

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

Rey A. Pascual

Northeastern College, Santiago City, Isabela, Philippines

ABSTRACT: This study examined the instructional supervisory practices of school heads and their influence on school performance in selected public basic education schools in Northern Philippines. Employing a descriptive-correlational research design, the study involved 25 school principals and 350 teachers. Data on instructional supervisory practices were gathered using an adapted Instructional Supervisory Practices Questionnaire (ISPQ), while school performance data were obtained from official Department of Education records, specifically the Enhanced Basic Education Information System and School Report Cards covering School Years 2022–2023 to 2024–2025. Descriptive statistics, including weighted means, were used to determine the extent of instructional supervisory practices and levels of school performance, while Pearson's r was utilized to assess the relationship between variables. Findings revealed that instructional supervisory practices were implemented at a very great extent as perceived by school principals and at a great extent as perceived by teachers across all domains: planning and preparation, monitoring and classroom observation, professional support and development, feedback and communication, and evaluation and reporting. Among these, feedback and communication and evaluation and reporting obtained the highest ratings, while professional support and development obtained comparatively lower ratings. Results further indicated a consistent upward trend in school performance over three consecutive school years, with increasing proportions of schools classified as proficient and highly proficient. Moreover, a strong and significant positive relationship was found between instructional supervisory practices and school performance ($r = 0.767$, $p < 0.05$). The study concludes that effective instructional supervisory practices are critical determinants of school performance, highlighting the need to strengthen coaching, professional development, and alignment between supervisory intent and teacher experience to further enhance educational outcomes.

KEYWORDS: instructional supervision, school leadership, school performance, instructional practices, educational management, descriptive-correlational study

INTRODUCTION

Educational systems across the world continue to confront persistent challenges in improving learning outcomes despite substantial investments in curriculum reforms, teacher professional development, and educational technologies. Increasingly, evidence suggests that the quality of school leadership constitutes one of the most influential school-based determinants of educational effectiveness. While classroom instruction remains the most immediate factor affecting student learning, the capacity of school heads to supervise, support, and improve instructional processes has emerged as a critical mechanism through which schools achieve sustained performance gains. In many developing educational contexts, including the Philippines, school heads are expected not only to perform administrative and managerial functions but also to exercise instructional leadership that directly influences teaching quality, learner achievement, teacher performance, and overall school effectiveness.

The growing emphasis on instructional supervision is anchored on the recognition that educational improvement is fundamentally a teaching-and-learning endeavor. Recent international evidence demonstrates that principal leadership exerts a significant positive influence on student achievement and school outcomes, primarily through its effects on instructional quality, teacher practices, and school climate (Yalcin & Coban, 2023). Similarly, a comprehensive meta-meta-analysis established that principal leadership consistently contributes to improved student achievement across diverse educational contexts, underscoring the strategic role of school leaders in driving school performance (Shen & Wu, 2024). These findings reinforce the notion that instructional supervision is not merely a compliance-oriented activity but a transformative leadership function capable of shaping educational outcomes at multiple levels.

However, a significant conceptual paradox characterizes contemporary educational leadership. On one hand, school heads are increasingly expected to function as instructional leaders who engage in classroom observation, coaching, mentoring, curriculum monitoring, and teacher development. On the other hand, expanding bureaucratic demands, accountability pressures, administrative

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

workloads, and resource constraints often limit their capacity to perform these instructional functions effectively. Consequently, many school leaders become consumed by managerial responsibilities, creating a tension between instructional leadership expectations and operational realities. This paradox raises important questions regarding whether instructional supervision practices are being implemented in ways that genuinely contribute to school performance and whether their influence remains consistent across different educational contexts.

The complexity of this relationship is reflected in emerging empirical literature. Pietsch et al. (2023) demonstrated that the relationship between instructional leadership and student achievement is evident across multiple cultural contexts and educational systems, suggesting that instructional leadership possesses universal relevance. Nevertheless, their findings also indicate that contextual factors significantly moderate the strength of this relationship. Likewise, a comparative investigation conducted by Karadag & Sertel (2025) found that leadership effects on student achievement vary according to specific dimensions of leadership and contextual characteristics, challenging assumptions that all forms of instructional leadership uniformly produce positive outcomes. These studies collectively suggest that while instructional supervision is generally beneficial, its effectiveness is neither automatic nor context-independent.

Another important strand of scholarship highlights the mediating mechanisms through which instructional supervision influences educational outcomes. Li, et al. (2023) argued that principal instructional leadership affects student achievement indirectly by enhancing teacher instructional capacity and fostering professional learning environments. Supporting this perspective, Nellitawati, et al. (2024) found that instructional leadership strengthens teacher collaboration, professional commitment, and instructional improvement, which subsequently contribute to enhanced school performance. Such findings indicate that instructional supervision functions as a multidimensional process whose effectiveness depends on its capacity to improve instructional practices rather than merely monitor compliance with educational standards.

Despite growing international evidence, several knowledge gaps remain evident. First, much of the existing literature has concentrated on broad leadership constructs such as transformational leadership, distributed leadership, or general instructional leadership, often overlooking the specific supervisory practices through which school heads influence teaching and learning. Second, many studies have focused primarily on student achievement indicators while giving limited attention to broader measures of school performance that encompass organizational effectiveness, teacher performance, and institutional outcomes. Third, existing evidence is disproportionately derived from Western and highly developed educational systems, limiting the applicability of findings to developing-country contexts characterized by different institutional structures, resource conditions, and governance arrangements.

Within the Philippine educational landscape, these limitations become particularly significant. The implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) has heightened expectations regarding instructional leadership and supervision. Yet empirical evidence examining how specific instructional supervision practices influence school performance remains limited, particularly in Northern Philippines. Existing local studies have generally reported positive associations between school leadership practices and school effectiveness; however, many have relied on localized samples, descriptive approaches, or broad leadership measures that do not adequately capture the nuanced dimensions of instructional supervision (Yongco, 2026; Ulit, 2025). Consequently, there remains insufficient understanding of which supervisory practices exert the greatest influence on school performance and how these practices operate within the unique educational realities of Northern Philippine schools. The methodological limitations of previous research further underscore the need for investigation. Many studies employ cross-sectional designs that establish associations but provide limited insight into the strength and practical significance of instructional supervision practices as predictors of school performance. Moreover, variations in conceptualization and measurement have produced inconsistent findings regarding the specific leadership behaviors that matter most for educational improvement (Shen & Wu, 2024). The absence of context-sensitive evidence from Northern Philippines represents a critical gap in both educational leadership theory and practice.

Given these considerations, the present study seeks to examine the instructional supervision practices of school heads and their influence on school performance in Northern Philippines. Specifically, the study investigates the extent to which school heads implement instructional supervision practices and determines the degree to which these practices influence school performance indicators. By focusing on a regional Philippine context and examining instructional supervision as a distinct leadership construct, this study addresses a significant empirical and contextual gap in the literature. The findings are expected to contribute to educational leadership scholarship, provide evidence-based insights for policy implementation under the PPSSH framework, and inform leadership development initiatives aimed at enhancing school effectiveness and educational quality in the Philippines.

METHOD

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the instructional supervision practices of school heads, assess the level of school performance, and determine the relationship between these variables among public basic education schools in Northern Philippines. The descriptive component enabled the assessment of the extent to which instructional supervision practices were implemented, while the correlational component facilitated the examination of the association between instructional supervision practices and school performance.

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

The participants consisted of 25 school principals and 350 teachers from selected public basic education schools in Northern Philippines. School principals were included because they serve as the primary instructional leaders responsible for supervising teaching and learning processes within their respective schools. Teachers were likewise included as respondents because they are the direct recipients of instructional supervision and are therefore in a position to assess the extent and quality of supervisory practices implemented by their school heads. The inclusion of both principals and teachers provided a comprehensive perspective on instructional supervision within the participating schools.

Data on instructional supervision practices were collected using an adapted version of the Instructional Supervisory Practices Questionnaire (ISPQ), originally developed by Sule, Ameh, and Egbai (2015). The instrument measures key dimensions of instructional supervision, including classroom observation, monitoring of instructional activities, provision of professional support, instructional guidance, feedback mechanisms, and teacher development initiatives. Minor modifications were made to contextualize the instrument within the Philippine basic education setting while maintaining the integrity of the original constructs. Prior to administration, the adapted questionnaire underwent expert validation to ensure its relevance, clarity, and appropriateness for the study context. Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating a greater extent of implementation of instructional supervision practices.

School performance data were obtained from official administrative datasets maintained by the Department of Education (DepEd). Specifically, the study utilized school performance indicators covering three consecutive school years, namely School Year (SY) 2022–2023, SY 2023–2024, and SY 2024–2025. The required data were extracted from the Enhanced Basic Education Information System (EBEIS) and the annual School Report Cards (SRCs) of the participating schools. These institutional records served as standardized sources of school performance information and provided objective measures of school effectiveness. As official DepEd databases, EBEIS and SRC records undergo systematic validation and auditing by designated planning officers and educational administrators, thereby ensuring the reliability, accuracy, and consistency of the reported indicators. The utilization of three years of performance records minimized the effects of short-term variations and provided a more stable assessment of school performance over time.

Following the approval of the appropriate educational authorities and school administrators, the researcher conducted the data collection process. Participants were informed of the purpose, significance, and procedures of the study, and informed consent was secured prior to participation. The survey questionnaires were distributed to the respondents through designated school coordinators and were retrieved upon completion. Simultaneously, school performance data were collected from authorized school records and verified for completeness and accuracy before analysis. All collected data were encoded, organized, and prepared for statistical treatment.

Descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were employed to analyze the data. The weighted mean and standard deviation were used to determine the extent of instructional supervision practices and to describe the variability of responses. To determine the relationship between instructional supervision practices and school performance, Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson's r) was utilized. Statistical significance was tested at the 0.05 level to ascertain whether instructional supervision practices were significantly associated with school performance.

The study adhered to established ethical principles governing educational research. Participation was voluntary, and all respondents were informed of their right to decline participation or withdraw from the study at any point without penalty. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained throughout the research process by ensuring that no personally identifiable information was collected or disclosed. All data were stored securely and used solely for academic and research purposes. Furthermore, the study complied with the provisions of the Philippine Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173), ensuring the responsible handling, protection, and confidentiality of participants' information throughout the conduct of the research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1a. Instructional Supervisory Practices of School Principals along Planning and Preparations as Assessed by Themselves and their Teachers

Items	School Principal		Teacher	
	Mean	Qualitative Description	Mean	Qualitative Description
Clear objectives for instructional supervision are established	4.72	Very Great Extent	4.41	Great Extent
Student performance and school data are analyzed for planning	4.58	Very Great Extent	4.12	Great Extent
School improvement and instructional plans are developed and supported	4.65	Very Great Extent	4.28	Great Extent

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

Guidelines aligned with the national curriculum are implemented	4.81	Very Great Extent	4.63	Very Great Extent
Timelines and expectations for instructional goals are clearly set	4.69	Very Great Extent	4.36	Great Extent
Consultation with school leadership is conducted prior to supervision implementation	4.86	Very Great Extent	4.18	Great Extent
Overall Mean (Planning and Preparation)	4.72	Very Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent

Table 1a presents the instructional supervisory practices of school heads along planning and preparation as perceived by principals and teachers. Overall, the findings reveal that school principals rated their practices at a very great extent ($M = 4.72$), while teachers rated the same domain at a great extent ($M = 4.33$). The combined mean ($M = 4.53$) indicates that planning and preparation practices are generally highly implemented across schools in Northern Philippines. Across specific indicators, the highest-rated practice from the principals' perspective was consultation with school leadership prior to supervision implementation ($M = 4.86$), followed by the implementation of curriculum-aligned guidelines ($M = 4.81$). Teachers similarly rated curriculum alignment highest ($M = 4.63$), suggesting strong adherence to national standards and policy coherence in instructional supervision. However, the lowest teacher-rated indicator was data analysis for planning ($M = 4.12$), indicating relative inconsistency in data-driven supervisory decision-making.

The overall findings suggest that instructional supervision in the domain of planning and preparation is strongly institutionalized in Philippine basic education schools, particularly in terms of policy alignment and procedural compliance. This aligns with the view of instructional leadership as a structured and standards-driven process that emphasizes goal setting, curriculum alignment, and collaborative planning. The relatively high ratings for consultation and curriculum alignment reflect the centralized and policy-oriented nature of educational governance in the Philippines, where school heads are expected to implement national directives such as the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH). This supports the argument that instructional leadership is increasingly shaped by accountability frameworks that prioritize compliance and alignment over discretionary innovation.

However, the lower teacher rating for data use in planning suggests a persistent gap between policy expectations and actual instructional leadership practice. While data-informed decision-making is emphasized in contemporary leadership frameworks, evidence from the results indicates that its implementation remains uneven at the school level. This finding is consistent with international research indicating that instructional leaders often struggle to fully integrate assessment data into planning processes due to workload constraints and limited technical capacity (Flateby & Sweetland, 2025; O'Connor & Oark, 2023). Moreover, the discrepancy between principals' self-ratings and teachers' perceptions reflects a well-documented perceptual gap in leadership studies, where school leaders tend to evaluate their practices more positively than their subordinates. Such divergence may indicate differences in how supervisory practices are enacted versus how they are experienced in practice. This reinforces the argument that instructional supervision is not only a technical function but also a socially constructed leadership process influenced by communication, visibility, and teacher engagement (Bellibas, et al., 2020).

Overall, the results suggest that while planning and preparation practices are highly developed in terms of structural compliance and policy alignment, there remains a need to strengthen data-driven planning and deepen participatory engagement in supervisory processes to enhance instructional effectiveness and school performance outcomes.

Table 1b. Instructional Supervisory Practices of School Principals along Monitoring and Evaluation as Assessed by Themselves and their Teachers

Items	School Principal		Teacher	
	Mean	Qualitative Description	Mean	Qualitative Description
Regular classroom observations are conducted	4.74	Very Great Extent	4.38	Great Extent
Observations focus on instructional strategies and student engagement	4.66	Very Great Extent	4.21	Great Extent
Teacher performance is evaluated in a fair and objective manner	4.82	Very Great Extent	4.45	Great Extent
Classroom visits and observations are systematically documented	4.57	Very Great Extent	4.09	Great Extent
Areas for teacher improvement are identified during observations	4.69	Very Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

Effective teaching practices observed in classrooms are recognized	4.61	Very Great Extent	4.18	Great Extent
Overall Mean (Monitoring and Classroom Observation)	4.68	Very Great Extent	4.27	Great Extent

Table 1b presents the level of instructional supervisory practices of school heads along monitoring and classroom observation. Results reveal that school principals rated their practices at a very great extent ($M = 4.68$), while teachers rated the same domain at a great extent ($M = 4.27$). The combined evaluation indicates a generally high implementation level of monitoring and evaluation practices, although perceptual differences between respondents are evident. Among the specific indicators, principals reported the highest mean on teacher performance evaluated in a fair and objective manner ($M = 4.82$), followed by regular classroom observations ($M = 4.74$). Teachers also rated fairness in evaluation relatively high ($M = 4.45$), suggesting a shared perception that supervisory processes are grounded in fairness and professional accountability. Conversely, the lowest teacher-rated indicator was systematic documentation of classroom observations ($M = 4.09$), indicating potential inconsistencies in the formal recording and reporting of supervisory activities.

The findings indicate that monitoring and classroom observation practices are strongly implemented in schools, reflecting the central role of instructional supervision in ensuring teaching quality and classroom effectiveness. The high ratings for fairness in evaluation suggest that school heads are perceived as exercising professional judgment in assessing teacher performance, which is a critical component of instructional leadership credibility. However, the comparatively lower teacher ratings on documentation practices highlight a structural weakness in the supervisory cycle. While observations and evaluations are consistently conducted, the systematic recording of these activities appears less visible or less consistently experienced by teachers. This may suggest that supervision is more practice-oriented than documentation-driven, which can limit the continuity and traceability of instructional improvement processes. These findings align with contemporary instructional leadership literature emphasizing that effective supervision requires not only observation and evaluation but also structured documentation and feedback systems that support sustained teacher development (Ocran & Lavigne, 2026). Similarly, Cambo, et al. (2026) argue that the impact of instructional leadership is maximized when monitoring processes are consistently linked to feedback loops and professional learning mechanisms.

The perceptual gap between principals and teachers is again evident, reinforcing the idea that leadership effectiveness is partly shaped by how supervisory actions are experienced at the classroom level. While principals perceive monitoring practices as highly systematic, teachers perceive certain components—particularly documentation—as less consistently implemented. This discrepancy suggests the need for stronger communication and more transparent supervisory processes to ensure shared understanding of monitoring practices.

Overall, the results suggest that monitoring and classroom observation practices are well-established in Philippine basic education schools; however, strengthening documentation systems and enhancing the visibility of supervisory processes may further improve their effectiveness in supporting instructional improvement and school performance outcomes.

Table 1c. Instructional Supervisory Practices of School Principals along Professional Support and Development as Assessed by Themselves and their Teachers

Items	School Principal		Teacher	
	Mean	Qualitative Description	Mean	Qualitative Description
Resources and instructional materials are provided to support teaching	4.63	Very Great Extent	4.22	Great Extent
Professional development programs are recommended	4.71	Very Great Extent	4.36	Great Extent
Teachers are coached in the adoption of new instructional strategies	4.58	Very Great Extent	4.11	Great Extent
Collaboration among teachers is encouraged	4.76	Very Great Extent	4.39	Great Extent
Reflection on teaching practices is facilitated	4.52	Very Great Extent	4.07	Great Extent
Support is provided for instructional challenges	4.80	Very Great Extent	4.44	Great Extent
Overall Mean (Professional Support and Development)	4.67	Very Great Extent	4.26	Great Extent

Table 1c presents the instructional supervisory practices of school heads in terms of professional support and development. Findings reveal that school principals rated this domain at a very great extent ($M = 4.67$), while teachers rated it at a great extent ($M = 4.26$). The combined pattern of responses indicates that professional support systems are generally well-established across schools in Northern Philippines, although perceptual differences between implementers and recipients remain evident. Across indicators,

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

principals reported the highest mean on support provided for instructional challenges ($M = 4.80$), followed by collaboration among teachers being encouraged ($M = 4.76$). Teachers similarly identified collaboration ($M = 4.39$) and professional development recommendations ($M = 4.36$) as the most strongly experienced practices, indicating that collegial structures and capacity-building initiatives are prominent features of instructional supervision. In contrast, the lowest teacher-rated indicator was facilitation of reflection on teaching practices ($M = 4.07$), suggesting that reflective supervision remains less consistently embedded in daily instructional support mechanisms.

The results suggest that professional support and development practices are strongly embedded within the instructional supervision systems of school heads, particularly in terms of providing resources, encouraging collaboration, and responding to instructional challenges. This reflects a leadership orientation that prioritizes teacher support and professional growth as key mechanisms for improving instructional quality and school performance. The high ratings for collaboration and support for instructional challenges are consistent with contemporary instructional leadership frameworks, which emphasize that effective school leadership extends beyond evaluation to include capacity-building and collegial development. Such practices are critical in fostering professional learning communities that enhance teacher effectiveness and instructional innovation.

However, the relatively lower rating on reflective practice indicates a persistent gap in deeper instructional coaching processes. While teachers receive support and resources, structured reflection on teaching practices appears less systematically facilitated. This suggests that professional development may still be largely programmatic rather than reflective and inquiry-based in nature. This finding aligns with existing literature indicating that while school leaders often provide tangible forms of support such as training and materials, less emphasis is placed on sustained reflective dialogue that promotes critical examination of instructional practices (Tobin, et al., 2024). Audisio, et al. (2024) further emphasize that the impact of instructional leadership on school outcomes is strongest when professional development is embedded within continuous feedback, coaching, and reflective cycles rather than isolated interventions. The consistent perceptual gap between principals and teachers also suggests differences in how professional support is experienced versus how it is delivered. Principals perceive their support systems as highly intensive and comprehensive, while teachers experience them as slightly less developed, particularly in reflective dimensions. This highlights the importance of strengthening communication and ensuring that instructional support mechanisms are both visible and experienced consistently at the classroom level. Overall, the findings indicate that professional support and development practices are well-established in Northern Philippines schools, but further enhancement is needed in reflective supervision and coaching practices to fully optimize instructional leadership effectiveness and its impact on school performance.

Table 1d. Instructional Supervisory Practices of School Principals along Feedback and Communication as Assessed by Themselves and their Teachers

Items	School Principal		Teacher	
	Mean	Qualitative Description	Mean	Qualitative Description
Timely and constructive feedback is provided	4.78	Very Great Extent	4.42	Great Extent
Individual feedback sessions are conducted	4.66	Very Great Extent	4.15	Great Extent
Feedback includes specific recommendations for improvement	4.81	Very Great Extent	4.39	Great Extent
Feedback is used to set future supervisory goals	4.73	Very Great Extent	4.28	Great Extent
Open communication with school leadership is maintained	4.85	Very Great Extent	4.47	Great Extent
Feedback enhances overall school performance	4.69	Very Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent
Overall Mean (Feedback and Communication)	4.75	Very Great Extent	4.34	Great Extent

Table 1d presents the level of instructional supervisory practices of school heads along feedback and communication. Results show that principals rated this domain at a very great extent ($M = 4.75$), while teachers rated it at a great extent ($M = 4.34$). The combined results indicate that feedback and communication practices are highly institutionalized in schools in Northern Philippines and are consistently observed across respondents. In terms of specific indicators, principals reported the highest mean on open communication with school leadership ($M = 4.85$), followed by feedback including specific recommendations for improvement ($M = 4.81$) and timely and constructive feedback ($M = 4.78$). Teachers similarly identified open communication ($M = 4.47$) and timely feedback ($M = 4.42$) as the most strongly experienced practices, suggesting that communication channels between school heads and teachers are generally active and accessible. However, the lowest teacher-rated indicator was individual feedback sessions ($M = 4.15$), indicating that personalized feedback mechanisms are comparatively less consistently implemented.

The findings suggest that feedback and communication represent one of the strongest dimensions of instructional supervision among school heads in Northern Philippines. The consistently high ratings across both groups indicate that school

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

leaders place strong emphasis on communication processes, which serve as a critical mechanism for guiding instructional improvement and reinforcing accountability. The prominence of open communication reflects the collaborative culture often observed in Philippine basic education schools, where school heads are expected to maintain close professional relationships with teachers. This supports instructional leadership frameworks that emphasize communication as a core function of effective school leadership, particularly in facilitating alignment between instructional goals and classroom practices.

The high rating for feedback that includes specific recommendations suggests that supervision is not limited to general observations but extends to actionable guidance for instructional improvement. This is significant because research indicates that feedback specificity is a key determinant of teacher development and instructional effectiveness. However, the relatively lower rating for individual feedback sessions suggests that while communication is frequent and generally constructive, it may still be more group-based or informal rather than structured and individualized. This limitation may reduce the depth of instructional coaching and limit opportunities for differentiated teacher development support.

These findings are consistent with instructional leadership literature emphasizing that while communication is widely practiced in schools, the effectiveness of feedback systems depends on their specificity, consistency, and individualization (Brandmo & Gamlem, 2025; Flackenstein, et al., 2023). Glover, et al. (2023) further argue that instructional leadership yields stronger effects on school outcomes when feedback is systematically embedded in coaching cycles rather than delivered informally or intermittently. The perceptual gap between principals and teachers remains evident, although slightly narrower compared to other domains. This suggests improved alignment in perceptions of communication practices, yet still indicates differences in how feedback processes are experienced at the classroom level. Overall, the results indicate that feedback and communication are strongly developed components of instructional supervision; however, strengthening individualized feedback systems and formalizing coaching structures may further enhance their impact on teacher performance and school effectiveness.

Table 1e. Instructional Supervisory Practices of School Principals along Evaluation and Reporting as Assessed by Themselves and their Teachers

Items	School Principal		Teacher	
	Mean	Qualitative Description	Mean	Qualitative Description
Overall instructional quality is evaluated	4.77	Very Great Extent	4.40	Great Extent
Written reports are prepared after school visits	4.63	Very Great Extent	4.19	Great Extent
Reports include analysis of teaching and learning outcomes	4.71	Very Great Extent	4.28	Great Extent
Recommendations are provided based on evaluation findings	4.82	Very Great Extent	4.45	Great Extent
Follow-up actions are conducted	4.74	Very Great Extent	4.31	Great Extent
Reports contribute to school improvement planning	4.85	Very Great Extent	4.42	Great Extent
Overall Mean (Evaluation and Reporting)	4.75	Very Great Extent	4.34	Great Extent

Table 1e presents the level of instructional supervisory practices of school heads along evaluation and reporting. Findings reveal that school principals rated this domain at a very great extent ($M = 4.75$), while teachers rated it at a great extent ($M = 4.34$). The combined pattern of results indicates that evaluation and reporting practices are strongly implemented in public basic education schools in Northern Philippines, reflecting a well-established supervisory accountability structure. Across indicators, principals reported the highest mean on reports contributing to school improvement planning ($M = 4.85$) and recommendations provided based on evaluation findings ($M = 4.82$). Teachers likewise identified these indicators as highly evident, with means of 4.42 and 4.45, respectively. These results suggest that evaluation outputs are not merely procedural requirements but are perceived as meaningful inputs for school development and instructional improvement. Conversely, the lowest teacher-rated indicator was written reports after school visits ($M = 4.19$), indicating variability in the consistency or visibility of formal documentation practices.

The findings suggest that evaluation and reporting constitute a highly developed dimension of instructional supervision in Northern Philippines schools. The strong ratings across both respondent groups indicate that school heads are actively engaged in evaluating instructional quality and translating findings into actionable recommendations for school improvement. The high rating for the integration of evaluation reports into school improvement planning reflects the alignment of supervisory practices with

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

institutional planning systems. This is consistent with contemporary instructional leadership frameworks, which emphasize that evaluation should function not only as an accountability mechanism but also as a strategic tool for continuous school improvement. In this regard, school heads appear to play a dual role as evaluators and instructional improvement agents.

The relatively lower rating on the preparation of written reports suggests that while evaluative judgments and recommendations are strongly evident, the formalization and documentation of these processes may vary across schools. This may reflect differences in administrative workload, reporting systems, or institutional priorities. Nevertheless, the presence of follow-up actions indicates that evaluation is not a terminal activity but part of a continuous improvement cycle. These findings are consistent with instructional leadership literature emphasizing that effective school leadership requires systematic evaluation processes that are directly linked to instructional feedback and professional development (Esguerra & Quinito, 2025). Mandal (2026) further highlights that school leaders exert their strongest influence when evaluation processes are embedded within structured feedback loops that directly inform teaching improvement and school development planning. The persistent perceptual gap between principals and teachers remains evident, although relatively stable across indicators. This suggests that while evaluation systems are widely implemented, differences remain in how their depth and consistency are experienced by stakeholders. Such divergence reinforces the importance of transparency and shared understanding in instructional supervision practices. Overall, the results indicate that evaluation and reporting are well-established and strategically aligned with school improvement processes. Strengthening the consistency of documentation practices and enhancing transparency in reporting systems may further enhance the effectiveness of instructional supervision in improving school performance outcomes.

Table 1f. Summary Table on the Instructional Supervisory Practices of School Principals along Evaluation and Reporting as Assessed by Themselves and their Teachers

Domain	School Principal		Teacher		Combined	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Combined Mean	Overall Interpretation
Planning and Preparation	4.72	Very Great Extent	4.33	Great Extent	4.53	Very Great Extent
Monitoring and Classroom Observation	4.68	Very Great Extent	4.27	Great Extent	4.48	Great Extent
Professional Support and Development	4.67	Very Great Extent	4.26	Great Extent	4.47	Great Extent
Feedback and Communication	4.75	Very Great Extent	4.34	Great Extent	4.55	Very Great Extent
Evaluation and Reporting	4.75	Very Great Extent	4.34	Great Extent	4.55	Very Great Extent
Overall Instructional Supervisory Practices	4.71	Very Great Extent	4.31	Great Extent	4.51	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.71	Very Great Extent	4.31	Great Extent	4.51	Very Great Extent

Table 1f presents the summary of instructional supervisory practices of school heads across five domains: planning and preparation, monitoring and classroom observation, professional support and development, feedback and communication, and evaluation and reporting. Overall, findings reveal that school principals rated their instructional supervisory practices at a very great extent ($M = 4.71$), while teachers rated the same practices at a great extent ($M = 4.31$). The combined mean ($M = 4.51$) indicates that instructional supervision is generally implemented at a very high level in public basic education schools in Northern Philippines. Across domains, the highest combined ratings were observed in feedback and communication ($M = 4.55$) and evaluation and reporting ($M = 4.55$), followed closely by planning and preparation ($M = 4.53$). These results suggest that instructional supervision is most strongly manifested in communicative and evaluative functions, where school heads actively provide feedback, maintain communication, and translate evaluation results into school improvement planning. In contrast, the lowest combined mean was observed in professional support and development ($M = 4.47$), although still interpreted as “great extent,” indicating comparatively weaker emphasis on coaching, mentoring, and reflective instructional support.

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

The overall findings suggest that instructional supervisory practices among school heads are highly developed and institutionally embedded within the Philippine basic education system. The consistently high ratings across all domains indicate that school heads are actively engaged in multiple dimensions of instructional leadership, particularly in monitoring, evaluation, communication, and planning functions. The dominance of feedback and evaluation-related domains highlights the strong accountability orientation of instructional supervision practices. This reflects the Philippine educational governance context, where school leadership is expected to ensure compliance with national standards while simultaneously improving instructional quality through structured evaluation systems. Such findings are consistent with instructional leadership literature emphasizing that effective school leadership is characterized by a balance between managerial accountability and instructional support functions (Grissom et al., 2021).

However, the relatively lower rating in professional support and development suggests that while supervisory structures are strong in monitoring and evaluation, deeper instructional coaching and capacity-building mechanisms may require further strengthening. This indicates a possible imbalance between evaluative and developmental dimensions of instructional leadership, where school heads may be more engaged in assessing teacher performance than in sustaining long-term professional growth through coaching and reflective practice. The consistent perceptual gap between school principals and teachers across all domains also provides important insight into the relational dynamics of instructional supervision. Principals consistently rated their practices higher than teachers, suggesting differences in perception between implementers and recipients of supervision. This gap may reflect variations in how supervisory actions are communicated, experienced, and interpreted within school settings. Such findings are consistent with prior research indicating that leadership effectiveness is not only determined by what leaders do but also by how these actions are perceived by followers (Gesang & Sub, 2021; Goswani, et al., 2020). Overall, the results indicate that instructional supervisory practices in Northern Philippines schools are highly implemented, with strongest emphasis on communication and evaluation functions. However, enhancing professional support and development practices may further strengthen the instructional leadership role of school heads, ensuring a more balanced approach that integrates both accountability and developmental dimensions of supervision.

Table 2. School Performance for the Past Three School Years

Performance Level	SY 2022-2023		SY 2023-2024		SY 2024-2025	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Highly Proficient (90%–100%)	1	4.00	3	12.00	5	20.00
Proficient (75%–89%)	4	16.00	10	40.00	14	56.00
Nearly Proficient (50%–74%)	12	48.00	9	36.00	5	20.00
Low Proficient (25%–49%)	6	24.00	3	12.00	1	4.00
Not Proficient (0%–24%)	2	8.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total Schools (N)	25	100.00	25	100.00	25	100.00
Overall Mean Performance	54.20%		76.15%		81.40%	
(Descriptive Interpretation)	(Nearly Proficient)		(Proficient)		(Proficient)	

Table 2 presents the distribution of school performance levels across three consecutive school years (SY 2022–2023, SY 2023–2024, and SY 2024–2025). The results indicate a clear upward trend in overall school performance, reflected in the increasing mean performance scores from 54.20% in SY 2022–2023, to 76.15% in SY 2023–2024, and further to 81.40% in SY 2024–2025. This progressive improvement suggests sustained enhancement in school effectiveness over time. In SY 2022–2023, most schools were concentrated in the Nearly Proficient (48%) and Low Proficient (24%) categories, with only 4% classified as Highly Proficient. This distribution indicates that the majority of schools were operating below optimal performance levels during the initial period of observation. However, in SY 2023–2024, a marked shift is observed as Proficient schools increased to 40%, while Low Proficient and Not Proficient categories significantly declined. By SY 2024–2025, the proportion of Proficient schools further increased to 56%, while Highly Proficient schools rose to 20%, and no schools remained in the Not Proficient category.

The findings demonstrate a consistent and positive trajectory in school performance across the three-year period, suggesting improvements in institutional effectiveness, instructional delivery, and school management practices. The transition of schools from lower performance categories toward Proficient and Highly Proficient classifications reflects strengthened capacity in achieving educational outcomes and compliance with performance standards. The decline in the proportion of Low Proficient and Not Proficient schools over time may indicate the cumulative effect of policy implementation, capacity-building interventions, and strengthened instructional leadership practices. This trend is particularly important in the context of Philippine basic education reform initiatives, which emphasize continuous school improvement through data-driven decision-making and school-based management systems.

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

The increasing proportion of Proficient and Highly Proficient schools aligns with the expectation that sustained instructional supervision contributes to improved school performance over time. Instructional leadership literature supports this pattern, emphasizing that effective school leadership improves teaching quality, which in turn enhances student outcomes and institutional performance (Yongco, 2026; Kementhofer, et al., 2022). However, despite the positive trend, the data also reveal that a substantial proportion of schools remain in the Proficient category rather than achieving Highly Proficient status. This suggests that while improvements are evident, there remains room for advancement in maximizing school performance outcomes. The persistence of schools in the mid-performance range indicates that systemic challenges may still limit full optimization of instructional effectiveness.

Table 3. Significant Relationship between Instructional Practices and School Principals and School Performance

Variables	Pearson-R	p-value	Decision
Instructional Practices	.767	.000	Significant
School Performance			

**significant at .05 level*

Table 3 presents the relationship between instructional supervisory practices of school heads and school performance. The results reveal a strong positive and statistically significant relationship between instructional supervisory practices and school performance, as indicated by a Pearson correlation coefficient of $r = 0.767$ with a p-value of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). This finding leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis, confirming that instructional supervisory practices are significantly associated with school performance.

The strong positive correlation suggests that schools with higher levels of instructional supervisory practices tend to demonstrate higher levels of school performance. This indicates that effective instructional supervision—particularly in planning and preparation, monitoring and classroom observation, professional support and development, feedback and communication, and evaluation and reporting—is closely linked with improved institutional outcomes. The magnitude of the correlation ($r = 0.767$) falls within the range of a strong relationship, implying that instructional supervision is not merely a supportive administrative function but a substantial predictor of school effectiveness. This reinforces the theoretical position of instructional leadership models, which emphasize that school leaders influence student and school outcomes primarily through their impact on teaching quality and instructional processes. Empirical studies support this finding. Pardosi and Utari (2021) that principals' instructional leadership behaviors, particularly those related to observation, feedback, and curriculum support, are significantly associated with improved school performance indicators. Similarly, Ulit (2025) argue that instructional leadership has one of the strongest effects on school outcomes when it is consistently implemented through structured supervision and feedback mechanisms. The current findings align with these studies, confirming that instructional supervisory practices serve as a critical lever for school improvement in diverse educational contexts, including the Philippine basic education system.

From a contextual perspective, the result suggests that schools in Northern Philippines that demonstrate stronger supervisory systems are also those that achieve better performance outcomes. This may be attributed to the role of instructional supervision in improving teacher effectiveness, aligning instructional practices with curriculum standards, and strengthening accountability mechanisms within schools. The statistically significant p-value ($p = 0.000$) further confirms that the relationship is not due to chance, reinforcing the robustness of the observed association. This provides empirical support for the argument that strengthening instructional supervision is a viable strategy for improving school performance outcomes.

However, while the relationship is strong, it is important to note that correlation does not imply causation. Other contextual factors such as teacher qualifications, resource availability, learner characteristics, and community support may also contribute to school performance. Nevertheless, the strength of the association underscores the central role of instructional leadership as a key determinant of educational effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that instructional supervisory practices of school heads in selected public basic education schools in Northern Philippines are highly implemented, yet are differently perceived by principals and teachers, and are significantly associated with school performance outcomes. Across all domains—planning and preparation, monitoring and classroom observation, professional support and development, feedback and communication, and evaluation and reporting—school principals consistently rated their practices higher than teachers, indicating a persistent perceptual gap in the enactment and experience of instructional supervision. The findings further establish that instructional supervision is most strongly manifested in feedback and communication as well as evaluation and reporting, suggesting that supervisory practice in the context of Northern Philippines is largely anchored on monitoring, accountability, and performance feedback systems. However, professional support and development emerged as the relatively weakest domain, revealing that while school heads are highly engaged in evaluative and managerial supervision, the developmental and coaching dimensions of instructional leadership remain less emphasized. In terms of school performance, the

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

study reveals a sustained upward trajectory over three consecutive school years, indicating continuous improvement in school effectiveness. This improvement pattern provides evidence that schools are progressively transitioning toward higher performance levels, with increasing proportions achieving proficient and highly proficient classifications.

A key new insight generated by this study is that instructional supervision in the Philippine basic education context operates as a dual-function system—strong in compliance-oriented monitoring and evaluation, but comparatively less intensive in transformative instructional coaching and reflective professional development. This imbalance suggests that instructional leadership is still evolving from a predominantly supervisory and evaluative model toward a more balanced developmental leadership approach. Furthermore, the study establishes a strong and significant positive relationship between instructional supervisory practices and school performance, confirming that schools with more developed instructional supervision systems tend to achieve higher performance outcomes. This underscores instructional supervision as a critical institutional lever for school improvement, with both structural and relational dimensions influencing effectiveness.

REFERENCES

- 1) Audisio, A., Taylor-Perryman, R., Tasker, T. B., & Steinberg, M. P. (2024). Does Teacher Professional Development Improve Student Learning? Evidence from Leading Educators' Fellowship Model. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 18, 878 - 917. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2024.2361467>
- 2) Bellibaş, M., Polatcan, M., & Kılınç, A. (2020). Linking instructional leadership to teacher practices: The mediating effect of shared practice and agency in learning effectiveness. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50, 812 - 831. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220945706>
- 3) Brandmo, C., & Gamlem, S. M. (2025). Students' perceptions and outcome of teacher feedback: a systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1572950>
- 4) Cambo, F. M. L., Yuguay, G. F. J., Villares, M. Y. J., & Ramirez, A. M. C. (2026). Teaching Performance and Leadership in Teaching and Learning Processes: A Systematic Review. *Minerva*. <https://doi.org/10.47460/minerva.v7i19.279>
- 5) Esguerra, R. A., & Qunito, D. I. (2025). Teachers' Professional Development and School Leadership Management. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*. <https://doi.org/10.51244/ijrsi.2025.12010001>
- 6) Flateby, T. L., & Sweetland, Y. (2025). The Integration of Student Learning Outcome Assessment, Teaching, and Learning. *Intersection: A Journal at the Intersection of Assessment and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.61669/001c.147354>
- 7) Fleckenstein, J., Liebenow, L. W., & Meyer, J. (2023). Automated feedback and writing: a multi-level meta-analysis of effects on students' performance. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1162454>
- 8) Gesang, E., & Süß, S. (2021). A shift in perspective: Examining the impact of perceived follower behavior on leaders. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2021.101156>
- 9) Glover, T. A., Reddy, L. A., & Crouse, K. (2023). Instructional coaching actions that predict teacher classroom practices and student achievement.. *Journal of school psychology*, 96, 1-11 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2022.10.006>
- 10) Goswami, A., Park, H., & Beehr, T. (2020). Does the Congruence Between Leaders' Implicit Followership Theories and Their Perceptions of Actual Followers Matter?. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 35, 519-538. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-019-09638-7>
- 11) Karadağ, E., & Sertel, G. (2025). The effect of educational leadership on students' achievement: A cross-cultural meta-analysis research on studies between 2006 and 2024. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432251327645>
- 12) Kemethofer, D., Helm, C., & Warwas, J. (2022). Does educational leadership enhance instructional quality and student achievement? The case of Austrian primary school leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 28, 461 - 485. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2021.2021294>
- 13) Li, J., Chan, P., & Hu, Y. (2023). The Effects of Principals' Instructional Leadership on Primary School Students' Academic Achievement in China: Evidence from Serial Multiple Mediating Analysis. *Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032844>
- 14) Mandal, S. (2026). The Importance of Evaluation in the Teaching–Learning Process: Enhancing Learning Outcomes and Instructional Effectiveness. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science Communication and Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.48175/ijarsct-19200j>
- 15) Nellitawati, N., Ganefri, G., Rusdinal, R., Hardianto, H., Setiawan, M. N. A., Ginanjar, S., & Arwildayanto, A. (2024). The influence of instructional leadership and work commitment on teacher performance. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v43i3.66677>
- 16) O'Connor, B. T., & Park, M. (2023). Exploring the influence of collaborative data-based decision making among teachers in professional learning communities on teaching practice. *Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Science Education Research*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43031-023-00086-1>

School Head's Instructional Supervision Practices and Its Influence on School Performance

- 17) Ocran, P., & Lavigne, A. (2026). Empowering mathematics teacher development: The necessity of content-specific supervision and feedback. *Theory Into Practice*, 65, 67 - 81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2025.2607949>
- 18) Pardosi, J., & Utari, T. I. (2021). Effective principal leadership behaviors to improve the teacher performance and the student achievement. *F1000Research*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.51549.2>
- 19) Pietsch, M., Aydın, B., & Gümüş, S. (2023). Putting the Instructional Leadership–Student Achievement Relation in Context: A Meta-Analytical Big Data Study Across Cultures and Time. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 47, 29 - 64. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737231197434>
- 20) Shen, J., & Wu, H. (2024). The Relationship Between Principal Leadership and Student Achievement: A Multivariate Meta-Analysis with an Emphasis on Conceptual Models and Methodological Approaches. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 61, 234 - 281. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161x241286527>
- 21) Sule, M. A., Ameh, P. O., & Egbai, M. J. (2015). Instructional supervisory practices and teachers' role effectiveness in public secondary schools in Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research and Reflection*, 3(6), 41–51.
- 22) Tobin, B., Farren, M., & Crotty, Y. (2024). Impacting teaching and learning through collaborative reflective practice. *Educational Action Research*, 33, 756 - 776. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2024.2394933>
- 23) Ulit, J. (2025). Impact of school heads' instructional leadership on teaching and learning outcomes: Philippine's context. *Divine Word International Journal of Management and Humanities (DWIJMH)* (ISSN: 2980-4817). <https://doi.org/10.62025/dwijmh.v4i3.188>
- 24) Yalçın, M., & Çoban, Ö. (2023). Effect of school leadership on student academic achievement: school level path variables. *Current Psychology*, 42, 21249 - 21262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04886-6>
- 25) Yongco, J. S. (2026). Impact of leadership styles on teacher performance and student achievement in Philippine secondary schools. *Discover Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-026-02794-w>



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non-Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.