

# Instructional Supervisory Practices of School Heads in Bulusan District: Basis for Policy Recommendations

Jeffrey F. Riamon<sup>1</sup>; Virginia D. Detera<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>School of Graduate Studies, Annunciation College of Bacon Sorsogon Unit, Inc.,  
Sorsogon City, Philippines

Publication Date: 2026/04/10

**Abstract:** This study explored the instructional supervisory experiences, practices, strengths, challenges, and policy recommendations relevant to school heads in public elementary schools. Employing a mixed-methods design, the research combined qualitative interviews to capture the lived experiences and supervisory approaches of school heads with quantitative assessments that measured their strengths and weaknesses in instructional leadership, communication, and innovation. The findings revealed that school heads frequently navigate a complex balance between providing instructional support such as conducting classroom observations, mentoring teachers, monitoring curriculum implementation, and facilitating assessments, and managing extensive administrative responsibilities. While the results indicate that school heads generally exhibit strong competencies in communication, leadership, and innovative problem-solving, several supervisory limitations emerged, including difficulty sustaining instructional follow-through, challenges in setting clear instructional goals, and constraints brought about by insufficient resources. Further analysis identified key challenges that hinder effective supervision, particularly administrative workload, limited support from higher offices, and lack of adequate learning materials. Despite these barriers, school heads continue to implement meaningful supervisory practices that promote teacher growth, curriculum alignment, and data-driven instructional decisions. The study recommends systemic adjustments such as reducing administrative burdens, expanding professional development opportunities, improving resource provision, and encouraging collaborative leadership structures. Overall, the findings underscore the importance of strengthening institutional support to enhance the effectiveness of instructional supervision and ultimately improve teaching and learning outcomes in public elementary schools.

**Keywords:** Curriculum Implementation, Instructional Supervision, Policy Recommendation, Supervisory Function, Supervisory Practices.

**How to Cite:** Jeffrey F. Riamon; Virginia D. Detera (2026) Instructional Supervisory Practices of School Heads in Bulusan District: Basis for Policy Recommendations. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(4), 154-169. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26apr016>

## I. INTRODUCTION

The quality of teaching and learning in basic education is strongly shaped by how instructional leadership is practiced within the school setting. While policies and curricula provide direction, it is the consistent guidance, monitoring, and support extended to teachers that directly influence classroom instruction and learner achievement. School heads play a central role in this process, as they are responsible not only for managing school operations but also for fostering continuous improvement in instruction through purposeful supervision. In schools that operate amid varied challenges and limited resources, instructional supervision emerges as a vital means of maintaining teaching quality, enhancing teacher competence, and supporting the broader goals of education.

In every educational institution, the school head or principal holds a pivotal role in shaping the direction, performance, and culture of the school. As Ramos; says the success or failure of an institution's educational mission often rests on the principal's ability to lead both administratively and instructionally. In the Philippine educational context, Castillo emphasis school heads are not merely office-bound managers but instructional leaders who supervise teaching and learning, mentor teachers, and ensure the effective and efficient implementation of the curriculum,

Section 4 of Republic Act No. 9155, otherwise known as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, provides a clear and comprehensive definition of the School Principal as the person responsible for both the administrative and instructional supervision of the school. The law explicitly identifies the principal as accountable for the promotion and

preservation of academic excellence and effective teaching and learning. This responsibility underscores the pivotal role of the school head as both a manager and an instructional leader whose primary task is to ensure that quality education is effectively delivered within the school system.

The law emphasizes that the principal, as an institutional supervisor, must take the lead in all educational activities and programs. This leadership goes beyond managerial duties; it calls for the principal to be a catalyst of learning transformation. The provision also highlights that in carrying out their supervisory functions, school heads must manifest professional courtesy, helpfulness, and sympathy toward teachers and other school personnel. Such qualities are not mere niceties but essential characteristics of effective supervision anchored in mutual respect, empathy, and collaborative engagement. These attributes form the bedrock of what the law describes as standards of effective school supervision, dignified administration, responsible leadership, and enlightened direction.

In essence, Republic Act 9155 portrays the principal as both a leader and servant, one who manages the school with integrity while nurturing an environment conducive to the holistic development of learners and teachers alike. The principal is not merely a figure of authority but a transformative leader, guiding teachers toward professional growth and inspiring them to reach the standards of excellence expected in the education system.

This view of the principal's role was further reinforced by Brother Armin A. Luistro, then Secretary of the Department of Education, during the Principals' Forum of the National Capital Region, Philippine Elementary School Principals' Association (NCR-PESPA) in 2010. Luistro delivered a powerful message that has since resonated with many educators: that Principals should not be confined to their offices but should be out in the field where the real action of education happens. His statement challenged the traditional notion of leadership as a desk-bound role, advocating instead for a model of visible, participative, and responsive leadership.

According to Luistro, "Principals, who just stay in their offices and do not personally monitor the situation in their respective schools, do not transform Philippine education." This assertion highlights that genuine educational leadership is not achieved through administrative paperwork alone, but through direct engagement with the teaching and learning process. A school head must understand firsthand the conditions of classrooms, the challenges faced by teachers, and the learning needs of students. By being present and participatory, Principals are better able to diagnose problems, provide immediate solutions, and inspire their teachers to continuously improve their practice.

Luistro further explained that Principals should be proactive in their supervision by "doing the rounds, inquiring on the needs of the teachers, filling their inadequacies, sharing their joy and sympathizing in their grief." This description paints a vivid picture of a human-centered

leadership style, one that recognizes teachers not merely as subordinates but as partners in education. The principal's role, therefore, extends beyond monitoring compliance; it involves mentorship, emotional support, and professional guidance. In this regard, the principal becomes both a coach and a confidant, fostering a school culture built on trust, empathy, and shared purpose.

Such leadership requires a deep sense of accountability and dedication. To be "on top of everything that happens in the school" means that the principal must embody vigilance, adaptability, and foresight. A school is a dynamic ecosystem where numerous processes occur simultaneously curriculum implementation, classroom instruction, student management, and community engagement. The principal must ensure that all these components function harmoniously to achieve the overarching goal of educational excellence.

Luistro's vision also underscores the need for transformational leadership among school heads. He asserted that Principals should possess the capability to translate the Department's vision into reality and turn plans into action. This involves not only understanding the goals of the education system but also aligning school-level initiatives with national and regional educational priorities. The effective Principal is one who bridges policy and practice, someone who can take abstract directives and convert them into meaningful programs that directly benefit learners and teachers.

Moreover, Luistro described himself as an eternal optimist, one who believes in the potential of every individual within the education system. His statement, "I always want to see and draw out the best in everyone," encapsulates the essence of positive educational leadership. It reflects a mindset that values empowerment over control, growth over perfection, and collaboration over isolation. By seeking to maximize the potentials of young students, Luistro argued that education leaders must likewise maximize the potentials of teachers and Principals. This concept rests on the belief that the quality of student learning is inherently linked to the quality of teacher performance, which in turn depends on the quality of leadership exercised by the school head.

This leadership philosophy aligns with modern educational paradigms emphasizing distributed leadership and instructional supervision as key factors in improving school performance. Research in recent years supports Luistro's assertion, showing that effective school leadership is strongly correlated with higher levels of teacher motivation, better instructional quality, and improved learner outcomes. The principal, therefore, stands at the intersection of policy, pedagogy, and people management tasked with harmonizing these elements to foster a learning environment that is both efficient and nurturing.

In summary, both Republic Act 9155 and Luistro's educational philosophy converge on one central idea: that the principal's role is one of active, compassionate, and transformative leadership. The principal must serve as an instructional leader, guiding teachers to improve their craft; a

manager, ensuring the efficient operation of the school; and a visionary, translating educational goals into tangible results. This multifaceted role requires a balance of technical competence and emotional intelligence, administrative skill and moral purpose.

Ultimately, the measure of a principal's effectiveness lies not in the number of reports submitted or meetings presided over, but in the positive transformation that occurs within the school community, inspired teachers, engaged learners, and a culture of shared pursuit for excellence. Through this form of leadership, the principal becomes the true embodiment of the spirit of Republic Act 9155: a steward of learning, a servant-leader, and a relentless advocate of educational quality and human development" DepED considers that education reforms can only happen if the principals are hands-on. They should also be able to inspire their constituents, to energize the people below them and earn the respect of those above them. "Principals should be able to correct, to encourage, to set the standard and to live by example," He added that aside from being a School Administrator, he should also be the direct link to the community who will open the door for more stakeholders to invest in public education.

According to Mangadlao In rural settings such as Bulusan District in the Division of Sorsogon, the challenges of instructional leadership are magnified by contextual realities such as limited resources, teacher shortages, and the multiple roles that school heads perform daily. Barredo, et al also said that despite these constraints, principals are expected to fulfill their roles as mentors, supervisors, and curriculum leaders in ensuring that instruction meets the standards set by the Department of Education (DepEd).

Following the disruptions of the COVID-19 pandemic, the role of school heads as instructional supervisors became even more crucial. Ngussa & Makewa pointed out that the abrupt shift to modular and blended learning modalities in 2020 exposed the need for strong instructional guidance and emotional support from principal and also cited by HRMARS. Johnsons and O'Brein said that as schools transitioned back to face-to-face instruction, supervision played a key role in helping teachers manage learning gaps, adjust pedagogy, and rebuild classroom routines.

Recent studies across the world affirm that instructional supervision significantly influences teacher performance and student achievement and it is make sense in the writing of Osei et al. When principals engage in supportive, formative, and collaborative supervision rather than merely evaluative oversight, teachers demonstrate stronger reflective practices and higher motivation; Lewis et al. Similarly, the studies of Valida; in the Philippines have shown that consistent and structured supervision enhances both teacher efficacy and learner outcomes was also given fact by Dacer et al.

In Ghana, Osei and Mensah emphasized that effective supervision improves teacher morale and instructional quality when head teachers conduct classroom observations followed by meaningful mentoring. Meanwhile, Maisyaroh compared

supervision practices in Indonesia and the Philippines, highlighting that the success of supervision depends largely on cultural context, leadership style, and systemic support. Hassan & Nasir suggested that instructional supervision findings is not a one-size-fits-all process but a contextual and relational practice; Chan et al.

Within the Philippine framework, Republic Act 9155 and the DepEd Manual of Operations identify principals as both administrative and instructional leaders responsible for ensuring academic excellence. Yet despite these mandates, the actual practice of supervision varies widely among school heads due to workload, travel constraints, and limited professional training. In districts like Bulusan, school heads often manage multiple schools across distant barangays, balancing administrative and pedagogical responsibilities.

Instructional supervision is critical not only for teacher accountability but also for professional growth. Studies have shown that school heads who engage teachers in reflective dialogue, evidence-based feedback, and collaborative planning tend to create more motivated and effective teaching teams was also given place by White et al. and Ahmed et al. The New Teacher Project further noted that classroom observations should serve a developmental purpose, helping teachers identify strengths, address weaknesses, and refine instructional methods.

The primary goal of classroom observation is to make sure that the teacher is in the right track of delivering the basic strategies which may result to the remarkable achievement of the learners. It will also be the basis for data gathering which will be used in strengthening instructional practices, approaches and support mechanism in DepEd No. 196, s. 2012. Another purpose is describing the status of instructional practices and identifying instructional problems is stated by Good.

#### ➤ *Statement of the Problem*

This study entitled instructional supervisory practices of school head in Bulusan, District: basis for policy and recommendation, answered the following questions:

- What are the experiences of school heads as instructional supervisor in Bulusan?
- How do school heads perform their instructional supervisory practices along with:
  - ✓ Classroom Observations
  - ✓ Mentoring
  - ✓ Curriculum Implementation
  - ✓ Evaluation of Learning Outcomes
- What are the strength and weaknesses of the school heads in performing instructional supervision?
- What challenges do school heads face in implementing their supervisory role?
- What policy recommendation can be proposed to address the identified challenges?

## II. METHODOLOGY

This study employed mixed-method research design. Mixed-method research is an approach that integrates both quantitative and qualitative data to produce a more comprehensive understanding of a phenomenon. It combines numerical trends with contextual explanations, allowing researchers to capture not only “what” is happening but also “why” and “how” it occurs.

The study employed a mixed-method research design because it sought to understand the instructional supervisory practices of school heads from both experiential and measurable perspectives. The qualitative component was essential for capturing the nuanced experiences, challenges, and supervisory approaches of school heads through narratives and direct accounts, which revealed insights into communication, mentoring, curriculum implementation, and leadership practices. Meanwhile, the quantitative component allowed the study to measure the strengths, weaknesses, and supervisory challenges using mean scores, rankings, and descriptive statistics, which provided objective patterns and trends across respondents. By integrating these two forms of data, the study was able to produce a richer, more accurate understanding of how school heads supervise instruction, the factors that influence their effectiveness, and the systemic issues that shape their roles, something that neither qualitative nor quantitative data alone could fully capture.

The participants of this study were the 10 elementary School Heads from the Municipality of Bulusan, Division of Sorsogon province who were chosen using purposive sampling. The covered schools are Buhang Elementary School, Bulusan Central School, Dancalan Elementary School, Sabang Elementary School, San Bernardo Elementary School, San Francisco Elementary School, San Rafael Elementary School, San Roque Elementary School, Sta. Barbara Elementary School and Tinampo Elementary School.

## III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Presented in this chapter are presentation, analysis, and interpretation of the data gathered from the participants of the study from the Municipality of Bulusan, Division of Sorsogon, regarding their instructional supervisory practices.

### A. *Experiences of the School Heads as Instructional Supervisors*

The participants of this study shared significant experiences as school heads serving as instructional supervisors. Their narratives reflect the day-to-day realities of supervision, showing how school heads interact with teachers, manage instructional processes, and navigate the demands of their supervisory roles. Through these accounts, the varied and nuanced experiences of school heads emerge, illustrating significant aspects of their instructional supervision practices.

### ➤ *Experiences of School Heads in Interacting with Teachers*

The participants described their interactions with teachers as a central part of their supervisory role, emphasizing the need for open communication, sensitivity, and adaptability. They shared how conversations before and after classroom observations help create a supportive atmosphere where teachers feel guided rather than judged. Many school heads also highlighted the importance of friendly, informal discussions during meetings or vacant periods to address concerns without causing discomfort. Through these consistent and respectful interactions, the school heads were able to build trust, encouraged professional reflection, and fostered a collaborative relationship with their teachers.

Participant 9 mentioned “In my interactions with teachers, I always make sure to communicate openly and respectfully. Before giving any feedback, I take time to listen to their explanations and understand their perspective. This approach helps ease tensions and allows us to discuss instructional concerns in a positive and constructive way.” Similarly, participant 10 shared “I consistently remind teachers that my role is to support, not intimidate. During informal hallway conversation. I try to reassure them that feedback is meant to help them improve. Over time, this open and friendly interaction has made teachers more comfortable approaching me whenever they need guidance”.

Participants 9 and 10 highlighted the significance of open, respectful, and supportive communication in their interactions with teachers, reflecting their experiences as school heads. Participant 9 emphasized actively listening to teachers’ perspectives before providing feedback, which helps ease tensions and promotes constructive discussions on instructional concerns. In a similar vein, Participant 10 focused on reassurance and informal interactions, consistently reminding teachers that feedback is meant to support rather than intimidate, thereby fostering approachability and trust. Both participants demonstrate that effective supervision extends beyond evaluation, emphasizing relationship-building, guidance, and mentorship to create a positive and collaborative school environment where teachers feel comfortable seeking support.

These implications are similar to the investigation of Voelkel et al. said that on effective principal leadership behaviors that enhance teacher collective efficacy and found that principals who actively build relationships, trust, collaboration, and empowerment positively shape how teachers perceive leadership and their own professional roles. Teachers in the study described leaders who were *approachable, non-intimidating, and engaged in supportive collaboration*, behaviors that mirror what Participants 9 and 10 emphasized in their responses about open, respectful, and reassuring communication. These findings suggest that when school heads intentionally foster trust and maintain friendly, accessible interactions, teachers experience greater comfort and confidence in seeking feedback and guidance. Such supportive leadership practices are associated with stronger collective efficacy, improved collaboration, and overall positive school dynamics.

➤ *Experiences of School Heads in Managing Instructional Processes*

School heads play a critical role in managing instructional processes by ensuring that teaching and learning are organized, monitored, and continuously improved. Their experiences often involve coordinating curriculum implementation, observing classroom practices, and providing timely feedback to teachers to enhance instructional quality. Many school heads highlighted the need for balancing administrative oversight with pedagogical support, demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness to the diverse needs of both teachers and learners. By actively engaging in instructional planning, resource allocation, and assessment monitoring, they create an environment that promotes consistency, accountability, and professional growth. These practices underscore the school heads' role not only as managers but also as instructional leaders who guide and support teachers to achieve effective learning outcomes.

Participant 1 said "In managing instructional practices, I make it a point to regularly observe classroom activities and provide constructive feedback to teachers. I coordinate with them during lesson planning to ensure the curriculum is effectively implemented and that instructional strategies meet the students' needs. I believe that guidance and support help teachers grow professionally while maintaining consistent learning outcomes". In addition, Participant 5 mentioned "I focus on balancing administrative responsibilities with supporting teachers in their instructional practices. By monitoring lessons, assisting in resource allocation, and reviewing student performance, I can identify areas for improvement and collaborate with teachers to enhance teaching methods. My goal is to ensure that instruction is well-organized, effective, and responsive to students' learning needs." These statements reflect their experiences as school heads in actively managing, supporting, and improving instructional processes while maintaining both oversight and collaboration with teachers.

Participants 1 and 5 highlighted the multifaceted role of school heads in managing instructional practices, emphasizing both oversight and collaborative support. Participant 1's approach of regularly observing classrooms and providing constructive feedback illustrates a commitment to continuous professional development for teachers, ensuring that instructional strategies are effectively aligned with student needs. Similarly, Participant 5 emphasized balancing administrative duties with active involvement in lesson monitoring, resource allocation, and performance review, demonstrating how instructional management requires both strategic planning and hands-on support. Together, their experiences suggest that effective school leadership in managing instructional processes involves guiding teachers through structured feedback, fostering collaboration, and ensuring that teaching practices are organized, responsive, and focused on achieving consistent learning outcomes.

Similarly, He, Guo, and Abazie found that principals' instructional leadership including activities such as curriculum coordination, supervision of instruction, and

providing professional learning opportunities, significantly predicts teachers' professional development and growth. Their study showed that when school leaders actively guide and support teachers through structured feedback, observation, and collaborative planning, teachers are more likely to refine their instructional practices and advance professionally. These findings align with the experiences described by Participants 1 and 5, who emphasized classroom observations, constructive feedback, lesson planning collaboration, and monitoring as key elements of effective instructional management. This body of research underscores the importance of instructional leadership in fostering a supportive school environment where teachers can improve their teaching effectiveness and consistently deliver quality learning outcomes.

➤ *Experiences of School Heads in Navigating the Demands of their Supervisory Roles*

School heads often face complex and diverse demands as they navigate their supervisory roles, balancing administrative responsibilities, instructional leadership, and the need to support and guide teachers effectively. Their experiences involve managing time, resources, and expectations while ensuring that school operations and teaching practices align with educational standards and goals. This role requires not only organizational and managerial skills but also interpersonal competence, as school heads must foster positive relationships with teachers, students, and other stakeholders. By examining their experiences in navigating these supervisory demands, insights can be gained into the strategies, challenges, and adaptive approaches that school heads employ to maintain a productive, supportive, and well-functioning school environment.

Participant 3 shared "Managing my supervisory role is challenging because I have to balance administrative tasks, like reports and meetings, with visiting classrooms to support teachers. I make it a point to schedule my time carefully and prioritize tasks so that I can address both operational requirements and the professional needs of my staff. It's not easy, but building strong relationships with teachers helps me navigate these demands more effectively."

Similarly, participant 7 stated "As a school head, I often face competing responsibilities, overseeing instructional quality, managing resources, and ensuring compliance with policies. I try to remain organized and communicate clearly with teachers and staff so that everyone understands their roles and expectations. Maintaining a supportive and approachable attitude is crucial because it allows me to guide teachers while still handling administrative pressures."

Participants 3 and 7 illustrate that navigating the demands of a school head's supervisory role requires a careful balance of administrative responsibilities, instructional oversight, and relational support for teachers. Their experiences highlight the need for strong organizational and time-management skills, as well as the ability to prioritize tasks without compromising instructional quality. Moreover, their emphasis on maintaining positive relationships with teachers underscores the importance of interpersonal

competence in fostering a collaborative and supportive school environment. These insights imply that effective supervisory leadership is not only about enforcing policies or monitoring performance but also about guiding, mentoring, and creating conditions where teachers feel supported, enabling both professional growth and the consistent achievement of school goals.

A recent qualitative inquiry by Prestoza and Naldoza bore significance to the findings of the present study. Prestoza and Naldoza examined the lived experiences of school principals and teachers in navigating instructional leadership challenges, finding that principals frequently grapple with balancing administrative responsibilities and instructional leadership roles while striving to support teaching quality and school improvement. The study identified balancing administrative and instructional roles, managing resources, and adapting to evolving educational demands as significant challenges faced by school heads. At the same time, effective practices such as engagement, collaboration, and ongoing professional development helped leaders mitigate those challenges and foster a collaborative school environment. These findings align with the experiences shared by Participants 3 and 7, who emphasized the complexity of managing time and expectations and the importance of interpersonal competence in instructional supervision. Overall, this research highlights that navigating supervisory demands requires adaptive strategies and reinforces the idea that school heads must integrate both managerial and instructional leadership dimensions to maintain a productive and supportive educational setting.

#### *B. How the School Heads Perform their Instructional Supervisory Practices*

This study explored the experiences of school heads as instructional supervisors, focusing specifically on their roles in classroom observation, mentoring, curriculum implementation, and evaluation of learning outcomes. As instructional leaders, school heads play a crucial part in ensuring that teaching practices align with educational standards and that teachers receive adequate support to enhance instructional quality. Understanding their experiences provides valuable insights into how supervision is carried out in actual school settings, the challenges they encounter, and the strategies they employ to foster effective teaching and learning. By examining these key supervisory functions, the study aims to deepen the understanding of instructional leadership practices and contribute to improving the overall delivery of quality education.

The following are the specific shared experiences of the School Heads as Instructional Supervisors particularly in classroom observation, mentoring, curriculum implementation, and evaluation of learning outcomes.

##### ➤ *Classroom Observation*

Classroom observation is a vital supervisory practice that allows school heads to monitor teaching performance, assess instructional strategies, and ensure that learning objectives are effectively delivered. Through systematic observation, they gain firsthand insights into classroom

dynamics, teacher–student interactions, and the overall implementation of instructional practices. This process not only supports instructional improvement but also helps identify areas where teachers may need further guidance or professional development.

Participant 1 mentioned “In a central school like mine, where teachers have varied styles and identities, I find the pre-observation conference essential. I use this time to clarify expectations, walk them through the observation tools, and understand their planned approaches. This allows me to give focused guidance while still honoring their individual teaching styles. It also helps ease their anxiety and ensures they feel prepared and confident for the actual observation”. Similarly, Participant 4 shared “In a big school like central school with varied of teachers with different styles of behaviors and attitudes, giving feedback was the most rising issues concerning egocentric teachers that are brighter than the school heads, feedback requires sensitivity and balance. I need to be honest about areas for improvement while ensuring that teachers do not feel discouraged or judged. Some teachers are open and reflective, while others may feel defensive or anxious, so I must adjust my approach depending of the individual”.

The responses of Participants 2 and 4 highlighted the importance of sensitivity, preparation, and adaptability in conducting classroom observations within diverse school environments. Participant 2 emphasized the value of the pre-observation conference as a means to clarify expectations, reduce teacher anxiety, and respect individual teaching styles, demonstrating how collaborative preparation strengthens the observation process. Participant 4, on the other hand, underscored the challenges of delivering feedback to teachers with varying personalities, attitudes, and confidence levels, noting that some may be receptive while others become defensive. Their experiences collectively suggested that effective instructional supervision requires not only technical knowledge of observation tools and standards but also strong interpersonal skills that allow school heads to balance honesty with encouragement, adjust their communication strategies, and maintain a supportive and professional supervisory relationship.

In addition, participant 6 stated “I make sure my feedback remains constructive, respectful and anchored on evidence gathered during the observation, so it truly supports their professional growth” Participant 6 emphasized the importance of delivering feedback that is constructive, respectful, and grounded in actual observation data. This approach ensures that teachers receive guidance that is fair, objective, and genuinely supportive of their professional growth.

The shared experiences of the participants are parallel to the study of Yaşar and Gürbüz, which emphasizes that effective classroom observation relies on clear communication, sensitivity, and adaptable feedback. Like Participant 2’s use of pre-observation conferences to reduce anxiety and clarify expectations, the study highlights the value of preparing teachers through supportive dialogue.

Similarly, Participant 4's challenge of handling varied teacher attitudes reflects the study's finding that feedback must be balanced and respectful to prevent defensiveness. Both the participants' insights and the study affirm that successful instructional supervision depends not only on technical procedures but also on strong interpersonal skills.

#### ➤ *Mentoring*

Mentoring is a key component of instructional supervision that focuses on guiding and supporting teachers as they develop their skills and professional confidence. Through mentoring, school heads provide individualized assistance, share best practices, and help teachers reflect on and improve their instructional approaches. This collaborative relationship fosters continuous learning, builds trust, and creates a supportive environment where teachers feel encouraged to grow and enhance their effectiveness in the classroom.

Participant 1 said "Giving feedback is difficult because mentors must balance honesty with sensitivity, avoid hurting the mentee's feeling, remain objective and communicate clear suggestions". Participant 1 highlighted that giving feedback in mentoring can be challenging because mentors must be honest while still being sensitive to the mentee's feelings. They also emphasized the need to stay objective and provide clear, constructive suggestions to ensure the feedback truly supports the mentee's improvement.

Participant 2 also mentioned "Yun nga during FGDs or meeting and of course during vacant times, sometimes I talk to the concern teacher regarding any concern but in the friendliest way, yung hindi ka naman makaka offend. Often times mga concern lang naman sa newly implemented ng DepEd na kailangang ma meet ng teacher in their respected grade levels katulad ng ILE for K teachers yun mga ganun". The statement of participant 2 in English means "During FGDs or meetings, and even during vacant times, I sometimes talk to the concerned teacher about any issue, but always in the friendliest way so as not to offend them. Most of the time, the concerns are about newly implemented DepEd policies that teachers in their respective grade levels need to meet, such as the ILE for Kindergarten teachers". This statement shows that mentoring is most effective when done informally and with a friendly, non-threatening approach, allowing teachers to receive guidance without feeling criticized. It also highlights that mentor often help teachers navigate new DepEd requirements, ensuring they understand and meet updated standards in their grade levels.

The statements of participants 1 and 2 are similar to the study of Galvez and Azarias, which highlighted that effective mentoring requires a careful balance of honesty, sensitivity, and clear communication to support teachers' professional growth. Just as Participant 1 emphasized the challenge of giving feedback without discouraging mentees, the study found that mentors must remain objective while providing constructive guidance that fosters improvement. Similarly, Participant 2's approach of addressing concerns informally and in a friendly manner mirrors the study's finding that mentoring is most effective when delivered in a supportive,

non-threatening way. Both the participants' insights and the study underscore the importance of interpersonal skills and relational strategies in mentoring, especially in helping teachers navigate new educational policies and standards.

#### ➤ *Curriculum Implementation*

Curriculum planning is a fundamental aspect of instructional supervision that involves designing, organizing, and aligning learning experiences to meet educational standards and student needs. Through effective curriculum planning, school heads guide teachers in selecting appropriate content, instructional strategies, and assessment methods that promote meaningful learning. This process ensures coherence across grade levels, fosters consistency in teaching practices, and supports the overall goal of improving student outcomes by providing a structured and purposeful framework for instruction.

Participant 5 shared "*In our school the Implementation of revised K-12 Curriculum is on its 2<sup>nd</sup> phase last year we implement this new curriculum for kinder grade 1 and grade 4 and this year we expand it in grade 2 3 and 5 as mandated by the department.*" He also added "*I explained that we align lesson plans and instructional materials with the new standards, and teachers attend orientations and capacity-building activities to stay updated. However, challenges remain, such as limited learning resources, varying teacher readiness, and time constraints in completing curriculum requirements. Despite these issues, we continue to provide mentoring and support to ensure effective implementation*"

Similarly, participant 6 also mentioned "*Curriculum review is conducted in the school regular curriculum review sessions ensures our lesson plans, teaching strategies, and learning materials are align with the Revised K-12 or MATATAG Curriculum. These reviews allow teachers to reflect on what works, identify gaps in content delivery, and propose adjustments to improve learning outcomes. It also provides an opportunity to discuss challenges, share best practices, and make necessary updates to keep the curriculum relevant and responsive to learners' needs*"

The statements of Participants 5 and 6 highlighted the active role of school heads in ensuring the effective implementation of the Revised K-12 Curriculum. Participant 5 emphasized aligning lesson plans and providing teacher support through orientations and mentoring despite challenges like limited resources and varying teacher readiness. Similarly, Participant 6 pointed out that regular curriculum review sessions help teachers reflect, identify gaps, share best practices, and make adjustments, ensuring that instruction remains relevant, coherent, and responsive to learners' needs.

The statements of Participants 5 and 6 resonated with findings from empirical research on curriculum implementation in the Philippines. For instance, Challenges and Extent of Readiness Among Teachers in the Implementation of the Kindergarten Curriculum in Select Public Elementary Schools in the Philippines. Jaca & Lopez-Baroman, reveals that many teachers, and by

extension, school heads, faced major difficulties aligning lesson plans and instructional materials with the new curriculum, due to limited resources, varying teacher readiness, and time constraints. These difficulties mirror what Participant 5 described: despite aligning lesson plans and offering mentoring and capacity-building, issues such as insufficient resources and uneven teacher preparedness persisted. Further, the study underscored that successful curriculum implementation often depends on ongoing support, review, and adaptability, something Participant 6 echoed by pointing out the importance of regular curriculum review sessions to reflect, identify gaps, share best practices, and adjust teaching strategies to ensure relevance and coherence.

#### ➤ *Evaluation of Learning Outcomes*

Evaluation of learning outcomes is a critical aspect of instructional supervision, as it allows school heads to assess whether teaching strategies effectively promote student learning and meet curriculum standards. Through systematic evaluation, supervisors can identify gaps in student understanding, monitor progress, and provide targeted feedback to teachers to improve instructional practices. This process not only ensures accountability but also supports professional development, enabling school heads to guide teachers in refining lesson delivery, adjusting instructional materials, and implementing interventions that enhance overall learning outcomes.

Participant 4 stated *“We conduct quarterly assessments or summative tests other assessment like CRLA, Phil IRI and RMA are also administered in our school as mandate by DEPED but other initiated assessment are being discourage in our school. I always explained to them that assessments are our primary tool for measuring students’ overall performance and seeing how well they have mastered the competencies in the MATATAG Curriculum. They help me and my teachers identify the areas where students are excelling and the areas that need more support, so we can adjust our instruction accordingly. The results also guide our curriculum review and planning to ensure continuous improvement throughout the school year”*

Participant 4’s statement highlighted the essential role of assessments in evaluating learning outcomes and guiding instructional supervision. By using both mandated and school-based assessments, supervisors can identify students’ strengths and areas needing improvement, enabling teachers to adjust their instruction effectively. This practice also informs curriculum review and planning, ensuring that teaching strategies remain responsive and continuously improve student learning outcomes.

Participant 8 also shared some innovative or initiative to ensure the continuous support and evaluation of the learning outcome. Participant 8 said *“we have programs that actively involve parents and stakeholders. One key initiative is our Home-Based Reading Intervention, which encourages parental participation in enhancing students’ reading proficiency. Through this program, parents are guided on how to support their children at home, monitor their*

*progress, and reinforce learning. This collaboration not only strengthens the connection between home and school but also helps us identify areas where students need additional support, ultimately improving overall school performance. Involving parents and stakeholders ensures that education is a shared responsibility, creating a stronger, more supportive learning environment for our learners.”*

Similarly, participant 7 shared *“One of the ways I assist is by reaching out to parents and calling their attention to the importance of supporting their children’s learning at home. I guide them on how they can help their children cope with studies, reinforce lessons, and establish good study habits. By empowering parents to actively participate in their child’s education, they not only help their children succeed academically but also teach them to take responsibility for their own learning. In this way, the support of parents and stakeholders becomes a powerful factor in improving overall student performance and creating a collaborative, nurturing environment for our learners.”*

The statements of Participants 7 and 8 emphasized that involving parents and stakeholders is a vital strategy for supporting and evaluating learning outcomes. By guiding parents to actively participate in their children’s learning through programs like home-based interventions or reinforcement of study habits, school heads can extend instructional support beyond the classroom. This collaboration strengthens the home-school connection, ensures continuous monitoring of student progress, and fosters a shared responsibility for learning, ultimately enhancing student performance and creating a more supportive educational environment.

A recent study by Wang and Wei demonstrated that parental involvement through home-based support, communication, and engagement in learning, has a significantly positive effect on students’ academic performance, particularly in mathematics. This evidence supported the implication from your participants’ statements: involving parents and stakeholders in educational programs like home-based reading or homework support can reinforce learning outside classroom hours, strengthen the home-school connection, and contribute to improved student learning outcomes.

#### *C. The Strengths and Weaknesses of School Heads in Performing Instructional Supervision*

The effectiveness of instructional supervision greatly depends on the school heads’ ability to balance their leadership strengths with the challenges they encounter in guiding teachers and managing instructional processes. Understanding their strengths provides insight into the competencies that enhance teaching and learning, such as their skills in communication, instructional leadership, and innovative problem-solving. Conversely, identifying their weaknesses reveals areas where support, resources, or capacity-building may be needed to improve supervisory practices.

By examining both strengths and weaknesses, this section offers a comprehensive picture of how school heads perform their supervisory roles and highlights opportunities

for enhancing instructional supervision across schools. Table 1 presented the strengths of school heads as instructional leaders.

Table 1 Strengths of School Heads as Instructional Leaders

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Description
Using data from observation and assessments to guide teachers in the teaching-learning process	4.60	Strongly Agree
Guiding teachers effectively in enhancing classroom practices through concrete examples	4.50	Agree
Providing clear directions on instructional goals and expectations through classroom activities	4.50	Agree
Monitoring instructional delivery to ensure teaching objectives are achieved	4.50	Agree
Leading initiatives that strengthen teaching learning outcome	4.40	Agree
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>Agree</b>

The results in Table 1 show that school heads demonstrate strong instructional leadership, with weighted mean scores ranging from 4.40 to 4.60, indicating Agree to Strongly Agree responses. The highest-rated indicator, “Using data from observation and assessments to guide teachers” (M = 4.60), suggests that school heads consistently utilize evidence-based decision-making to support teachers’ instructional improvement. Other indicators such as “Guiding teachers through concrete examples,” “Providing clear directions,” and “Monitoring instructional delivery” all garnered 4.50, reflecting the heads’ strong capacity to ensure

instructional alignment and quality. The lowest, though still high, mean score of 4.40 for “Leading initiatives to strengthen teaching-learning outcomes” indicates general competence but hints at possible limitations in initiating broader school-wide innovations. Overall, the data imply that school heads possess substantial strengths in instructional planning, monitoring, and feedback, enabling them to effectively guide teachers toward achieving curriculum standards and improved student learning outcomes. Table 2 presented the strengths of school heads as effective communicators.

Table 2 Strengths of School Heads as Effective Communicators

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Description
Building open communication channels among teachers and staff	4.8	Strongly Agree
Providing instructions and guidelines in a way that is easy to understand	4.7	Strongly Agree
Adjusting communication style to suit teachers with different needs and backgrounds	4.6	Strongly Agree
Clarifying expectations consistently to avoid misunderstandings among teachers	4.5	Agree
Communicating feedback clearly to teachers after classroom observation	4.5	Agree
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.62</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>

The results in Table 2 highlight communication as one of the strongest leadership attributes of school heads, with weighted mean scores from 4.50 to 4.80. The indicator “Building open communication channels among teachers and staff” received the highest mean (M = 4.80), indicating that school heads are highly committed to fostering transparency and collaboration. Providing clear and understandable instructions (M = 4.70) and adjusting communication styles based on teachers’ needs (M = 4.60) further illustrate the leaders’ strong interpersonal

adaptability. Meanwhile, *clarifying expectations and communicating feedback* both scored 4.50, still underlining their effectiveness in ensuring that messages are well conveyed and understood. These findings imply that effective communication is a major strength among school heads, enabling smoother coordination, reduced misunderstandings, and more productive teacher-administrator relationships. Table 1.3 presented the strengths of school heads as innovative thinker.

Table 3 Strengths of School Heads as Innovative Thinker

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Description
Providing appropriate assistance to teachers who need instructional support	4.6	Strongly Agree
Responding positively to teachers’ concerns and instructional needs	4.6	Strongly Agree
Providing emotional and professional support to teachers during high-pressure periods	4.6	Strongly Agree
Facilitating opportunities for peer mentoring and shared learning	4.6	Strongly Agree
Motivating teachers to continuously improve their teaching Practices	4.5	Agree
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.58</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Table 3 reveals uniformly high weighted mean scores between 4.50 and 4.60, indicating that school heads display strong innovative-thinking skills. Four indicators earned 4.60, such as *providing instructional support, responding to*

*teachers’ concerns, offering emotional and professional support, and facilitating shared learning opportunities.* These results show that school heads actively cultivate an environment that encourages teacher collaboration and

continuous improvement. The indicator *“Motivating teachers to continuously improve their teaching practices”* received a slightly lower mean of 4.50, though still high, suggesting room for growth in sustaining long-term teacher motivation. Altogether, these findings imply that school heads

demonstrate a high degree of creativity, responsiveness, and initiative, which strengthens teacher morale and enhances instructional effectiveness across the school. Table 1.4 presented the weaknesses of school heads as instructional leaders.

Table 4 Weaknesses of School Heads as Instructional Leaders

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Description
Failing to sustain scheduled instructional engagements due to overlapping schedules	3.62	Agree
Having trouble setting clear instructional goals due to teachers’ varying needs	3.60	Agree
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>Agree</b>

In Table 4, school heads acknowledge weaknesses in instructional leadership, with means ranging from 3.60 to 3.62, indicating Agree responses suggesting moderate challenges. The highest-rated weakness, *“Failing to sustain scheduled instructional engagements due to overlapping schedules”* (M = 3.62), highlights time management as a persistent concern. Similarly, *“Trouble setting clear instructional goals due to teachers’ varying needs”* (M =

3.60) suggests difficulty in addressing diverse teacher competencies and instructional contexts. These findings imply that while school heads are generally strong instructional leaders, their effectiveness is sometimes hindered by administrative overload and the complexity of differentiating supervision according to teachers’ needs. Table 5 presented the weaknesses of school heads as effective communicators.

Table 5 Weaknesses of School Heads as Effective Communicators

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Description
Having limited knowledge of the various forms of communication	3.63	Agree
Overlapping schedules and administrative demands often limit opportunities for meaningful dialogue	3.61	Agree
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>Agree</b>

The data in Table 5 show that communication-based weaknesses also exist, with means of 3.61 and 3.63 (Agree). The primary concern, *“Having limited knowledge of various forms of communication”* (M = 3.63), indicates that school heads may require further training in modern or alternative communication strategies. Meanwhile, *“Overlapping schedules and administrative demands limiting opportunities*

*for meaningful dialogue”* (M = 3.61) reflects structural and workload-related challenges. These results imply that while communication is a strength, it is also an area where external pressures and skill limitations create gaps, particularly in maintaining consistent, meaningful interactions with teachers. Table 6 presented the weaknesses of school heads as innovative thinkers.

Table 6 Weaknesses of School Heads as Innovative Thinkers

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Description
Having limited resources that hinder the implementation of creative instructional approaches	3.68	Agree
Struggling to adapt, leading to inconsistencies in classroom practices on the part of the teachers	3.62	Agree
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Table 6 presents weaknesses related to innovation, with mean scores of 3.62 and 3.68. The highest weakness, *“Having limited resources that hinder creative instructional approaches”* (M = 3.68), suggests that innovation is often restricted by funding shortages and material constraints. *“Struggling to adapt, leading to inconsistencies in classroom practices”* (M = 3.62) indicates that school heads may face

difficulty implementing change consistently. These findings imply that innovation is challenged not by lack of willingness but by limited resources and the complexity of sustaining change across individuals and grade levels.

Table 7 shows the weaknesses of school heads as collaborative leaders.

Table 7 Weaknesses of School Heads as Collaborative Leaders

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Description
Failing to consistently organize Professional Learning Communities	3.65	Agree
Failing to involve external stakeholders in school activities thereby reducing opportunities for community participation and support	3.61	Agree
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>Agree</b>

Table 7 shows that weaknesses in collaborative leadership have means of 3.61 and 3.65, indicating school heads face notable challenges in this domain. The highest-ranked weakness, “*Failing to consistently organize Professional Learning Communities*” (M = 3.65), implies difficulty sustaining teacher collaboration due to time constraints or limited organizational structures. “*Failing to involve external stakeholders*” (M = 3.61) further suggests challenges in community engagement and partnership-building. These findings imply that while school heads recognize the value of collaboration, systemic and time-related barriers hinder their ability to maintain consistent professional communities and stakeholder involvement.

#### D. Challenges Faced by the School Heads in their Supervisory Roles

School heads encounter numerous challenges as they carry out their supervisory responsibilities, balancing the demands of instructional leadership with the realities of school management. These challenges arise from a combination of administrative workload, resource limitations, curriculum demands, and the diverse needs and readiness levels of teachers. Understanding these difficulties is essential, as they significantly affect the school heads’ ability to provide consistent supervision, deliver meaningful feedback, and sustain teacher development. By examining the challenges, they face, this section provides valuable insights into the systemic and contextual factors that shape supervisory practices and highlights areas where targeted support and intervention are needed to strengthen instructional leadership in schools. Table 8 presented the challenges faced by the school heads in their supervisory roles.

Table 8 Challenges Faced by the School Heads in Their Supervisory Roles

Challenges	Sum of Ranks	Overall Rank
Lack of time due to administrative workload	36	1
Limited support from higher office	45	2
Limited learning resources	49	3
Constraints in conducting follow-up	50	4
Difficulty aligning teachers practices with curriculum standards	53	5
Difficulty addressing teachers with low performance	55	6
Insufficient training or preparation for instructional supervision	57	7
Inadequate monitoring tools	63	8
Large number of teachers to supervise	69	9
Teachers’ resistance to being supervised or observed	73	10

The highest-ranked challenge among school heads is the lack of time due to administrative workload, with a sum of ranks of 36, placing it at Rank 1. This indicates that the majority of school heads perceive administrative tasks as the most dominant factor hindering their ability to effectively perform supervisory roles. The consistently heavy workload such as reports, compliance documents, meetings, and operational duties limits the time they can devote to instructional supervision. This suggests that while school heads understand the importance of guiding teachers, the competing demands of bureaucratic responsibilities significantly reduce their capacity to carry out classroom observations, mentoring, and follow-up activities.

This finding underscores a systemic problem in school administration, where school heads are expected to juggle both instructional leadership and extensive administrative tasks. When administrative duties overshadow supervision, the quality of instructional monitoring may suffer, leading to less meaningful feedback for teachers and delayed interventions for instructional challenges. This issue may result in a “managerial overload,” where school heads perform more as office administrators than academic leaders. The implication is clear: unless administrative processes are streamlined or workload is redistributed, instructional supervision which is essential for improving teaching and learning will continue to be compromised.

The challenge limited support from higher office ranks second, with a sum of ranks of 45. This indicates that many school heads feel unsupported by the district or division offices in areas such as resources, guidance, supervision tools, and policy implementation. Less support from higher authorities may create gaps in executing programs, managing curriculum changes, or addressing teacher concerns effectively. This finding suggests a disconnect between school-level needs and higher-level administrative support systems.

Limited support may manifest in delayed responses from supervisors, insufficient resources, unclear directives, or lack of follow-up assistance. When school heads do not receive adequate support, they may struggle to address issues at the school level, leading to burnout, decreased motivation, and inefficiencies in supervision. This challenge reveals the need for a more responsive and collaborative relationship between schools and district/division offices. Improving communication channels, providing timely interventions, and ensuring consistent guidance can significantly enhance school heads’ ability to fulfill their roles effectively.

With a sum of ranks of 49, limited learning resources ranks third among the identified challenges. This reflects that school heads frequently encounter shortages in instructional materials, technological tools, textbooks, and facilities

necessary for delivering effective learning experiences. The lack of adequate resources restricts the teachers' ability to implement innovative strategies and hinders school heads from carrying out meaningful supervision based on updated standards or instructional tools.

Resource shortages can significantly affect the quality of teaching and learning, as school heads and teachers must often improvise or rely on outdated materials. This creates additional pressure on school heads who must find ways to manage resource gaps through local initiatives, stakeholder engagement, or personal resource mobilization. The challenge highlights the importance of equitable distribution of resources and the need for stronger partnerships with local government units, NGOs, and community stakeholders to support instructional needs. Without sufficient resources, the effectiveness of instructional supervision becomes limited, as feedback and improvements cannot be fully realized.

Ranking fourth with a sum of ranks of 50, constraints in conducting follow-up signifies that although school heads may conduct observations and mentoring, they often struggle to sustain these processes. Follow-up is essential in supervision to ensure that feedback is implemented and that improvements are continuously monitored. However, this ranking suggests that time constraints, scheduling conflicts, and workload demands hinder school heads from consistently revisiting teacher progress.

The lack of follow-up undermines the supervisory cycle, reducing the effectiveness of initial classroom observations and feedback. Without consistent monitoring, teachers may revert to old practices or fail to fully implement recommended instructional improvements. This challenge emphasizes the importance of designing more manageable follow-up systems, such as scheduled check-ins, brief coaching sessions, or digital monitoring tools. A more structured follow-up mechanism can ensure sustained teacher growth, improved instructional quality, and better learning outcomes for students.

With a sum of ranks of 53, the challenge of difficulty aligning teachers' practices with curriculum standards takes the fifth spot. This indicates that school heads often struggle to ensure that teaching strategies, lesson delivery, and assessment methods are aligned with updated curriculum requirements, such as the MATATAG or revised K–12 standards. The challenge may stem from varying teacher competence, resistance to change, or lack of training in new curriculum frameworks.

Curriculum alignment is a complex task requiring continuous coaching, monitoring, and capacity-building. When teachers' practices are inconsistent with standards, it may lead to learning gaps and reduced mastery of competencies. School heads must therefore invest more time in lesson plan reviews, professional development sessions, and curriculum walkthroughs. This challenge highlights the need for consistent curriculum training, clear instructional guidelines, and collaborative planning sessions to ensure that

instruction remains aligned with national expectations and learner needs.

Ranking sixth with a sum of ranks of 55, difficulty addressing teachers with low performance reveals that school heads find it challenging to manage teachers who consistently struggle with instructional delivery or professionalism. This reflects concerns about sensitivity, potential conflict, and teachers' receptiveness to feedback. It also suggests that dealing with performance issues remains a delicate aspect of supervision.

Low-performing teachers may exhibit defensive behavior, lack of motivation, gaps in content knowledge, or resistance to corrective feedback. School heads must navigate these situations with diplomacy, empathy, and firmness. However, without proper training in coaching or conflict management, school heads may find these situations emotionally taxing and complex. This challenge underscores the need for professional development in performance management, supportive coaching strategies, and clear performance standards to assist school heads in addressing these issues more effectively.

With a sum of ranks of 57, this challenge ranks seventh, indicating that school heads feel inadequately trained for the instructional supervision aspect of their role. Many school heads come from various teaching backgrounds but may not have received specialized training in supervision, coaching, curriculum leadership, or data-driven instruction. This lack of preparation reduces their confidence and effectiveness in fulfilling supervisory functions.

Instructional supervision requires a unique set of skills, including observation, communication, analysis of teaching practices, and instructional coaching. Without formal training, school heads may rely on traditional or outdated supervisory approaches, limiting the quality of their feedback and decision-making. This challenge highlights the need for continuous professional development offered by district or division offices, as well as structured leadership programs that strengthen the instructional expertise of current and future school heads.

The eighth challenge, with a sum of ranks of 63, is inadequate monitoring tools. This suggests that school heads often find the existing observation forms, evaluation tools, and classroom monitoring templates insufficient or misaligned with what they need to assess instructional quality accurately. Inadequate tools limit their ability to fully capture teaching practices and provide precise, evidence-based feedback.

Effective monitoring requires tools that are clear, updated, and aligned with curriculum standards. When tools are outdated or insufficient, school heads may rely heavily on subjective judgment, reducing the objectivity of supervision. This challenge calls for the refinement of monitoring instruments and the introduction of digital tools or observation platforms that streamline documentation and analysis. Improved tools will help ensure accuracy,

consistency, and efficiency in evaluating instructional practices.

The ninth challenge, with a sum of ranks of 69, concerns the *large number of teachers to supervise*. This indicates that school heads with high teacher-to-supervisor ratios struggle to conduct regular observations, mentoring sessions, and follow-up activities. The challenge suggests that workloads are unevenly distributed or that some schools lack adequate administrative support.

Supervising many teachers reduces the amount of time school heads can dedicate to individualized support. This results in rushed observations, delayed feedback, or missed opportunities for mentoring. In larger schools, supervision becomes more managerial than instructional, undermining the purpose of meaningful supervision. This finding highlights the need to review staffing structures, assign assistant principals, or implement teacher-leadership models to distribute supervision tasks more effectively.

Ranked last with a sum of 73, teachers' resistance to being supervised or observed is the tenth challenge. Although ranked lowest, it still reflects a persistent issue in some schools where teachers may feel anxious, threatened, or distrustful of the observation process. This resistance can hinder collaboration and negatively affect the supervisory climate.

Resistance often arises from past negative experiences, fear of criticism, or lack of understanding of the purpose of supervision. When teachers view supervision as punitive rather than developmental, they may avoid feedback sessions or exhibit defensive behaviors. School heads must therefore emphasize supportive supervision, transparency, and trust-building to reduce resistance. Promoting a culture of professional growth rather than compliance can gradually foster teacher openness and improve the overall supervisory environment.

The results of Table 2 reveal a comprehensive picture of the realities school heads face in executing their supervisory responsibilities, and the implications of these findings extend to the overall quality of instructional leadership in schools. The dominance of administrative workload as the most pressing challenge implies that school heads are frequently pulled away from their core instructional duties, limiting their capacity to conduct classroom observations, provide meaningful feedback, and sustain follow-up interventions. This administrative burden not only threatens the balance of their roles but also reduces opportunities to influence teaching and learning directly. The high ranking of challenges related to limited support from higher offices and inadequate learning resources further underscores systemic constraints that hinder school heads from fully implementing effective supervisory practices. These gaps indicate that the supervisory function is not solely dependent on individual leadership competence but is significantly shaped by the structural and organizational support available to school heads.

Moreover, the identified challenges related to teacher alignment with curriculum standards, addressing low-performing teachers, and resistance to supervision point to deeper instructional issues that require consistent mentoring, capacity-building, and strengthened communication approaches. These issues imply that school heads must navigate complex interpersonal and pedagogical situations, often without sufficient training, highlighting the necessity for more robust professional development programs that focus on coaching, conflict resolution, and curriculum leadership. Meanwhile, weaknesses in monitoring tools and large teacher-to-supervisor ratios suggest logistical and operational limitations that can reduce the depth and accuracy of supervisory efforts. Overall, the findings imply that improving instructional supervision requires not only enhancing the competencies of school heads but also reducing structural barriers, strengthening support systems, and fostering a more collaborative and resource-equipped school environment. Addressing these challenges holistically can lead to more effective supervision, improved teaching practices, and ultimately, better learning outcomes for students.

#### *E. Policy Recommendations to Address the Identified Gaps*

Based on the findings of the study, several policy directions are recommended to strengthen the instructional supervisory practices of school heads and address the challenges identified across various domains of their responsibilities.

First, to alleviate the persistent issue of administrative overload which emerged as the top challenge, there is a need for the Department of Education to streamline documentary requirements and minimize redundant reporting tasks. Assigning administrative aides or designating school records personnel in highly burdened schools can also free up school heads' time, allowing them to focus more on instructional leadership, classroom observation, and teacher mentoring. Reducing administrative workload is crucial for enabling school heads to fulfill their instructional roles with greater depth and consistency.

Second, the findings highlight limited support from higher offices, inadequate learning resources, and insufficient monitoring tools as significant constraints that weaken instructional supervision. To address these systemic gaps, it is recommended that district and division offices enhance their communication, follow-up mechanisms, and logistical support for schools. Regular provision of updated instructional materials, standardized observation tools, and digital monitoring systems should be prioritized to ensure more consistent and evidence-based supervision. Partnerships with local government units, NGOs, and community stakeholders are also encouraged to supplement resource needs and support school-based programs, particularly in curriculum implementation and learning recovery initiatives.

Third, the difficulty in aligning teachers' practices with curriculum standards and addressing low-performing teachers emphasizes the need for stronger and continuous

professional development. Policy should mandate targeted capacity-building programs focused on instructional coaching, curriculum leadership, differentiated supervision, and conflict management. These programs must be designed not as one-time seminars but as ongoing, sustained learning opportunities. Establishing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and coaching teams within schools can also provide structured avenues for teacher collaboration, peer mentoring, and collective problem-solving. Strengthening these systems will help school heads ensure consistent curriculum alignment and support for teachers' instructional improvement.

Fourth, the challenge of conducting follow-up supervision and managing large teacher-to-supervisor ratios suggests the need to institutionalize distributive leadership structures. Policies should support the designation of master teachers, department coordinators, or senior teachers who can assist in conducting preliminary observations, mentoring sessions, and instructional walkthroughs. This shared leadership model not only lightens the supervisory load of school heads but also empowers teachers and cultivates a collaborative school culture. Additionally, integrating digital tools such as online observation forms, scheduling apps, and digital feedback systems can enhance efficiency and ensure timely follow-up even amid heavy workloads.

Lastly, to reduce teacher resistance to supervision and foster a more open, growth-oriented school environment, policy must reinforce the importance of supportive, non-punitive, and developmental supervision. Districts should provide clear guidelines that position supervision as a mechanism for professional growth rather than fault-finding. Training programs that emphasize communication skills, emotional intelligence, and relationship-building can further help school heads establish trust and openness among teachers. Encouraging school-based initiatives that involve parents and stakeholders such as home-based reading programs or learning support campaigns should also be part of policy action, as these strengthen the shared responsibility for student learning and increase overall school performance.

In summary, addressing the identified gaps requires a combination of reduced administrative burden, strengthened systemic support, enhanced professional development, distributed leadership, and the promotion of a positive supervisory culture. Implementing these policy recommendations can significantly improve the instructional leadership capacity of school heads, leading to more effective supervision, more empowered teachers, and ultimately, better learning outcomes for students.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

➤ *Based on the Foregoing Findings, the Following Conclusions are Drawn:*

- School heads' experiences center on managing teacher interactions, classroom observations, and administrative demands. They highlighted the need for respectful

communication and evidence-based feedback, yet their work is often constrained by overlapping schedules, these experiences reflect the ongoing balance between instructional duties and administrative tasks.

- School heads carry out supervision through classroom observations, mentoring, curriculum implementation, and assessment. They oversee the rollout of the Revised K–12 Curriculum, implemented first in Kinder, Grade 1, and Grade 4, then expanded to Grades 2, 3, and 5, while ensuring alignment through reviews and orientations. Evaluation tools such as quarterly tests, CRLA, Phil-IRI, and RMA guide instructional adjustments and identify learning gaps
- School heads demonstrate strengths in data-driven teacher guidance and building open communication, yet they face weaknesses in sustaining scheduled observations, utilizing modern communication platforms, and consistently organizing Professional Learning Communities due to heavy administrative burdens.
- The challenges encountered by school heads in performing their supervision are lack of time due to heavy administrative workload, limited support from higher offices, constraints in conducting consistent follow-up, and difficulties in aligning teacher practices with updated curriculum standards
- A Policy recommendation is proposed to address the identified challenges.

➤ *Based on the Result of the Study, the Following are Recommended:*

- School heads be provided with structured time and support systems to help them balance administrative tasks with meaningful instructional supervision
- School heads be given continuous training and resources to strengthen classroom observation, mentoring, curriculum implementation, and learning assessment processes, and school heads to monitor regularly their teachers.
- Provide opportunity to implement a systematic, evidence-based analysis of feedback gathered from observations and assessments, ensuring that guidance is constructive, respectful, and consistently followed up through professional learning communities to foster teacher growth and curriculum alignment.
- School Heads be encouraged to seek varied feedback of co-school leaders and teachers and the Department of Education can streamline administrative requirements and improve logistical and technical support to reduce the supervisory barriers faced by school heads.
- The Policy Recommendations be adopted to meet the challenges of school heads and to address their difficulties during their instructional supervisions.
- Similar research should be conducted in other schools or municipality to determine the instructional supervisory practices of School Heads. The DepEd and regional office should also make further research studies on instructional leadership to inform policy formulation.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Abdurahman, A., Sabtula, S. B. A., & Abdurahman, F. T. (2025). *Strengthening instructional supervision to foster teacher professional development in rural schools*. Sprin Journal of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences, 4(1).
- [2]. Ahmed, R., & Yusuf, I. (2024). *The effect of instructional supervision on teacher performance in secondary schools in Nigeria*. Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research, 9(4).
- [3]. Alvarado, J. T., & Manalo, F. P. (2021). *Supervisory competencies of school administrators in public elementary schools of Laguna Division*. Asian Journal of Education and Human Development, 9(3).
- [4]. Barredo, S. J., & Sarmiento, A. (2022). *Instructional leadership and supervision practices of school heads in Batangas Province: Basis for a developmental plan*. Philippine Journal of Educational Research, 14(1).
- [5]. Castillo, M. A. (2024). *Impact of instructional supervision strategies on teacher performance in Hinabangan Samar District I*. International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 5(8).
- [6]. Chan, K. W., & Lim, C. L. (2025). *Challenges of instructional supervision in Asian public schools during digital transformation*. Journal of Educational Administration, 63(2).
- [7]. Dacer, R. D., Magana, C. B., Bayani, A. L., & Saenz, A. F. (2025). *Extent of instructional supervision on teacher job satisfaction in public high schools in Camarines Norte, Philippines*. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9(3).
- [8]. Department of Education. (2012). *DepEd Order No. 196, s. 2012: Revised guidelines on classroom observation*. Author.
- [9]. Galvez, B., & Azarias, R. A. (2024). *GURO AT GABAY: Mentoring and coaching from the lens of selected public elementary teachers*. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 13(5), 113–138.
- [10]. Good, T. L. (1998). *Classroom observation*. In H. J. Walberg & G. D. Haertel (Eds.), *Psychology and educational practice* (pp. xx–xx). McCutchan Publishing.
- [11]. Hassan, M. A., & Nasir, N. (2022). *Instructional leadership and supervision for quality teaching in Malaysian primary schools*. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 42(3).
- [12]. He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). *School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teachers' professional development*. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 9, Article 63.
- [13]. Honculada, S. F. (2023). *Teachers' perceptions on the instructional supervisory practices of school heads in Tangub City*. Basic Education Research Fund (BERF).
- [14]. HRMARS Research Team. (2022). *The role, strategy, and challenges of instructional supervision in the COVID-19 pandemic era: A systematic literature review*. International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, 11(4).
- [15]. Jaca, C. A. L., & Lopez-Baroman, J. L. (2021). *Challenges and Extent of Readiness Among Teachers in the Implementation of the Kindergarten Curriculum in Select Public Elementary Schools in the Philippines*. International Journal of Elementary Education, 10(4), 134–144.
- [16]. Johnson, T., & O'Brien, K. (2024). *Reframing instructional supervision for post-pandemic schools: A global perspective*. International Review of Education, 70(1).
- [17]. Lewis, S., & Thompson, A. (2023). *Mentoring as a form of instructional supervision: Practices and implications for leadership development*. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 51(5).
- [18]. Maisyaroh, M. (2021). *The implementation of instructional supervision in Indonesia and the Philippines: A comparative analysis*. Cogent Education, 8(1).
- [19]. Mangadlao, J. (2025). *Enhancing supervisory programs through instructional leadership among school heads in Lianga District, Surigao del Sur*. Journal of Innovation and Productivity, 4(2).
- [20]. Ngussa, B. M., & Makewa, L. N. (2021). *Instructional supervision practices and effective teaching in Ugandan secondary schools*. International Journal of Education and Research, 9(3).
- [21]. Osei, C., & Mensah, P. (2023). *Instructional supervision and teacher motivation in Ghanaian basic schools*. African Journal of Educational Management, 11(2).
- [22]. Osei, C., & Mensah, P. (2023). *Instructional supervision and teacher motivation in Ghanaian basic schools*. African Journal of Educational Management, 11(2).
- [23]. Prestoza, M. J. R., & Naldoza, N. D. (2025). *Challenges and practices of instructional leadership: A qualitative inquiry of principals' and teachers' perspectives*. The Normal Lights, 19(1).
- [24]. Quilala, C. C., & Tantiado, R. A. (2025). *Instructional supervision and teachers' efficacy in public secondary schools of Cagayan de Oro City*. ResearchGate Publication.
- [25]. Ramos, M. D. (2023). *Instructional supervision practices of school heads and teachers' performance in public schools of Sorsogon Province*. Bicol University Graduate Research Journal, 18(1).
- [26]. The New Teacher Project. (2021). *Observation and feedback resources* [Web page]. TNTP. <https://tntp.org/insight-help-center/observation-and-feedback-resources/>
- [27]. Valida, H. J. Y. (2025). *The role of instructional supervision in improving student learning outcomes*. International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies, 7(2).
- [28]. Voelkel, R. H., Jr., Prusak, K. J., & Van Tassell, F. (2024). *Effective principal leadership behaviors that enhance teacher collective efficacy*. Education Sciences, 14(4), 431.

- [29]. Wang, X., & Wei, Y. (2024). The influence of parental involvement on students' math performance: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15.
- [30]. White, D., & Cooper, J. (2020). Instructional supervision in the 21st century: From evaluation to capacity building. *Educational Leadership Review*, 21(3).
- [31]. Yaşar, D. I., & Gürbüz, N. (2023). *The effectiveness and impact of post-observation feedback sessions in an in-service training program*. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(8), 21–31.