4.2	Tables		
1.4.3	Sidebars		
1.4.4	Photos		
1.4.5	Infographics		
2	Appropriateness of language and grammar used	1.0	
2.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section used gender neutral words (e.g., they, he/she, chairperson, etc.)?		
2.2	Did it leave you the impression that this section used appropriate grammar?		
2.3	Did it leave you the impression that this section had minimal spelling corrections?		

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
School Improvement Plan (SIP) Quality Assessment Tool

Chapter 2: School's Current Situation		Rating	Reviewer Comments
Content		1.0	
1	Clarity and completeness of discussion on the school's geography	1	
1.1	Was there discussion in the chapter about the school's geography?		
1.2	Did you clearly understand the school's geography after one reading of the discussion?		
2	Clarity and completeness of discussion on the school's learning environment	1	
2.1	Was there discussion in the chapter about school's learning environment?		
2.2	Did you clearly understand the school's learning environment after one reading of the discussion?		
3	Clarity and completeness of discussion on the teacher's situation	1	
3.1	Was there discussion in the chapter about the school's teacher's situation?		
3.2	Did you clearly understand the school's teacher's situation after one reading of the discussion?		
4	Clarity and completeness of discussion on learner's health and safety	1	
4.1	Was there discussion in the chapter about the learner's health and safety?		
4.2	Did you clearly understand the learner's health and safety after one reading of the discussion?		
5	Clarity and completeness of discussion on learner's access to basic education	1	
5.1	Was there discussion in the chapter about the learner's access to basic education?		
5.2	Did you clearly understand the learner's access to basic education after one reading of the discussion?		
6	Clarity and completeness of discussion on learner's quality of education	1	
6.1	Was there discussion in the chapter about the learner's quality of education?		
6.2	Did you clearly understand the learner's quality of education after one reading of the discussion?		
Style and Language		1.0	
1	Compliance with the following requirements:	1.0	
1.1	DepEd style guide	1.0	
1.1.2	Did it leave you the impression that this section was written based on DepEd's prescribed style guide?		
1.2	Template and branding requirements	1.0	
1.2.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section used the correct DepEd logo and placement as indicated in the DepEd branding guidelines (if applicable)?		
1.3	Citation and labeling	1.0	
1.3.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section properly cited its sources using the Chicago Manual of Style or its equivalent as guide?		
1.4	When needed, did this section present the following additional information using the prescribed format	1.0	
1.4.1	Graphs		
1.4.2	Tables		
1.4.3	Sidebars		
1.4.4	Photos		
1.4.5	Infographics		
2	Appropriateness of language and grammar used	1.0	
2.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section used gender neutral words (e.g., they, he/she, chairperson, etc.)?		
2.2	Did it leave you the impression that this section used appropriate grammar?		
2.3	Did it leave you the impression that this section had minimal spelling corrections?		

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
School Improvement Plan (SIP) Quality Assessment Tool

Chapter 3: Planning Worksheet		Rating	Reviewer Comments
Content		1.0	
1	Priority Improvement Area (PIA)	1.0	
1.1	Did the SIP present the Priority Improvement Areas?		
1.2	Did it leave you the impression that the PIAs were identified using the prescribed process and rubrics (strategic importance, urgency, magnitude, and feasibility)?		
1.3	Did it leave you the impression that the PIAs cover all activities mandated by DepEd policies (i.e. professional development for teachers)?		
2	Root Cause	1.0	
2.1	Did the SIP present the root causes of the PIA?		
2.2	Did it leave you the impression that the root causes identified in the SIP were derived using a root cause methodology (i.e. fish bone, problem tree, etc)?		
2.3	Quality of articulation of root cause (can they be easily understood?)		
3	General Objectives	1.0	
3.1	Did the SIP present its objectives?		
3.2	Did it leave you the impression that the objectives identified in the SIP address the root cause?		
3.3	Did it leave you the impression that the objectives identified in the SIP are necessary to address the root cause?		
3.4	Quality of articulation of strategies (can they be easily understood?)	1.0	
3.4.1	Were the objectives written as an approach to deliver the intermediate outcomes?		
3.4.2	Were the objective written in an infinitive sentence?		
4	Timeline	1.0	
4.1	Did the SIP present timeline?		
4.2	Did it leave you the impression that the timeline is feasible?		
Style and Language		1.0	
1	Compliance with the following requirements:	1.0	
1.1	DepEd style guide	1.0	
1.1.2	Did it leave you the impression that this section was written based on DepEd's prescribed style guide?		
1.2	Template and branding requirements	1.0	
1.2.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section used the correct DepEd logo and placement as indicated in the DepEd branding guidelines (if applicable)?		
1.3	Citation and labeling	1.0	
1.3.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section properly cited its sources using the Chicago Manual of Style or its equivalent as guide?		
1.4	When needed, did this section present the following additional information using the prescribed format	1.0	
1.4.1	Graphs		
1.4.2	Tables		
1.4.3	Sidebars		
1.4.4	Photos		
1.4.5	Infographics		
2	Appropriateness of language and grammar used	1.0	
2.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section used gender neutral words (e.g., they, he/she, chairperson, etc.)?		
2.2	Did it leave you the impression that this section used appropriate grammar?		
2.3	Did it leave you the impression that this section had minimal spelling corrections?		

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
School Improvement Plan (SIP) Quality Assessment Tool

Chapter 4: Monitoring & Evaluation		Rating	Reviewer Comments
Content		1.0	
1	Monitoring Arrangements	1.0	
1.1	Did the SIP present its monitoring arrangement?		
1.2	Did it leave you the impression that the monitoring arrangements were identified using the prescribed process?		
2	Appropriateness of monitoring arrangements	1.0	
2.1	Did it leave you the impression that the discussion on monitoring and reporting mechanisms both in terms of progress monitoring and results monitoring was complete?		
2.2	Did it leave you the impression that the discussion on data sources or means of verification was complete?		
2.3	Did it leave you the impression that data sources or means of verification are readily available for M&E purposes?		
2.4	Did it leave you the impression that the timing of reporting and monitoring is appropriate and relevant?		
2.5	Did it leave you the impression that the planned frequency of monitoring and reporting was appropriate?		
2.6	Did you clearly understand the monitoring and reporting mechanisms both in terms of progress monitoring and results monitoring after one reading?		
Style and Language		2.0	
1	Compliance with the following requirements:	3.0	
1.1	DepEd style guide	NA	
1.1.2	Did it leave you the impression that this section was written based on DepEd's prescribed style guide?		
1.2	Template and branding requirements	1.0	
1.2.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section used the correct DepEd logo and placement as indicated in the DepEd branding guidelines (if applicable)?		
1.3	Citation and labeling	1.0	
1.3.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section properly cited its sources using the Chicago Manual of Style or its equivalent as guide?		
1.4	When needed, did this section present the following additional information using the prescribed format	1.0	
1.4.1	Graphs		
1.4.2	Tables		
1.4.3	Sidebars		
1.4.4	Photos		
1.4.5	Infographics		
2	Appropriateness of language and grammar used	1.0	
2.1	Did it leave you the impression that this section used gender neutral words (e.g., they, he/she, chairperson, etc.)?		
2.2	Did it leave you the impression that this section used appropriate grammar?		
2.3	Did it leave you the impression that this section had minimal spelling corrections?		