IJGGSD
International Journal of Global Goals and Sustainable Development
RESEARCH | INNOVATION | INCLUSION | SUSTAINABLE FUTURES
ISSN: 3155-7716
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/ijggsd.V1.I1.30

Outcome-Based Instructional Coaching to Strengthen Teacher Professional Development

Roel C. Buñao
Master of Arts in Education, Major in Administration and Supervision, Cebu Technical University, Cebu City, Philippines

Email: roel.bunao01@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study examined the extent of instructional coaching implementation and its relationship with teacher professional development among public secondary school teachers in Carmen I District, Bohol, Philippines. A quantitative descriptive-correlational design was employed, involving 50 teachers from three schools through total enumeration during School Year 2026–2027. Data were collected using a content-validated structured questionnaire and analyzed through descriptive statistics and Pearson product-moment correlation. Instructional coaching was generally implemented (WM = 4.16), with classroom observation (WM = 4.29) and post-observation feedback (WM = 4.23) receiving the highest ratings. Teacher professional development was likewise favorably perceived (WM = 4.19), particularly in content knowledge and pedagogy (WM = 4.28) and reflective teaching (WM = 4.27). A statistically significant positive, low-to-moderate relationship was established between instructional coaching and professional development ($r = 0.35$, $p = 0.014$). However, progress monitoring and documentation (WM = 4.06) and assessment-related competencies (WM = 4.09) emerged as priority areas for improvement. The findings indicate that stronger coaching implementation is associated with higher perceived professional development without establishing causation. Schools should strengthen coaching follow-through, systematic progress monitoring, and targeted Learning Action Cell mentoring. The geographically limited sample and reliance on self-reported data constrain generalizability. By identifying actionable gaps in instructional support, the study provides an empirical basis for enhancing school-based professional learning and promoting educational sustainability aligned with Sustainable Development Goal 4: Quality Education.

Keywords: *Classroom Observation, Educational Sustainability, Instructional Coaching, Learning Action Cells, Professional Development, Public Secondary Schools, Reflective Teaching*

1. INTRODUCTION

Teacher professional development is essential to improving instructional quality, pedagogical competence, and effective teaching practices. Educators must continuously strengthen their content knowledge, instructional strategies, assessment methods, classroom management, and responsiveness to diverse learner needs. Effective professional development requires sustained, collaborative, and evidence-based learning opportunities connected to classroom practice. Sims et al. (2025) emphasized professional learning that strengthens teachers' knowledge, motivation, instructional techniques, and application of acquired competencies. Similarly, Visscher et al. (2025) demonstrated that professional development interventions can improve student achievement, depending on program characteristics and implementation conditions. Instructional coaching supports teacher development through collaborative goal setting, classroom observation, constructive feedback, mentoring, and reflective practice. Warnock et al. (2022) identified improved professional relationships, self-awareness, reflection, and instructional practices as key benefits of coaching. Bellibaş (2023) further highlighted the relevance of classroom observation feedback and instructional leadership in strengthening teacher self-efficacy and teaching practices. In the Philippines, teacher professional development remains a priority under the Basic Education Development Plan 2030 and Department of Education guidelines promoting competency-based improvement, professional learning, and systematic monitoring (Department of Education, 2022, 2023a, 2023b). Rivera et al. (2025) also emphasized the importance of accessible and relevant professional development opportunities for Filipino teachers. However, coaching effectiveness depends on consistent implementation, meaningful feedback, collaboration, and sustained follow-through. Accordingly, this study examines instructional coaching practices and their relationship with teacher professional development in three public secondary schools in Carmen I District, Bohol. The findings provide a basis for developing an enhanced, outcome-based instructional coaching program responsive to teachers' professional learning needs.

Research Problem

Although instructional coaching is incorporated into school-based professional development practices, its implementation may vary across instructional monitoring, collaborative learning, feedback delivery, and follow-through activities. Research demonstrates that coaching can support instructional improvement and inclusive classroom practices, but its effectiveness depends on how coaching activities are designed and implemented (Craig et al., 2022; Warnock et al., 2022). Furthermore, Rivera et al. (2025) identified concerns regarding access, relevance, workload, and institutional support as important considerations in Philippine teacher professional development. In public secondary schools, instructional coaching commonly involves pre-observation conferences, classroom observations, post-observation feedback, peer coaching, Learning Action Cell (LAC) participation, and monitoring of teacher progress. However, the extent to which these activities are systematically implemented and associated with professional development requires empirical examination. Contemporary research supports the value of feedback, collaboration, and practice-oriented professional learning, while emphasizing the importance of examining their implementation within particular educational contexts (Jurkowski & Abramczyk, 2024; Sims et al., 2025). The central research problem concerns the relationship between the extent of implementation of instructional coaching practices and the level of teacher professional development among public secondary school teachers in Carmen I District, Bohol. Specifically, the study examines coaching implementation, professional development domains, and observed best practices to determine areas requiring improvement. The findings serve as the basis for formulating an enhanced instructional coaching program that emphasizes systematic support, reflective practice, collaborative learning, and outcome-oriented professional development.

Assumptions of the Study

The study operates on the assumption that instructional coaching is practiced to varying extents within the selected public secondary schools and that teachers can provide meaningful assessments of their experiences with coaching and professional development. It further assumes that structured observation, constructive feedback, mentoring, collaboration, and reflective practice are relevant dimensions through which professional learning may be examined. These assumptions are consistent with contemporary professional learning frameworks emphasizing evidence-informed improvement, collaborative inquiry, and sustained instructional support (Learning Forward, 2022; Warnock et al., 2022). The study also assumes that instructional coaching practices and teacher professional development can be assessed using defined indicators and that their statistical association can be examined through a descriptive-correlational design. However, the existence, direction, and significance of this relationship remain empirical questions. Accordingly, the study tests the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant relationship between the extent of instructional coaching implementation and the level of teacher professional development.

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to determine the extent of instructional coaching implementation and its relationship with teacher professional development among public secondary school teachers in Carmen I District, Bohol, during School Year 2026–2027. Specifically, it examines respondents' demographic profiles in terms of age, gender, educational attainment, teaching experience, professional rank, subject specialization, and professional development participation. It assesses instructional coaching across six dimensions: pre-observation conferences and goal setting; classroom observation and monitoring; post-observation feedback; peer coaching and collaboration; Learning Action Cell (LAC) participation; and progress monitoring, follow-through, and documentation. Teacher professional development is evaluated across seven domains: content knowledge and pedagogy; instructional strategies and learner engagement; classroom management and inclusive learning; curriculum planning; assessment and feedback; reflective teaching and professional growth; and collaboration and mentoring. Furthermore, the study determines the significant relationship between instructional coaching and professional development, identifies observed coaching best practices, and proposes an enhanced instructional coaching program based on the findings. These objectives support evidence-based professional learning, instructional improvement, and collaborative teacher development (Learning Forward, 2022; Sims et al., 2025).

Theoretical or Conceptual Basis

This study is anchored in Adult Learning Theory, Reflective Practice Theory, Social Constructivist Learning Theory, Professional Learning Community principles, Transformational Leadership Theory, and Self-Efficacy Theory, which collectively explain the relationship between instructional coaching and teacher professional development. Adult Learning Theory emphasizes self-directed, experience-based, and practice-oriented learning, enabling teachers to identify professional needs, establish instructional goals, and apply improved teaching strategies. Sims et al. (2025) emphasized the importance of strengthening teachers' knowledge, motivation, instructional techniques, and sustained application of professional learning. Reflective Practice Theory highlights continuous improvement through critical examination of classroom experiences, instructional decisions, and feedback. Warnock et al. (2022) similarly identified enhanced self-awareness and reflection as important benefits of instructional coaching. Social Constructivist Learning Theory and Professional Learning Community principles emphasize collaboration, shared inquiry, and collective professional growth. Peer coaching, mentoring, and Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions facilitate knowledge exchange and collaborative problem-solving. Jurkowski and Abramczyk (2024) highlighted the contribution of

teacher collaboration to instructional improvement, while Learning Forward (2022) emphasized collaborative inquiry and evidence-informed professional development. Transformational Leadership Theory underscores the role of school leaders in providing motivation, guidance, and supportive learning environments. Özdemir et al. (2024) established relationships among transformational leadership, professional learning, and teacher self-efficacy. Complementing this perspective, Self-Efficacy Theory explains how teachers' confidence in their instructional capabilities relates to professional engagement and classroom practices, as examined by Bellibaş (2023). Collectively, these theories establish instructional coaching as the principal study variable and teacher professional development as the corresponding outcome variable. Instructional coaching is examined across six practice dimensions, while professional development is assessed through seven competency domains. Consistent with the descriptive-correlational design, the framework examines the relationship between these variables without assuming causation. The findings provide a basis for developing an enhanced, outcome-based instructional coaching program responsive to teachers' professional learning needs.

This study primarily aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4): Quality Education, which promotes inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities. The study is particularly relevant to SDG Target 4.c, which focuses on increasing the supply of qualified teachers. UNESCO and the International Task Force on Teachers for Education 2030 (2024) emphasized the importance of strengthening teacher preparation, professional support, and educational systems to advance quality education. By examining instructional coaching implementation and teacher professional development, the study addresses professional learning conditions associated with instructional quality, pedagogical competence, inclusive classroom practices, assessment, reflective teaching, and collaboration. Its proposed enhanced coaching program may contribute to educational sustainability by encouraging continuous teacher learning, institutionalized mentoring, systematic feedback, and evidence-informed professional development. The study also has implications for institutional and social sustainability through its emphasis on strengthening school-based professional learning systems, supporting educators within available resources, and promoting continuous instructional improvement. These contributions remain prospective because the research examines teachers' reported coaching practices and professional development rather than directly measuring student achievement or long-term sustainability outcomes. Thus, the study supports SDG 4 by generating context-specific evidence that may inform the development of more consistent, responsive, and sustainable instructional coaching practices in public secondary schools.

2. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to examine instructional coaching practices and teacher professional development. The descriptive component assessed respondents' demographic characteristics, the extent of instructional coaching implementation across six dimensions, and teacher professional development across seven competency domains. The correlational component determined the significance, strength, and direction of the relationship between instructional coaching implementation and teacher professional development without manipulating the study variables.

Research Locale or Study Setting

The study was conducted in three public secondary schools in Carmen I District, Schools Division of Bohol, Philippines: Isabel S. J. Gujol Memorial High School in Barangay Alegria, Ponciano F. Ramasola Sr. High School in Barangay Calatrava, and Policronio S. Dano Sr. High School in Barangay Nueva Fuerza. These schools serve predominantly rural and agricultural

communities and provide junior and senior high school education under the supervision of the Department of Education. Their shared educational context provided an appropriate setting for examining instructional coaching practices, professional learning, and teacher development within available institutional resources.

Participants or Data Sources

The respondents comprised 50 public secondary school teachers from the three participating schools during School Year 2026–2027. Total enumeration was employed to include all available teaching personnel directly involved in classroom instruction, curriculum implementation, classroom observation, mentoring, feedback-giving, and Learning Action Cell (LAC) activities. The respondents represented different age groups, genders, educational qualifications, teaching experiences, professional ranks, subject specializations, and levels of participation in professional development activities.

Research Instruments or Materials

Data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire adapted and modified from Knight's (2018) Instructional Coaching Model and aligned with Department of Education standards, particularly the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). The instrument comprised four parts. The first gathered respondents' demographic characteristics, while the second assessed instructional coaching implementation across six dimensions: pre-observation conferences and goal setting; classroom observation and instructional monitoring; post-observation conferences and feedback-giving; peer coaching and collaborative professional learning; Learning Action Cell participation and coaching support; and progress monitoring, follow-through, and documentation. The third part evaluated teacher professional development across seven domains: content knowledge and pedagogy; instructional strategies and learner engagement; classroom management and inclusive learning environment; curriculum planning and lesson preparation; assessment, feedback, and reporting of learner progress; reflective teaching practice and professional growth; and collaboration, mentoring, and school-based professional learning. The second and third parts used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree). The fourth part identified observed instructional coaching best practices, issues, and concerns. The instrument underwent content validation by educational experts, research advisers, and school administrators to establish its clarity, relevance, and appropriateness.

Data Gathering Procedure

Before data collection, the researcher secured formal permissions and endorsements from the Public Schools District Supervisor of Carmen I District and the school heads of the participating institutions. Upon approval, coordination was undertaken with school authorities to administer the questionnaires to the 50 teacher-respondents during their available schedules. Respondents were informed of the study's objectives, voluntary nature, confidentiality provisions, and their right to withdraw. Completed questionnaires were retrieved, examined for completeness, coded, tallied, and organized for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and Pearson product-moment correlation. Frequencies and percentages described respondents' demographic characteristics, including age, gender, educational attainment, teaching experience, professional rank, subject specialization, and participation in professional development activities. Weighted means determined the extent of instructional coaching implementation and the level of teacher professional development across the identified

dimensions. The five-point scale was interpreted using the following weighted mean ranges: 4.21–5.00 (Strongly Agree/Highly Evident), 3.41–4.20 (Agree/Evident), 2.61–3.40 (Neutral/Moderately Evident), 1.81–2.60 (Disagree/Slightly Evident), and 1.00–1.80 (Strongly Disagree/Not Evident). Pearson product-moment correlation was employed to determine the strength, direction, and statistical significance of the relationship between instructional coaching implementation and teacher professional development. The null hypothesis was tested at the 0.05 level of significance.

Ethical Consideration

The study observed established ethical principles to protect respondents' rights, privacy, dignity, and well-being. Administrative permissions and endorsements were obtained from the concerned educational authorities before data collection. Respondents were informed of the research objectives and participated voluntarily, with the right to decline or withdraw without adverse consequences. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained by excluding personal identifiers from data tabulation and reporting. Questionnaire administration was scheduled during available periods to avoid disrupting instructional responsibilities. Data collection, processing, analysis, and interpretation were conducted objectively to maintain research integrity and prevent bias, fabrication, or misrepresentation.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Teacher Profile, Instructional Coaching Practices, and Professional Development

3.1.1 Demographic Profile of Teacher-Respondents

The 50 teacher-respondents had a mean age of 41.50 years (SD = 9.26), with most belonging to the 41–50 (36%) and 31–40 (34%) age groups. Female respondents comprised 72%, while males accounted for 28%. Regarding educational attainment, 42% had master's degree units, 28% held master's degrees, 26% held bachelor's degrees, and 4% had doctorate units. Teaching experience was predominantly 11–15 years (28%) and 6–10 years (26%), while Teacher III (34%) and Teacher II (28%) were the most represented positions. Respondents taught various subject areas, including English, Mathematics, Filipino, Science, Araling Panlipunan, and Technology and Livelihood Education. Additionally, 40% had attended three to four professional development activities, while 26% had participated in five or more. These findings indicate that the respondents represented educators with varied professional experiences, qualifications, teaching responsibilities, and exposure to professional learning. The proportion of teachers with graduate-level studies and previous professional development participation suggests an existing foundation for continued professional learning. However, differences in teaching experience and professional preparation underscore the importance of considering individual development needs when designing instructional coaching activities. The demographic findings provide descriptive context but do not independently establish differences in coaching effectiveness across respondent groups.

3.1.2 Extent of Implementation of Instructional Coaching Practices

Instructional coaching practices obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.16 (SD = 0.58), interpreted as Agree, indicating that coaching activities were generally implemented across the participating schools. Classroom observation and instructional monitoring received the highest rating (WM = 4.29, SD = 0.58), followed by post-observation conferences and feedback-giving (WM = 4.23, SD = 0.58), both interpreted as Strongly Agree. Pre-observation conferences and goal setting (WM = 4.17), Learning Action Cell participation and support (WM = 4.12), and peer coaching and collaborative professional learning (WM = 4.07) were rated Agree. Monitoring,

follow-through, and documentation of teacher progress received the lowest rating (WM = 4.06), although still interpreted as Agree. The findings suggest that classroom observation and post-observation feedback are relatively established components of instructional coaching in the participating schools. However, the lower ratings for peer coaching and progress monitoring indicate opportunities to strengthen collaborative support and continuity after classroom observations. White and Maher (2024) emphasized the importance of using classroom observation as a mechanism for teacher learning rather than solely as an evaluative process. Similarly, Jolly et al. (2024) highlighted the importance of identifying and systematically examining coaching behaviors to support the implementation of evidence-based teaching practices. These studies reinforce the relevance of structured observation, meaningful feedback, and systematic coaching documentation in professional development.

3.1.3 Level of Teacher Professional Development

Teacher professional development obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.19 (SD = 0.57), interpreted as Agree. Content knowledge and pedagogy received the highest rating (WM = 4.28, SD = 0.56), followed by reflective teaching practice and professional growth (WM = 4.27, SD = 0.56), and collaboration, mentoring, and school-based professional learning (WM = 4.24, SD = 0.55), all interpreted as Strongly Agree. Instructional strategies and learner engagement (WM = 4.18), classroom management and inclusive learning environment (WM = 4.15), and curriculum planning and lesson preparation (WM = 4.10) were rated Agree. Assessment, feedback, and reporting of learner progress obtained the lowest rating (WM = 4.09). The findings indicate favorable teacher perceptions of their professional development, particularly in pedagogical knowledge, reflective practice, and professional collaboration. These competencies are relevant to school-based coaching, which emphasizes instructional improvement through professional feedback and opportunities to apply effective teaching strategies. Glover et al. (2023) found that coaching practices involving instructional feedback and opportunities for practice were associated with stronger implementation of evidence-based classroom strategies. The comparatively lower ratings for assessment and curriculum planning suggest areas for more focused professional learning support. However, the respondents' ratings should be interpreted as self-reported assessments rather than independent measures of instructional competence or improvement.

3.2 Observed Best Practices in Instructional Coaching

Respondents identified several established instructional coaching practices across their schools. Pre-observation conferences were the most frequently reported practice (90%), followed by clear discussion and alignment of coaching goals (86%) and classroom observations focused on instructional improvement (86%). Constructive and respectful post-observation feedback was reported by 80% of respondents, while 76% identified reflective teaching and self-assessment as established practices. Other reported practices included identifying instructional strengths and areas for growth (74%), peer coaching (70%), collaborative lesson planning (68%), integration of LAC sessions for mentoring (64%), and sharing instructional best practices during professional development meetings (62%). These findings indicate that formal observation-related activities were more frequently reported than collaborative professional learning practices. The relatively lower percentages for LAC-based mentoring and the sharing of instructional practices suggest opportunities to reinforce professional collaboration beyond formal observation cycles. Dela Cruz and Baguio (2024) reported a positive relationship between Learning Action Cell practices and teacher self-efficacy among special education teachers in the

Philippines, highlighting the potential relevance of organized collaborative learning structures. Strengthening peer coaching, LAC participation, and shared reflection may support more consistent implementation of the professional learning practices already identified by respondents.

3.3 Relationship Between Instructional Coaching and Teacher Professional Development

Pearson product-moment correlation revealed a statistically significant positive relationship between the extent of instructional coaching implementation and the level of teacher professional development ($r = 0.35$, $df = 48$, $p = 0.014$). Since the computed probability value was below the 0.05 significance level, the null hypothesis was rejected. The correlation indicated a positive, low-to-moderate association, suggesting that higher reported levels of instructional coaching implementation tended to correspond with higher reported levels of teacher professional development among the 50 respondents. This finding supports the relevance of instructional coaching as a professional learning mechanism while recognizing that the observed association does not establish a causal relationship. Glover et al. (2023) demonstrated that specific coaching actions, particularly opportunities for instructional practice and feedback, predicted teachers' implementation of evidence-based classroom strategies in their study. Similarly, LaBrot et al. (2024) found that school-based consultation and coaching supported teachers' continued application of learned instructional practices across settings. These findings provide a relevant empirical context for the present relationship, although the descriptive-correlational design cannot determine whether coaching directly produced improvements in teacher professional development.

3.4 Challenges and Areas for Improvement in Instructional Coaching

Despite generally favorable coaching implementation and professional development ratings, several areas requiring improvement were identified. Monitoring, follow-through, and documentation of teacher progress received the lowest instructional coaching rating (WM = 4.06), while assessment, feedback, and reporting of learner progress obtained the lowest professional development rating (WM = 4.09). Respondents' reported concerns also identified heavy teaching workloads and time constraints as barriers to sustained coaching follow-through. These findings indicate that systematic progress tracking, sustained mentoring, and assessment-related professional learning require additional attention. The findings highlight the need to strengthen the continuity of coaching beyond classroom observation and immediate feedback. LaBrot et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of implementation support in helping teachers apply learned practices across instructional contexts, while Jolly et al. (2024) demonstrated the relevance of systematically examining coaching behaviors to strengthen implementation. Accordingly, the present findings provide a basis for an enhanced, outcome-based instructional coaching program emphasizing scheduled coaching activities, consistent feedback mechanisms, standardized progress documentation, targeted LAC mentoring, and follow-through support. These measures constitute recommendations derived from the identified needs rather than interventions whose effectiveness was tested in the present study.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study established that instructional coaching practices were generally implemented among 50 public secondary school teachers in Carmen I District, Bohol, particularly through classroom observation, post-observation feedback, and pre-observation goal setting. Teachers also reported favorable professional development, especially in content knowledge, pedagogical

competence, reflective teaching, and professional collaboration. However, progress monitoring, follow-through, and documentation remained the least developed coaching components, while assessment, feedback, and reporting of learner progress required further strengthening. A statistically significant positive, low-to-moderate relationship between instructional coaching implementation and teacher professional development ($r = 0.35$, $p = 0.014$) indicated that stronger reported coaching practices were associated with higher reported professional development. Although this association does not establish causation, the findings underscore the relevance of structured coaching to school-based professional learning. Overall, the study provides empirical evidence supporting the development of a more systematic, collaborative, and outcome-based instructional coaching program responsive to teachers' professional needs.

School heads, master teachers, and department heads should institutionalize an enhanced instructional coaching program with clearly scheduled pre-observation conferences, classroom observations, post-observation feedback sessions, and follow-through activities. Standardized coaching logs, progress-monitoring templates, and documentation procedures should be adopted to strengthen accountability and ensure that identified instructional needs receive appropriate support. Learning Action Cell sessions and peer coaching should prioritize assessment literacy, curriculum planning, collaborative lesson development, and reflective teaching practices. School administrators should provide adequate time, technical assistance, and available resources to minimize workload-related constraints affecting coaching continuity. Regular evaluation of coaching implementation and teacher progress should inform adjustments to professional development activities. The proposed enhanced coaching program should be implemented and subsequently assessed to determine its effectiveness in addressing the identified gaps. Future researchers should examine instructional coaching across additional schools and districts, explore factors influencing professional development, and investigate possible relationships with student learning outcomes.

The study was limited to 50 teachers from three public secondary schools in Carmen I District, Bohol, during School Year 2026–2027, restricting the generalizability of findings to other educational settings. Although total enumeration was employed, the respondents represented only the participating schools. Data were obtained through self-reported questionnaires, making the findings dependent on teachers' perceptions rather than independent assessments of instructional performance. Furthermore, the descriptive-correlational design established statistical association but could not determine causal relationships. Student achievement and changes in professional development over time were not directly measured. Future studies may employ broader samples, longitudinal approaches, and additional assessment methods.

5. REFERENCES

Bellibaş, M. Ş. (2023). Empowering principals to conduct classroom observations in a centralized education system: Does it make a difference for teacher self-efficacy and instructional practices? *International Journal of Educational Management, 37*(1), 85–102. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-02-2022-0086

Craig, S. L., Smith, S. J., & Frey, B. B. (2022). Effects of coaching on Universal Design for Learning implementation. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 11*(4), 414–433. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-01-2022-0001

Dela Cruz, J. B., & Baguio, J. B. (2024). Exploring the predictors of successful Learning Action Cell practices of special education teachers. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 50*(10), 352–361. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i101625

Department of Education. (2022). *Adoption of the Basic Education Development Plan 2030 (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2022)*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/DO_s2022_024.pdf

Department of Education. (2023a). *Interim guidelines for the quality assurance and monitoring and evaluation of the National Educators Academy of the Philippines core programs (DepEd Memorandum No. 044, s. 2023)*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DM_s2023_044.pdf

Department of Education. (2023b). *Multi-year guidelines on the Results-Based Performance Management System–Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (DepEd Memorandum No. 008, s. 2023)*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DM_s2023_008.pdf

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

Jolly, A. C., Beach, K. D., Aiken, H. H., & Amendum, S. J. (2024). The development and pilot of an observation tool to examine behaviors of instructional coaches. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 34*(2), 89–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2023.2227166

Jurkowski, S., & Abramczyk, A. (2024). Collaboration in in-service teacher training—The missing link between empirical evidence and practice? *Journal of Education for Teaching, 50*(4), 550–563. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2024.2327062

LaBrot, Z. C., Smith, T., Maxime, E., & Lawson, A. (2024). School-based consultation and coaching for promoting teachers' generalized outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of School Psychology, 107*, Article 101379. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2024.101379

Learning Forward. (2022). *Standards for professional learning*. https://standards.learningforward.org/standards-for-professional-learning/

Özdemir, M., Eriçok, B., Topaloğlu, H., & Tuti, G. (2024). Transformational leadership and job satisfaction in vocational high schools in Türkiye: A multilevel mediation model of teacher professional learning and self-efficacy. *Journal of Educational Administration, 62*(3), 309–324. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-08-2023-0200

Rivera, J. P. R., Sinsay-Villanueva, L. M. V., Tanyag, I. H., Berroya, J. D., Garcia, G. D. V., & Lim, V. L. (2025). *Revitalizing the Philippine education system: Facilitating access and participation to in-service training (INSET) and teacher professional development (TPD)* (Discussion Paper No. 2025-14). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2025.14

Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Goodrich, J., Van Herwegen, J., & Anders, J. (2025). Effective teacher professional development: New theory and a meta-analytic test. *Review of Educational Research, 95*(2), 213–254. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231217480

UNESCO & International Task Force on Teachers for Education 2030. (2024). *Global report on teachers: Addressing teacher shortages and transforming the profession*. UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.18356/9789231006555

Visscher, A. J., Dmoshinskaia, N., Pellegrini, M., & Rey-Naizaque, A. (2025). (When) do teacher professional development interventions improve student achievement? A meta-analysis of 128 high-quality studies. *Educational Research Review, 49*, Article 100742. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2025.100742

Warnock, J. M., Gibson-Sweet, M., & van Nieuwerburgh, C. J. (2022). The perceived benefits of instructional coaching for teachers. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education, 11*(3), 328–348. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-01-2021-0030

White, M., & Maher, B. L. (2024). How might rubric-based observations better support teacher learning and development? *Educational Research, 66*(1), 86–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2024.2304542