04/221-069

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Education
REGION IV-A CALABARZON
CITY SCHOOLS DIVISION OF THE CITY OF TAYABAS

12 APRIL 2021

DIVISION MEMORANDUM
No. 137. s. 2021

RECONSTITUTION OF THE SCHOOLS DIVISION RESEARCH COMMITTEE (SDRC) AND SPECIFYING ROLES THEREIN

To: Assistant Schools Division Superintendent
Chief Education Supervisors
Heads, Unit/Section
Heads, Public Elementary and Secondary Schools
All Others Concerned

1. In line with DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2017 Research Management Guidelines (RMG) which states that "DepEd establishes the Research Management Guidelines to provide guidance on the research management process and the rules and responsibilities of research managers in the central, regional, schools division offices, and schools", this office announces the reconstitution of the Schools Division Research Committee (SDRC).

2. The SDRC is composed of the following:

Chairperson: Gerlie M. Ilagan, CESO VI
Assistant Schools Division Superintendent

Co-Chairpersons: Edwin R. Rodriguez, EdD
Chief, School Governance and Operations Division (SGOD)
Imelda C. Raymundo
Chief, Curriculum Implementation Division (CID)

Members: Marife R. Lagar
Planning Officer III
Joseph Jay U. Aureada
CID Research Focal Person
All Education Program Supervisors

By invitation:
Representative/s from Budget and Finance Unit

Representative/s from Teacher-Researcher's Association in the Division of Tayabas City (TRAin.C)

Secretariat: Luzviminda E. Saludares
Division Research Coordinator

3. The SDRC shall:
   a. provide directions on the research initiatives through the national and local Basic Education Research Agenda, and other prioritized research initiative in the Division;
   b. evaluate and approve research proposals, full manuscripts, and other related research initiatives of the Division;
   c. forge partnerships with academic and research institutions, government agencies, and other DepEd offices on education research initiatives and projects;
   d. prepare and submit reports to the Regional Research Committee (RRC) on the research initiatives conducted in the Division;
   e. resolve emerging issues on management and conduct of research;
   f. ensure that cost estimates fall under existing accounting and auditing rules and regulations in cases of government-funded researches; and
   g. endorse approved proposals to the Regional Office (RO) for Basic Education Research Fund (BERF).

4. The SDRC Secretariat shall:
   a. organize, coordinate, and document meetings of the Committee;
   b. conduct initial screening of submitted proposals for compliance with submission guidelines;
   c. aid SDRC members in recommending proposals and full manuscripts for approval as per criteria in the RMG;
   d. liaise with the academic and research institutions, government agencies, and other DepEd offices in the conduct of the research;
   e. provide technical feedback to the researchers in the conduct of their studies;
   f. conduct periodic monitoring on research initiatives in schools and CLCs within the division;
   g. prepare periodic report on accomplishments related to Division research initiatives; and
   h. prepare a complete staff work in support of the Committee's functions as needed.

5. All elementary and secondary public schools in the Schools Division of Tayabas City are hereby encouraged to constitute their respective Research Committee.

6. Attached is Enclosure 1 – Division Research Management Guidelines for the perusal of all concerned.

7. Widest dissemination and strict compliance of this Memorandum is desired.

ANIANO M. OGAYON, CESO V
Schools Division Superintendent

Enc. As stated.

Enclosure 1

DIVISION RESEARCH MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

I. RATIONALE

To promote an environment of evidence-based decision making, DepEd has made strides in instituting research and its utilization in policy and program development. Some of these policies are the DepEd Order (DO) No. 13, s. 2015 (Establishment of a Policy Development Process at the Department of Education), DO No. 16, s. 2017 (Research Management Guidelines), DO No. 39, s. 2016 (Adoption of the Basic Research Agenda), and DepEd Memorandum (DM) No. 144, s. 201 (Supplemental Research Guides and Tools).

As we strengthen the research culture, this Memorandum seeks to build on the foregoing reforms by establishing a framework for the management of research initiatives in the Division. This framework intends to improve the research management process, and reinforce the link of research to education processes through research dissemination, utilization, and advocacy.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

For clarity and consistency, the following terms and phrases will be construed as follows:

1. Action Research - is a type of research initiated to improve existing practices, acquire knowledge to become better practitioners, or develop strategies to address problems in an operating unit (e.g. classroom, school, office) (Beaulieu, 2013).
2. Assent for Minors - is an affirmative agreement of a minor to participate in the study.
3. Author - is the researcher who has the major contribution in the proposal/manuscript. He/she drafts and revises the intellectual output and approves the final version of the proposal/manuscript. Authorship should be based on the magnitude of contribution; hence, the author with the most contributions would be the senior (first mentioned) among the other authors, if there are any (Portus, Barrios, Conaco & Go, 2018).
4. Basic Research - is a type of research that focuses on the full understanding of a phenomenon, theory, law, or any scientific topic. It does not necessarily have immediate application in the practical level.
5. Certificate of Authorship - is a document given to the author and co-author(s) of a completed research, after submitting their full manuscript, and approved by the Schools Division Research Committee (SDRC).
6. Certificate of Participation - is a document given to the attendees (e,g, presenters, observers) of the division/municipal conference, colloquium, or any research activity.
7. Certificate of Recognition - is a document given to the author and/or co-author(s) for the sake of recognizing their effort in presenting their research in a division/municipal conference, colloquium, or any research activity.
8. Co-author - is the researcher who plays a supplementary role in the development of the proposal/manuscript.
9. Contributor - helps in the supervision of research, funding, technical writing, editing, or proof reading. He/she does not qualify as an author/co-author.
10. Data falsification - includes any form of data presented that are not genuinely product of the research process (American Psychological Association [APA], 2017). This could either be totally fabricated, or manipulated, in order to meet one's own hypotheses, or expectations (APA, 2017).

11. Fraud - deliberate form of deception intended to result in financial and/or personal gain.
12. Immediate Supervisor - is a person to whom the personnel concerned is directly reporting to. In the school setting, the school head is the immediate supervisor of the teacher.
13. Informed Consent - is agreement among the author, co-author(s), and the participant, who is 18 years old or above, to voluntarily participate after stating the key information about the study.
14. Parental Consent - is the agreement among the author, co-author(s), and the parent/guardian of the participant, who is below 18 years old, to voluntarily allow the minor to participate in the research, after stating the key information about the study.
15. Participant - is the person who takes part in a research by being the target of observation or data collection. It is used synonymously with the terms: "respondent" , "subject", and "informant"
16. Plagiarism - is intellectual theft (APA, 2017). It involves deliberate/unintentional use of another person's words or ideas, without proper attribution. It also includes self-plagiarism and cyber-plagiarism (APA, 2017).
17. Proponent - refers to the author/co-author who submitted a proposal.

III. RESEARCH COMMITTEES

Research Committees will be set up at each governance level to supervise and monitor quality assurance and improvement measures in respect of the Division research activities, including the efficacy of research quality measures. They will provide guidance and make recommendations in the conduct of education research in alignment with the Basic Education Research Agenda (DO No. 39, s. 2016) and in the utilization of research results to inform the Division planning, policy, and program development aligned with its mission, vision, and core values.

The research committees will lead in the call of proposals, evaluation, approval, publication, consolidation of research reports, and full manuscript. Below are the composition, roles, and responsibilities of the committees.

A. SCHOOLS DIVISION RESEARCH COMMITTEE (SDRC)

Pursuant to DO No. 16, s. 2017, the Schools Division Research Committee (SDRC) will assume the following responsibilities at the division level:

1. Provide directions on the research initiatives through the national and local Basic Education Research Agenda, and other prioritized research initiative in the Division;
2. Evaluate and approve research proposals, full manuscripts, and other related research initiatives;
3. Forge partnerships with academic and research institutions, government agencies, and other DepEd offices on education research initiatives and projects;
4. Prepare and submit reports to the Regional Research Committee (RRC) on the research initiatives conducted in the Division;
5. Resolve emerging issues on management and conduct of research;
6. Ensure that cost estimates fall under existing accounting and auditing rules and regulations in cases of government-funded researches; and
7. Endorse approved proposals to the Regional Office (RO) for Basic Education Research Fund (BERF).

Chairperson: Gerlie M. Ilagan, CESO VI
Assistant Schools Division Superintendent

Co-Chairpersons: Edwin R. Rodriguez, EdD
Chief, School Governance and Operations Division (SGOD)
Imelda C. Raymundo
Chief, Curriculum Implementation Division (CID)

Members: Marife R. Lagar
Planning Officer III
Joseph Jay U. Aureada
CID Research Focal Person
All Education Program Supervisors

By invitation:
Representatives from Budget and Finance Unit

Representative/s from Teacher-Researcher's Association in the Division of Tayabas City (TRAin.C)

Secretariat: Luzviminda E. Saludares
Division Research Coordinator

Adviser: Aniano M. Ogayon, CESO V
Schools Division Superintendent

To facilitate the evaluation and approval of research proposals, Committee members shall designate permanent alternates to represent them during SDRC meetings, in case of unavailability.

The SDRC Secretariat shall deliver the following:

i. Organize, coordinate, and document meetings of the Committee;
j. Conduct initial screening of submitted proposals for compliance with submission guidelines;
k. Aid SDRC members in recommending proposals and full manuscripts for approval as per the criteria and scoring template provided in Annexes 9a and 9b; Liaise with the academic and research institutions, government agencies, and other DepEd offices in the conduct of the research;
l. Provide technical feedback to the researchers in the conduct of their studies;
m. Conduct periodic monitoring on research initiatives in schools and CLCs within the division;
n. Prepare periodic report on accomplishments related to Division research initiatives; and
o. Prepare a complete staff work in support of the Committee's functions as needed.

IV. RESEARCH MANAGEMENT CYCLE

A. CALL FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

Proposals must be submitted for approval to SDRC. The SDRC will approve the research proposals in the Division.
The proposal to be submitted to the SDRC must include the following requirements:
1. Application form and endorsement of immediate supervisor (Annex 1);
2. Research proposal (Annex 2) in a separate ordinary folder;
3. Declaration of originality, anti-plagiarism, and absence of conflict of interest (Annex 3);

4. SDRC feedback forms (5 copies) (Annex 4);
5. Request for SDRC Feedback (Annex 5);
6. Informed consent form for participants of legal age (Annexes 6a and 6b), and/or assent for minors (Annexes 7a and 7b) and parental consent for participants less than 18 years old (Annexes 7c and 7d);
7. 2 Title Pages (1 without the name(s) of researcher(s), 1 with name) (Annexes 8a and 8b); and Expanded Envelope (color to be determined by the SDRC Secretariat).

The research proposal should be typed and double-spaced on an A4-sized paper, with 1-inch margin on all sides. Texts should be in 12 pt Arial font. In-text citation and reference list must follow the APA citation style 6th edition format.

B. EVALUATION OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS

i. INITIAL SCREENING

The SDRC secretariat shall conduct initial screening of submitted proposals against the eligibility requirements.
Proposals falling under the following conditions will not be further evaluated, and will immediately be returned, with technical inputs, to the proponents:
1. Incomplete documentary requirements as prescribed in the call for proposals;
2. Conflict of interest in personal and professional aspects, which may influence the impartiality of the parties concerned, whether the proponent or the research manager;
3. Non-conformance to research ethics;
4. Non-alignment of research topic with the national and local basic Education Research Agenda (DO No. 39, s. 2016);
5. Non-alignment of research topic with the national RMG (DO No. 16, s. 2019); and
6. Plagiarized proposals.

The SDRC Secretariat shall encode all the pertinent details of the research proposals in the designated online spreadsheet. He/she shall only forward the research proposals with the Title Pages without the names of researchers.

Soft copies of aforementioned documents and other documents included in the annexes can be accessed and downloaded through the link *tinyurl.com/Tayabas Research Files.*

ii. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

The SDRC Secretariat shall receive the documents. She shall check if the documents submitted are complete. If not, she shall contact the researcher for the submission of the lacking document(s).

The SDRC shall evaluate the proposals using the criteria and scoring template (Annexes 9a for basic researches, and 9b for action researches) to be used as guide for the SDRC feedback. The scores garnered using the aforementioned template shall not be a basis for the rejection of the proposals; however, to be recommended for Basic Education Research Fund (BERF), proposals must score at least 70 points. The proposal score sheet form (Annex 10) shall be used by the SDRC.
The SDRC Chair shall designate SDRC Members, who will evaluate the research proposals. The number of evaluators shall be determined through the number of research proposals submitted in the Division:

10 Proposals – 3-5 SDRC evaluators each proposal;

11 -20 proposals – 2-4 SDRC evaluators each proposal;

21- 30 proposals – 1-3 SDRC evaluators each proposal; and
31 proposals and more – 1-2 SDRC evaluators each proposal.

In addition, the evaluators shall be determined by the difficulty of the research topic and the expertise of the evaluators. The SDRC Secretariat shall keep the record of the assigned evaluators by encoding in the designated online spreadsheet.
At any point in the evaluation process, the committee may contact the proponent for clarifications through the most cost-efficient means.
Green and/or blue pens shall be used in checking/evaluating the proposals.
SDRC evaluators shall accomplish a summary of their feedback for each paper. The Summary of Feedback (Annex 11), along with the proposal and other submitted documents shall be enclosed in each expanded envelope. The following documents shall be completed and submitted to the SDRC Secretariat, in this order:

1. Application form and endorsement of immediate supervisor;
2. Research proposal in a separate ordinary folder;
3. Declaration of originality, anti-plagiarism, and absence of conflict of interest;
4. Proposal score sheet;
5. Accomplished SDRC feedback forms;
7. Accomplished Request for SDRC Feedback;
8. Accomplished consent forms; and
9. Title Page without the name(s) of researchers).

The SDRC Chair will designate SDRC Members, who will evaluate the research proposals. The evaluator(s) shall be determined through their expertise on the research topic. The SDRC Secretariat shall keep the record of the assigned evaluators by encoding in the designated online spreadsheet.
The SDRC Secretariat shall be tasked to release the proposal, other documents and the SDRC feedback to the researchers as soon as possible.

C. **REVISIONS AND IMPROVEMENT OF PROPOSALS**

The SDRC Secretariat shall release the documents together with the SDRC Feedback, to the researchers.

D. **COMMENCEMENT AND ORIENTATION**

SDRC Chair shall schedule the presentation of research proposals on a date approved by SDRC. He/she shall assign/invite panel members. TRAin.C Officers shall be assigned to lead the different Technical Working Groups (TWGs).

Each researcher shall be given 1 Certificate of Recognition and 1 Certificate of Participation.

Researchers shall be given 3 options to choose from TRAin.C Officers and SDRC Members their respective technical critics for their research. However, the SDRC Chair shall have the final say on the number and designation of technical critics according to the difficulty of the topic, and expertise and willingness of the SDRC members and TRAin.C Officers to serve such assignment.

SDRC Chair shall lead in the orientation of the researchers. He/she shall announce the name(s) of Technical Critic(s) assigned to each research.

The SDRC Secretariat shall submit the following to the SDRC:

1. Narrative Report of the Activity;

2. List of Actual Research Presenters with the names of their respective Technical Critics; and

3. Photo documentation.

E. **PROGRESS MONITORING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

The SDRC shall schedule the research monitoring. The SDRC Chair shall lead in the monitoring of researches. He/she shall choose the composition of the monitoring team, provided that no classes shall be disrupted.

Technical assistance may be given anytime convenient to both the researcher(s) and the designated critic. Assistance may be given using any form of communication, including digital means, provided that the choice of platform or means supports the immediate and convenient relay of information and feedback.

F. **SUBMISSION OF THE FULL MANUSCRIPT**

Upon the completion of the research, the researcher(s) shall submit the following to the SDRC Secretariat:

1. Application form and endorsement from immediate supervisor;

2. Declaration of originality;

3. Signed SDRC Evaluation sheet;

4. SDRC Feedback Form;

5. Full Manuscript (Annex 12); and

6. Executive Data Set

The SDRC Secretariat shall screen the completeness of the documents submitted. She shall also check the executive data set if it reflects the results and findings in the study. Should the executive data set show huge evidences of discrepancies with the findings, the SDRC through the SDRC Secretariat shall recommend to the researcher to conduct the study again.

G. **SDRC EVALUATION OF THE FULL MANUSCRIPT**

The SDRC shall designate at least 2 SDRC Members or TRAin.C Officers to give feedback to the content of the full manuscript. The designated reviewers shall accomplish the SDRC Feedback Form.

The SDRC Secretariat shall release the documents, including the SDRC Feedback form to the researchers. The researcher/s shall revise and improve their full manuscripts based on the feedback of SDRC.

H. **COMMENCEMENT**

The SDRC shall organize Division colloquia/fora/conference. Committees shall be created through the leadership of the SDRC Chair. Panel members shall accomplish

the feedback form to be given to the researchers. Upon presentation, researchers shall take note of the feedback and comments, and shall be given Certificates of Recognition and Participation. The SDRC Secretariat shall submit the following documents to SDRC:

1. Narrative Report of the Activity;
2. List of Actual Research Presenters; and
3. Photo documentation.

I. REVISIONS AND IMPROVEMENT OF FULL MANUSCRIPTS

The researchers shall revise and improve their full manuscripts based on the feedback of the SDRC and TRAin.C Officers.

J. SUBMISSION, ACCEPTANCE, AND ARCHIVAL

Full manuscript shall be submitted to the SDRC Secretariat. The SDRC shall determine the fitness of the manuscript for archival based on the technicalities such as but not limited to:

1. format; and
2. grammar.

The SDRC Secretariat shall release the signed SDRC Approval Sheet (Annex 13) complete. Should the full manuscript be unfit for archival, the SDRC Secretariat shall provide the reasons to the researcher through a formal letter. The researcher shall do the appropriate revisions as advised.

Once approved, researchers shall submit 1 hard copy of the full paper for the SDRC, and 1 soft copy (pdf format) for the SDRC. Certificate of Authorship shall be issued by the SDRC upon the receipt of the soft copy of the full manuscript.

K. DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION

Dissemination and utilization of research results are crucial in the achievement of learning outcomes, and improve the teaching-learning and governance processes in schools, and the SDO. The SDRC, in collaboration with the researchers, will take measures to ensure the dissemination and utilization of research results and recommendations in the area/office/govemance level where the study was conducted, preferably attended by the respondents. The SDRC will provide venues to disseminate results from completed research studies and encourage everyone to analyze, consider, and incorporate these results in their practices.

In addition, the Division may utilize the completed researches to improve learning outcomes and administrative processes. Evidences may be used in the development of policies, frameworks, programs and projects; strategic, operational, and midterm plans; training programs; and instructional materials, to mention few governance strategies.

With the support of the school heads, teachers can disseminate and utilize their research through the existing mechanisms, such as Learning Action Cells (LACs), In-service Training (INSET), School Governing Council (SGC), Enhanced School Improvement Plan (eSIP), Annual Implementation Plan (AIP), and School Report Card (SRC).

Finished researches can also be disseminated through different web-based research platforms. Another possible venue for disseminating the research findings are the international and local (non-DepEd) conferences. However, because of the prevalence of predatory conferences, careful review of the background, contact details, office address, reviews and reputation of the organizers and the conference itself must be taken into consideration, before submitting research abstracts. Once the paper is accepted, the author must submit the following to the Office of the Schools Division Superintendent for approval:

1. Letter of request addressed to SDS, with the recommending approval from the school head and SDRC;

2. Notice of acceptance from the conference organizer;

3. Leaflets, or any promotional material containing relevant details about the conference; and

4. Research abstract submitted.

Upon the submission of the documents to the Division Office, SDRC shall check the legitimacy of the conference. If proven to be legitimate, or in the absence of "red flags", the approval to present the research shall be released within 5 working days.

V. SPECIAL PROVISIONS

A. OWNERSHIP AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE RESEARCH PAPER

A research can be individual, or group. The name of the author in the research paper shall be written first, while the names of the co-authors shall be arranged according to the magnitude of their contributions. Contributors shall not be included in the list of authors.

The number of co-authors is limited to two for school action and basic researches; for division, regional, or national researches, the number of co-authors is limited to 4. The number of co-authors for GAD and CIP researches shall be determined by the Division GAD and CIP Coordinators.

B. RESEARCH ETHICS

The SDRC and the researchers shall observe the highest ethical standards. The SDRC shall uphold the ethical principles in evaluating and implementing research proposals to protect our learners and communities.

Integrity in research is a commitment to accuracy. The following guidelines, as adapted from Portus et al. (2018), shall be observed to make sure integrity shall be upheld in the conduct of the research:

1. Apply only the statistical methodologies suitable to data and to obtaining valid results.

2. Avoid tendencies to slant quantitative analysis or qualitative interpretations towards predetermined outcomes, or draw conclusions based on faulty or insufficient evidence, that will unduly favor the sector, the research sponsor, or the researcher.

3. Preserve and honor the integrity of the historical record or document Fabricating, destroying, distorting or hiding sources or evidence, especially in documentary, will be subjected to disciplinary action,

4. The recording, disclosure, and preservation of research data, ethnographic, or historical evidence, should be consistent with laws, policies, global covenants, and rules of professional ethics.

The principle of confidentiality is the protective handling of information revealed in the relationship of trust and with the expectation that it will not be divulged to anyone without permission. The following guidelines, as adapted from Portus et al. (2018), must be observed to ensure the confidentiality, anonymity, and privacy, in handling data of the participants.

1. The participants' identity should not be revealed unless permission has been obtained, or such data are available from public documents.

2. The author/co-author(s) must make explicit to the participants how the data will be collected; how the information they provided will be safeguarded; and who may and will use this data.

3. The participants have the right to privacy, and to be free from unwanted observation, disturbance, and interference. They also have the right to control the access to their personal and private information.

4. Participants should be assured of anonymity. Their identities must be concealed in the research reports and public presentations of research output.

Anyone found to have violated the research ethics shall be blacklisted from availing any research grant mechanism and from presenting in any conference organized by the Department.

The researchers will refer to the DepEd Child Protection Policy (DO No. 40, s. 2012) as reference, in relation to interaction with the learners.

VI. PROCEDURE FOR THE ENDORSEMENT OF EXTERNAL RESEARCHES

External researches are studies of non-DepEd organizations, such as but not limited to Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and private institutions. Proponents, who

intend to conduct their external researches within the Division shall submit the following to the Division Office:

1. Letter of intent to conduct the research addressed to the Schools Division Superintendent (SDS). The letter must contain the official letter head of the organization, and must be signed by the proponent(s) and the research adviser/Dean;

2. Research proposal/objectives/statement of the problem;

3. Research instrument; and

4. Informed consent (Annexes 6a and 6b), and/or assent for minors (Annexes 7a and 7b) and parental consent (Annexes 7c and 7d).

VII. PLAGIARISM AND FRAUD

The research proponents are required to observe the highest standard of ethics during the preparation and implementation of the research proposals. They shall ensure that the research proposal and final report submitted are the original works. Appropriate referencing and citation must be included in the research proposal and the final report. The American Psychological Association (6th edition) format shall be used in citing the references.

The proponent/s is/are required to submit an anti-plagiarism declaration (Annex 3) attesting to the originality of the research study. Any act of fraud and plagiarism shall be dealt with accordingly. Further, anyone found to have committed plagiarism will be blacklisted from availing of any other research grant mechanism in the Department.

VIII. REFERENCES

American Psychological Association. (2017). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index Beaulieu, R. (2013). Action research: Trends and variations. Canadian Journal of Action Research, 14(3), 29-39. Retrieved from

https://journals.nipissingu.ca/index.php/cjar/artide/download/99/61
Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 16, s. 2017. Retrieved from

http://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/DO_s2017_016.pdf
DepEd Order No. 39, s. 2016. Retrieved from http://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/DO__s2016_039.pdf DepEd Memorandum No. 144, s. 2017. Retrieved from http://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/DM—s2017__144.pdf Portus, L., Barrios, E., Conaco, M. & Go, S. (2018). Doing social science research: A guidebook. Diliman, Quezon City: Philippine Social Science Council.