Republic of the Philippines
Department of Education
REGION X
DIVISION OF CAGAYAN DE ORO CITY

Office of the Schools Division Superintendent

DepEd DIVISION OF CAGAYAN DE ORO CITY RELEASED BY: DATE: 06 JUL 2026

06 Jul 2026

DIVISION MEMORANDUM
No. 606 s.2026

CONDUCT OF DISTRICT-LEVEL REVIEW OF THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (SIP) PRIOR TO DIVISION ACCEPTANCE

TO: Assistant Schools Division Superintendent
Chiefs, SGOD and CID
Public Schools District Supervisors/Districts In – charge
Concerned SGOD Personnel
All Public Elementary and Secondary School Heads

1. In line with the Division's commitment to ensuring the quality, coherence, and compliance of School Improvement Plans (SIPs) with existing planning standards and policy directions, all Public Schools District Supervisors (PSDSs) and Districts-in-Charge (DICs) are hereby directed to conduct a **district-level review** of the SIPs of schools under their respective jurisdictions prior to their submission to the Schools Division Office for acceptance.

2. The district-level review aims to:

a. ensure the completeness and quality of the School Improvement Plans;
b. validate the alignment of the SIP with the Division Education Development Plan (DEDP), the Quality Basic Education Development Plan (QBEDP), and other relevant DepEd policies and priorities;
c. identify areas for enhancement prior to Division-level acceptance; and
d. strengthen the quality assurance process of school development planning.

3. The **Public Schools District Supervisor (PSDS)** or **District-in-Charge (DIC)** shall lead the review process. The conduct, organization, and procedure of the review shall be **at the discretion of the respective PSDS or DIC**, taking into consideration the context and operational arrangements within the district.

4. To ensure a common quality assurance standard across all districts, the **SIP Quality Assurance Decision Tool**, attached as **Enclosure No. 1**, shall be used during the review process. The same tool shall likewise serve as a reference for School Heads in reviewing and refining their SIPs prior to the district-level review.

5. Attached as **Enclosure No. 2** is the **Division Planning Team – Panel of**

Address: Fr. William F. Masterson Ave., Upper Balulang, Cagayan de Oro City
Telephone: (088) 855-0044, (088) 855-0047, (088) 328-2142
Email Address: cagayandeoro.city@deped.gov.ph
Website: https://depedcdo.net/

Reviewers, who shall serve as the official panel responsible for the Division-level review and acceptance of the finalized School Improvement Plans (SIPs). The panel shall review endorsed SIPs and provide recommendations, as necessary, prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Acceptance.

6. Schools are encouraged to coordinate closely with their respective district offices and address the recommendations arising from the district-level review before submitting the finalized SIP to the Schools Division Office.

7. The district-level review shall be completed prior to the submission of the finalized School Improvement Plan to the Schools Division Office. The deadline for the submission of the finalized SIP, together with the required supporting documents, shall be **on or before July 17, 2026**.

8. Only SIPs that have undergone the prescribed district-level quality assurance review and have been endorsed by the respective Public Schools District Supervisor (PSDS) or District-in-Charge (DIC) shall be accepted for Division-level review by the Division Planning Team – Panel of Reviewers.

9. In adherence to Equal Opportunity Principle (EOP), inclusive and fair treatment is accorded to all personnel regardless of disability, sexual orientation, gender, age, religion, and ethnicity.

10. This Office directs immediate and wide dissemination of this Memorandum.

ROY ANGELO E. GAZO
Schools Division Superintendent

Encl.: As stated
Reference: None
To be indicated in the Perpetual Index
under the following subjects:

COMMUNICATION PLANNING
DM038-SGOD-PR-BASEN/ conduct of district-level review of the school improvement plan (sip) prior to division acceptance
July 6, 2026

SIP Quality Assurance Decision Tool

Purpose: To determine whether the School Improvement Plan (SIP) has been developed through a sound planning process, accurately reflects the planning outputs, and is ready for endorsement to the Schools Division Office.

Part I. School Profile

School:		**District:**	
School Head:		**PSDS/DIC**	
Date Reviewed:		**SIP Cycle:**	1st Term

Part II. Quality Assurance Procedure

The Public Schools District Supervisor (PSDS) or District In-charge (DIC) shall use this instrument following the procedures below:

1. **Validate the Planning Documents**
   - Review the planning documents submitted by the school to determine whether the School Improvement Plan (SIP) was developed through a systematic, evidence-based, and results-oriented planning process. Verify the logical alignment among the Dashboard, Gap Analysis, Priority Improvement Areas, Identification of Challenges, Strategic Interventions, Financial Planning, Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix (PWBM), and Annual Implementation Plan (AIP).
   - Decision Point: If significant weaknesses are identified in the planning documents, return the submission to the school and provide the necessary technical assistance before proceeding to the SIP content review.
2. **Validate the SIP Content**
   - If the planning documents meet the minimum quality standards, review the SIP to determine whether its contents accurately reflect the validated planning outputs. Verify the consistency of the school's current situation, strategic plans, key performance targets, strategic interventions, monitoring and evaluation framework, and annexes with the approved planning documents.
   - Decision Point: If inconsistencies exist between the SIP and the planning documents, identify the specific sections requiring revision and provide appropriate technical assistance.
3. **Conduct the Traceability Test**
   - Confirm that every project, program, and activity included in the SIP can be traced back to:
     a. a validated Division strategic target and/or office priorities;
     b. a verified school performance gap;
     c. an identified priority improvement area;
     d. a corresponding strategic intervention;
     e. an approved Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix (PWBM); and
     f. the Annual Implementation Plan (AIP).
   - Likewise, ensure that every identified priority improvement area has at least one corresponding intervention, project, and implementation strategy reflected in the SIP.
4. **Prescribe Technical Assistance**
   - For every deficiency or inconsistency identified during the review, document the specific technical assistance required. Clearly indicate the planning component that needs improvement, the nature of the issue, the recommended intervention or coaching support, the person responsible, and the agreed timeline for completion. This serves as the basis for follow-up coaching and monitoring by the PSDS.
5. **Determine the Recommendation**

- Based on the results of the planning validation, SIP content review, traceability test, and technical assistance assessment, determine the appropriate recommendation using the following categories:
    a. Endorse to the Schools Division Office – The planning documents and SIP are complete, consistent, and aligned with the Division's strategic priorities.
    b. Endorse after Minor Revisions – Minor revisions are required but may be verified by the PSDS without requiring another full review.
    c. Return for Technical Assistance and Resubmission – Significant improvements are required before the SIP may be endorsed.
    d. Require Major Revision of Planning Documents – Fundamental weaknesses exist in the planning process; the school must revisit the planning documents before revising the SIP.

Guiding Principle:

The quality of a School Improvement Plan depends on the quality of the planning process from which it is developed. Therefore, this Quality Assurance Decision Tool adopts a "planning-first" approach, wherein the planning documents are validated before the SIP content is reviewed. Only after establishing that the planning process is evidence-based, logically aligned, and responsive to Division priorities shall the SIP be evaluated for consistency and readiness for endorsement.

Stage 1. Planning Quality Assurance

Objective: Determine whether the planning documents were properly developed before reviewing the SIP.

Planning Documents Validation

Planning Document	Validation Questions	Yes	No	Remark
Dashboard	Does the dashboard present complete, updated, and validated school performance data aligned with QBEDP indicators?			
Gap Analysis	Are performance gaps computed as Division Target – School Baseline and supported by evidence?			
Priority Improvement Areas	Were priorities selected using the approved prioritization criteria and formula?			
Identification of Challenges	Do the identified challenges explain the root causes of the performance gaps?			
Strategic Interventions	Does each intervention directly address the identified challenge and performance gap?			
Financial Planning	Are estimated costs reasonable and are funding sources identified?			
Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix	Does every intervention have a corresponding project, timeline, budget, and person responsible?			
Annual Implementation Plan	Does the AIP consistently reflect the PWBM in terms of projects, timelines, budgets, and outputs?			

Stage 1 Decision:

☐ **PASS** – Proceed to SIP Content Validation

☐ **RETURN** – Provide Technical Assistance before SIP review

Stage 2: SIP Content Validation

Objective: Determine whether the SIP accurately reflects the validated planning documents.

SIP Section	Source Planning Document	Validation Questions	Yes	No	Remarks
DepEd Vision, Mission, and Core Values	Standard	Are the official DepEd Vision, Mission, and Core Values correctly presented?			
School's Current Situation	1. School Dashboard 2. QBEDP 5 Outcomes 3. Gap Analysis	1. Is the school profile consistent with the dashboard? 2. Does the narrative accurately present the school's performance against the five QBEDP outcomes?			
Key Performance Targets	Gap Analysis	Do the targets correspond to the validated performance gaps?			
List of Solutions / Key Interventions	Strategic Intervention Matrix	Are the listed interventions identical to the validated strategic interventions?			
Project Work Plan and Budget Matrix	PWBM	Is the PWBM section identical to the validated PWBM?			
Monitoring and Evaluation (SPIR)	AIP	Does the monitoring plan reflect the activities, timelines, indicators, and responsibilities identified in the AIP?			
Annexes	All Planning Documents	Are all required planning documents attached and consistent with the SIP?			

Stage 2 Decision:

☐ PASS – Proceed to Traceability Test

☐ RETURN – Revise SIP narrative before endorsement

Stage 3. Traceability Test

Objective: Verify that every project can be traced back to a validated planning output.

Validation Statement	Yes	No	Remarks
Every project originates from a verified performance gap.			
Every intervention addresses an identified challenge.			
Every project appears in the PWBM.			
Every PWBM project appears in the AIP.			
Every project contributes to at least one QBEDP outcome.			
Budgets are consistent across Financial Planning, PWBM, and AIP.			
Timelines are consistent across PWBM and AIP.			

Part III. Technical Assistance Prescription

Purpose: Document the assistance that the PSDS will provide to strengthen the SIP before endorsement.

Planning Component	Issue Identified	Technical Assistance to be Provided	Person Responsible	Timeline	Status
Dashboard					
Gap Analysis					
Priority Improvement Areas					
Identification of Challenges					
Strategic Interventions					
Financial Planning					
PWBM					
AIP					
SIP Narrative					

Part IV. Overall Quality Assurance Summary

Area	**Rating**
Planning Documents	☐ Satisfactory ☐ Needs Revision
SIP Content	☐ Satisfactory ☐ Needs Revision
Traceability	☐ Satisfactory ☐ Needs Revision
Overall Readiness	☐ Satisfactory ☐ Needs Revision

ENDORSEMENT DECISION

After reviewing the planning documents and the SIP, the undersigned recommends:

☐ ENDORSE TO THE SCHOOLS DIVISION OFFICE

☐ ENDORSE AFTER MINOR REVISIONS VERIFIED BY THE PSDS

☐ RETURN TO THE SCHOOL FOR TARGETED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RESUBMISSION

☐ REQUIRE MAJOR REVISION OF THE PLANNING DOCUMENTS PRIOR TO SIP FINALIZATION

Reviewed by:

____

PSDS/DIC

Concurred by:

BEVERLY ANNE E. NICOLASORA

SEPS – Planning and Research

Division Planning Team – Panel of Reviewers

____
PSDS/DIC

RODEL S. MEGOLLAS, MTCRE
Division Planning Officer

ELEANOR CONSEJO H. ROLLAN, PhD
SEPS – M and E

ARNEL A. CALUBAG, CPA
Accountant III

BEVERLY ANNE E. NICOLASORA
SEPS – Planning and Research

ROSALIO R. VITORILLO, PhD
SGOD Chief

AUDIE S. BORRES, CESO VI
Schools Assistant Division Superintendent

ROY ANGELO E. GAZO, CESO V
Schools Division Superintendent