

Instructional Supervisory Practices of Public School Heads

Gerlan M. Wahingon, MAEd

Master of Arts in Education-Major in Educational Management, Christ the King College, Calbayog City, Western Samar, Philippines

Email of Corresponding Author: gerlan.wahingon@deped.gov.ph

Publication history:

Received: August 21, 2026

Accepted: September 18, 2026

Revised: September 16, 2026

Published: September 19, 2026

[International Journal of Sustainable and Integrated Studies, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 441–450, September 2026.](#)

Abstract

This study evaluated the instructional supervisory practices of public school heads in the Schools Division of Calbayog City during School Year 2025–2026 as a basis for developing a professional development program. Anchored on the Clinical Supervision Model and Systems Theory, the study employed a sequential explanatory research design involving 128 public school heads selected through complete enumeration. Data were collected using a researcher-developed questionnaire comprising 57 indicators across ten supervisory dimensions and open-ended questions. Descriptive statistics, the Kruskal–Wallis test, multiple linear regression, and thematic analysis were utilized. Findings revealed that instructional supervisory practices were highly practiced ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 0.44$), with curriculum alignment obtaining the highest mean (4.85) and assessment and feedback the lowest (4.64). Significant differences were identified according to school category in learners' engagement, classroom management, and learning resources, while selected demographic and professional characteristics demonstrated significant associations with specific supervisory dimensions. Five major challenges emerged: time constraints, resistance to change, resource limitations, inadequate teacher preparation, and communication difficulties. School heads addressed these challenges through structured supervision frameworks, professional development programs, mentoring, resource allocation, and collaborative learning initiatives. The study recommends continuous leadership training, strengthened stakeholder collaboration, and implementation of a professional development program supported by regular monitoring and evaluation. Aligned with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education), the study provides evidence to support instructional quality, teacher development, and inclusive learning environments. Its contribution to educational and institutional sustainability lies in informing continuous supervisory improvement, professional capacity development, and responsive school management.

Keywords: Clinical Supervision Model; Educational Leadership; Instructional Supervision; Professional Development; Quality Education; School Management; Systems Theory

1. Introduction

Instructional supervision is an essential function of educational leadership that supports teaching effectiveness, professional development, and the continuous improvement of learning environments. School heads are responsible for balancing administrative management with instructional leadership, including curriculum implementation, classroom observation, teacher assessment, and professional support. Recent international research emphasizes that educational leadership involves focusing on learning, fostering collaboration, developing personnel, and establishing clear institutional expectations (Global Education Monitoring Report Team, 2024). This study evaluates the instructional supervisory practices of public school heads in the Schools Division of Calbayog City during School Year 2023–2024. It examines their supervisory practices, relationships with demographic and professional characteristics, encountered challenges, and initiatives undertaken to address these

challenges. The findings serve as the basis for a proposed professional development program intended to strengthen instructional supervision and support educational quality.

School heads perform interconnected administrative and instructional responsibilities that influence school operations, teacher development, and learning delivery. Their supervisory functions include monitoring instructional implementation, providing professional guidance, evaluating teaching practices, and supporting teachers in addressing classroom challenges. Amelia et al. (2022) emphasized that principals, as educational supervisors, contribute to teacher professionalism by providing guidance, instructional support, and assistance in developing teaching competencies. Similarly, Sumapal and Haramain (2023) found that instructional supervisory practices among Bangsamoro school heads, particularly teacher guidance, support, and performance assessment, were evident but not fully implemented. Their findings highlighted the need for improved supervisory training, collaborative practices, and continuing professional development. Despite the importance of instructional supervision, school heads encounter competing administrative responsibilities and institutional constraints. Chiwamba and Kigobe (2022) identified excessive workloads, inadequate supervisory training, insufficient qualifications, communication difficulties, and unfavorable teacher attitudes as challenges affecting instructional supervision. These findings underscore the need to examine how school heads implement their supervisory responsibilities within their respective educational contexts.

Recent literature identifies instructional supervision as a multidimensional process involving instructional guidance, curriculum implementation, teacher assessment, professional growth, and continuous improvement. Curriculum alignment and teaching strategies are essential supervisory concerns because instructional objectives, teaching activities, and assessments must support intended learning outcomes. Supervisory guidance helps teachers examine instructional practices, improve pedagogical approaches, and address difficulties in curriculum delivery. Amelia et al. (2022) identified the supervisory role of principals as an important component of teacher professional development, particularly through instructional guidance and support. Learner engagement, classroom management, and assessment are also interconnected dimensions of instructional effectiveness. Hiloma and Briones (2022) found that interactive formative assessment and feedback mechanisms improved learners' conceptual understanding, communication, interest, and task performance in Grade 9 mathematics. Their findings demonstrate the educational value of assessment practices that provide timely feedback and support instructional improvement. Inclusive education and technology integration present additional considerations for instructional supervision. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2023) emphasized that educational technology should be selected according to relevance, equity, sustainability, and demonstrated learning needs. Technology integration consequently requires consideration of learner characteristics, teacher preparation, and available instructional resources. Professional development, learning resources, and reflective practice further contribute to instructional improvement. Balderas-Solís et al. (2022), in a study involving university students, demonstrated the importance of appropriately selected instructional materials, teacher explanations, and online learning resources. Although conducted in higher education, their findings provide relevant insights into resource selection that require contextual consideration when applied to basic education. Meanwhile, Mohamed et al. (2022) conceptualized reflective practice as a cyclical process involving reflection, planning, action, and evaluation. This perspective supports the use of reflective supervision in identifying instructional difficulties and developing improvement strategies. The relationship between supervisory practices and teacher performance also requires careful examination. Ordanel and Dioso (2023), in a Philippine study involving 80 secondary school teachers, found no statistically significant relationship between principals' supervisory practices and teachers' work performance. This finding suggests that the presence of supervisory activities alone does not establish improved teacher performance and that relationships must be examined within specific educational contexts. Collectively, these studies support examining instructional supervision through curriculum alignment, teaching methods and strategies, learners' engagement, classroom management, assessment and feedback, inclusion and equity, technology integration, professional development, learning resources, and reflective practice.

Globally, educational leadership remains an important concern in improving learning outcomes and strengthening educational systems. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2024) emphasized the need to prepare and support educational leaders in instructional leadership, collaboration, personnel development, and institutional management. The report also identified administrative workloads and insufficient preparation as constraints that may limit school heads' opportunities to focus on teaching and learning. At the national level, the Philippine Department of Education adopted the Basic Education Development Plan 2030 through DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2022. The plan establishes a strategic direction for improving access, equity, educational quality, and institutional resilience. It also provides a framework for developing, implementing, monitoring, evaluating, and supervising basic education programs and initiatives (Department of Education, 2022). Within the Philippine context, Sumapal and Haramain (2023) documented gaps in the implementation of instructional supervisory practices among Bangsamoro school heads. Their study emphasized professional development, resource allocation, and collaboration as important areas for improvement. Locally, the present study focuses on the Schools Division of Calbayog City in Samar, Philippines. It covers 128 public elementary and secondary school heads across 12 districts during School Year 2023–2024. Instructional supervision within the division involves classroom

observation, supervisory planning, monitoring, and instructional performance evaluation. The study examines these practices to generate context-specific information for professional development.

The study is anchored on the Clinical Supervision Model and Systems Theory, which provide complementary perspectives for examining instructional supervisory practices. The Clinical Supervision Model emphasizes a collaborative process involving instructional observation, analysis, feedback, and professional reflection. It views supervision as a developmental process through which supervisors and teachers identify instructional needs and formulate strategies for improvement. Contemporary research supports this developmental orientation. Amelia et al. (2022) explained that educational supervision assists teachers in improving their professional competencies, while Mohamed et al. (2022) emphasized reflection, planning, action, and evaluation as interconnected processes supporting professional learning. Systems Theory, on the other hand, provides a perspective for understanding schools as interconnected organizations. Within this perspective, instructional supervision is influenced by relationships among school heads, teachers, learners, curriculum, learning resources, and institutional conditions. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2024) likewise emphasized that educational leadership operates within organizational and systemic environments. Leadership practices are influenced by institutional structures, available resources, collaborative relationships, and contextual constraints. This contemporary evidence supports examining instructional supervision beyond the individual characteristics of school heads. The conceptual framework identifies school heads' demographic and professional profiles as independent variables and their self-assessed instructional supervisory practices as dependent variables. The study also examines supervisory challenges and corresponding initiatives to inform the development of a proposed professional development program. Existing studies provide important insights into instructional supervision, teacher professionalism, and challenges encountered by educational leaders. However, the literature reviewed presents findings from different educational environments and research populations. For instance, Sumapal and Haramain (2023) examined supervisory practices in the Bangsamoro region, while Chiwamba and Kigobe (2022) investigated instructional supervisory challenges among school heads in Tanzania. Ordanel and Dioso (2023) examined the relationship between principals' supervisory practices and teacher performance in another Philippine educational setting. Although these studies contribute to understanding instructional supervision, they do not provide a division-wide assessment of the ten specified supervisory dimensions among public school heads in Calbayog City during School Year 2023–2024. The present study addresses this contextual gap by evaluating instructional supervisory practices and examining their differences and relationships with the respondents' demographic and professional characteristics. It also identifies supervisory challenges and existing initiatives to provide a more comprehensive understanding of instructional supervision within the division. The study's rationale lies in generating empirical evidence that may guide the formulation of a contextualized professional development program for public school heads.

The study is primarily aligned with Sustainable Development Goal 4: Quality Education, which promotes inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning opportunities for all. More specifically, the research relates to SDG Target 4.1 through its focus on improving instructional quality and learning environments, and Target 4.c through its emphasis on teacher development and instructional support. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2024) identified educational leadership as an important component of achieving quality education, particularly through instructional guidance, collaboration, professional development, and the creation of inclusive learning environments. By evaluating supervisory practices and identifying professional development needs, the present study generates evidence that may support institutional initiatives directed toward improving instructional quality and strengthening teacher support. The study does not directly measure SDG achievement. Rather, its contribution lies in providing empirical information that may inform education-related improvement initiatives.

The study contributes primarily to educational, institutional, socio-economic, and technological sustainability through its examination of instructional supervision and school leadership. Educational sustainability is addressed by identifying supervisory practices and professional development needs that may support continuous instructional improvement. Strengthened instructional support can help educational institutions respond to changing learning requirements and maintain attention to teaching quality. Institutional sustainability is reflected in the study's emphasis on supervisory planning, professional accountability, resource utilization, and continuous improvement. By identifying challenges and existing initiatives, the findings may inform more responsive professional development and school management strategies. The study also has implications for technological sustainability through its examination of technology integration and learning resources. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2023) emphasized that sustainable technology use in education requires appropriate resources, evidence-based decisions, and adequate teacher preparation. Socio-economic sustainability is addressed indirectly through the study's focus on quality and inclusive education, which supports the development of learners' competencies and educational opportunities. Overall, the study's multidisciplinary relevance lies in producing evidence that can support instructional improvement, institutional capacity development, and the responsible integration of educational resources and technologies. Its proposed professional development program provides a mechanism through which the findings may be translated into sustainable supervisory improvement.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

The study employed a sequential explanatory research design involving quantitative data collection and analysis followed by qualitative analysis. According to Ivankova et al. (2006), this design involves two consecutive phases in which quantitative findings are complemented by qualitative data to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research problem. The quantitative phase assessed the respondents' profiles, instructional supervisory practices, and the differences and relationships among the study variables. The qualitative phase examined the challenges encountered by school heads and the initiatives undertaken to address them.

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in the Schools Division of Calbayog City, Samar, under the Department of Education Region VIII. The division comprised 174 public elementary and secondary schools, including one stand-alone senior high school, distributed across 12 districts: Calbayog 1–6, Oquendo 1–3, and Tinambacan 1–3. School heads in the division served as principals, head teachers, and teachers-in-charge. Instructional supervision was conducted through established mechanisms, including the Guide for Instructions Yielding Archetypal Teachers (GIYA), classroom observations, and the preparation of School Instructional Supervisory Plans and Reports (SISP and SiSAR), which were evaluated during the Performance Implementation Review (PIR).

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The respondents comprised 128 public school heads from elementary and secondary schools across the 12 districts of the Schools Division of Calbayog City. They included principals, head teachers, and teachers-in-charge responsible for school administration and instructional supervision during School Year 2023–2024. The respondents were assessed according to age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, administrative position, length of service, school category, and performance rating.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The study employed total or complete enumeration, involving all 128 public school heads across the 12 districts. Since the entire identified population was included, no separate sampling procedure was applied.

2.5 Research Instrument

A researcher-developed questionnaire consisting of four parts was used to collect the data. The first part gathered the respondents' demographic and professional profiles, including age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, administrative position, length of service, school category, and performance rating. The second part comprised 57 indicators assessing instructional supervisory practices across ten dimensions: curriculum alignment, teaching methods and strategies, learners' engagement, classroom management, assessment and feedback, inclusion and equity, technology integration, professional development, learning resources, and reflective practice. Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree). The third and fourth parts contained open-ended questions examining the challenges encountered by school heads and the initiatives undertaken to address them. The questionnaire underwent expert review by the thesis adviser and panel members, followed by face and content validation by five Education Program Supervisors. After revisions and approval, the instrument was pilot-tested among 30 public school heads from Sta. Margarita I and II Districts in the Schools Division of Samar. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, yielding coefficients ranging from 0.81 to 0.93 across the ten dimensions and an overall coefficient of 0.90 for the 57-item instrument, indicating excellent internal consistency according to the study's adopted reliability criteria.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher secured permission from the Schools Division Superintendent of Calbayog City and the Public Schools District Supervisors of the 12 districts. A list of public school heads was obtained from the Division Planning Officer to identify the respondents. Following the approval of the instrument, questionnaires were distributed to the identified school heads and personally collected upon completion. The quantitative responses were tallied and submitted to a statistician for analysis, while the qualitative responses were coded according to recurring themes with the assistance of a qualitative data expert.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

Quantitative data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The Kolmogorov–Smirnov and Shapiro–Wilk tests were used to assess data normality. Frequency counts and percentages described the respondents' demographic and professional profiles, while weighted means and standard deviations determined their self-assessed levels of instructional supervisory practices. The Kruskal–Wallis test was employed to determine significant differences in instructional supervisory practices when respondents were grouped according to their profiles. Multiple linear regression was used to examine the relationships between the respondents' profiles and their levels of instructional supervisory practices. Qualitative responses were analyzed

through thematic analysis to identify recurring challenges and initiatives related to instructional supervision. As cited by Majumdar (2022), thematic analysis involves identifying, organizing, and interpreting patterns within qualitative data. The procedure included familiarization with responses, coding, identification and review of themes, and the definition and naming of emerging themes. Frequencies of recurring terms, phrases, and topics were also examined to support the categorization and interpretation of responses.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Demographic and Professional Profiles of Public School Heads

3.1.1 Demographic Characteristics

The findings revealed that 36.4% of the respondents were aged 41–50 years, followed by those above 50 years (33.3%) and those aged 31–40 years (29.5%), with a reported mean age of 42.67 years. Most respondents were female (57.81%) and married (73.4%). Regarding educational attainment, 44.53% were master's degree holders, 28.91% had earned doctoral units, 19.53% had master's units, 5.47% held doctoral degrees, and 1.56% held bachelor's degrees. The findings describe the demographic characteristics and educational qualifications of public school heads in the division. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2024) emphasized that educational leadership requires appropriate preparation and continuous professional development. However, demographic characteristics and educational qualifications alone do not establish supervisory effectiveness, which must be evaluated through actual leadership practices and institutional outcomes.

3.1.2 Professional Characteristics

The respondents comprised principals (49.2%), head teachers (30.5%), and teachers-in-charge (20.3%). Regarding administrative experience, 32.8% had served for 1–5 years, 28.9% for 6–10 years, 25.8% for 11–15 years, and 12.5% for more than 15 years. Most respondents managed monograde elementary schools (40.6%), followed by multigrade elementary schools (26.6%), integrated schools (18.8%), junior high schools (13.3%), and stand-alone schools (0.8%). Based on their Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF), 81.25% obtained Outstanding ratings, while 18.75% received Very Satisfactory ratings. The findings indicate that respondents represented different administrative positions, service periods, and school categories while receiving favorable institutional performance ratings. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2024) emphasized that school leadership responsibilities vary according to organizational context, resources, and institutional expectations. These differences provide a basis for examining whether professional characteristics are associated with variations in instructional supervisory practices.

3.2 Level of Instructional Supervisory Practices

3.2.1 Curriculum Alignment and Teaching Methods

Curriculum alignment obtained a mean of 4.85 and a standard deviation of 0.28, indicating strong agreement among school heads regarding their supervisory practices. The highest-rated indicator was assisting teachers in communicating curriculum goals and objectives ($M = 4.89$), while supervision of the integration of prescribed teaching methods and strategies received the lowest rating ($M = 4.82$). Teaching methods and strategies obtained a mean of 4.70 ($SD = 0.42$). Mentoring teachers in evidence-based pedagogies and providing access to instructional resources received the highest ratings ($M = 4.73$), while coaching teachers in innovative teaching strategies received the lowest rating ($M = 4.63$). These findings indicate that respondents perceived their curriculum-related supervisory practices positively, particularly in communicating curriculum objectives and supporting instructional delivery. Nevertheless, coaching teachers in innovative strategies received comparatively lower ratings. Sumapal and Haramain (2023) similarly highlighted the importance of strengthening instructional guidance, teacher support, and supervisory implementation through professional development and collaborative practices.

3.2.2 Learners' Engagement and Classroom Management

Learners' engagement obtained a mean of 4.70 ($SD = 0.42$), with the highest rating given to supervising teachers in promoting active student participation during classroom activities ($M = 4.73$). Classroom management obtained a mean of 4.73 ($SD = 0.41$). Providing technical assistance to teachers and collaborating with teachers and guardians in maintaining positive classroom behavior received the highest ratings ($M = 4.80$), while monitoring the implementation of fair classroom management practices received the lowest rating ($M = 4.67$). The findings reflect the respondents' favorable perceptions of their supervision of learner participation, classroom discipline, and teacher-parent collaboration. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2024) identified instructional leadership and collaboration as important dimensions of school leadership, emphasizing the involvement of teachers and other stakeholders in supporting learning. These perspectives provide a broader context for interpreting the supervisory practices reported by the respondents.

3.2.3 Assessment and Feedback, Inclusion and Equity

Assessment and feedback obtained a mean of 4.64 ($SD = 0.45$). Communicating clear timelines for assessment development, administration, and analysis received the highest rating ($M = 4.68$), while mentoring teachers in reviewing test items for accuracy and alignment received the lowest rating ($M = 4.60$). Inclusion and equity

obtained a mean of 4.71 (SD = 0.48). Collaborating with teachers to create learner-friendly and healthy classroom environments received the highest rating (M = 4.77), while assisting teachers in integrating diverse perspectives into instruction received the lowest rating (M = 4.66). The findings suggest that school heads perceived their supervisory practices in assessment administration and inclusive learning environments positively. However, relatively lower ratings were recorded for test-item review and the integration of diverse perspectives. Hiloma and Briones (2022) demonstrated the educational value of interactive formative assessment and feedback in improving learners' understanding and engagement. Likewise, Kilag et al. (2024) highlighted inclusive school culture, collaborative leadership, educational equity, and communication as important dimensions of diversity management.

3.2.4 Technology Integration and Professional Development

Technology integration obtained a mean of 4.65 (SD = 0.53). Recognizing teachers who effectively used technology received the highest rating (M = 4.70), while assisting teachers in integrating technology into instructional methods received the lowest rating (M = 4.60). Professional development obtained a mean of 4.81 (SD = 0.34). Allowing teachers to participate in training, workshops, and Learning Action Cell sessions received the highest rating (M = 4.88), while seeking teacher feedback on the effectiveness of career development opportunities received the lowest rating (M = 4.70). The findings indicate that respondents reported strong support for teacher participation in professional development activities. However, direct assistance in technology integration and the evaluation of development opportunities received comparatively lower ratings. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2023) emphasized that educational technology requires appropriate resources, teacher preparation, and evidence-based implementation. Furthermore, the Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2024) identified personnel development as a central responsibility of educational leaders.

3.2.5 Learning Resources and Reflective Practice

Learning resources obtained a mean of 4.70 (SD = 0.43). Monitoring teachers' use of appropriate and relevant learning resources received the highest rating (M = 4.71), while the remaining indicators obtained means of 4.70. Reflective practice obtained a mean of 4.74 (SD = 0.38). Valuing teachers' reflective practices received the highest rating (M = 4.81), while providing opportunities for reflective discussions received the lowest rating (M = 4.68). These findings reflect favorable self-assessments of school heads regarding learning-resource supervision and teacher reflection. Balderas-Solís et al. (2022) emphasized the importance of selecting learning resources according to their instructional value, although their study was conducted in higher education. Mohamed et al. (2022) described reflective practice as a cyclical process involving reflection, planning, action, and evaluation, providing a conceptual basis for understanding its role in professional development.

3.2.6 Overall Instructional Supervisory Practices

The overall level of instructional supervisory practices obtained a mean of 4.72 (SD = 0.44), interpreted as Highly Practiced. Curriculum alignment received the highest mean (4.85), followed by professional development (4.81), reflective practice (4.74), classroom management (4.73), inclusion and equity (4.71), and teaching methods and strategies, learners' engagement, and learning resources (4.70 each). Technology integration (4.65) and assessment and feedback (4.64) obtained the lowest domain means, although all ten dimensions were categorized as Highly Practiced. The results indicate consistently favorable self-assessments of instructional supervision across all dimensions. Nevertheless, the relatively lower means in assessment and feedback and technology integration identify areas for further attention within the proposed professional development program. Sumapal and Haramain (2023) similarly emphasized the need for continuing supervisory improvement despite the presence of established supervisory practices.

3.3 Differences in Instructional Supervisory Practices According to Profile

The Kruskal–Wallis test revealed no statistically significant differences in instructional supervisory practices when respondents were grouped according to age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, administrative position, length of service, and performance rating across the ten dimensions ($p > .05$). However, significant differences were identified when respondents were grouped according to school category, specifically in learners' engagement ($p = .04$), classroom management ($p = .02$), and learning resources ($p = .02$). No significant differences were found across the remaining seven dimensions when grouped according to school category. These findings indicate that reported supervisory practices were generally comparable across the demographic and professional groups examined, except for three dimensions associated with school category. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2024) emphasized that school leadership operates within different institutional contexts, including differences in organizational structure, educational needs, and available resources. This provides a contextual perspective for interpreting variations across school categories, although the present results do not identify which specific categories differed.

3.4 Relationships Between Instructional Supervisory Practices and School Heads' Profiles

3.4.1 Curriculum Alignment and Teaching Methods

Multiple linear regression revealed no statistically significant associations between the respondents' profile variables and their instructional supervisory practices in curriculum alignment and teaching methods and strategies. All eight profile variables, including age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, administrative position, length of service, school category, and performance rating, yielded p-values greater than .05 in both supervisory dimensions. The findings indicate that none of the examined profile variables demonstrated a statistically significant association with the two supervisory dimensions in the fitted regression models. These results should be interpreted within the context of self-assessed supervisory practices and the specific population studied. Ordanel and Dioso (2023) likewise found no significant relationship between principals' supervisory practices and teachers' work performance in their separate investigation, although the variables and respondent groups differed from those of the present study.

3.4.2 Learners' Engagement and Classroom Management

Significant associations with learners' engagement were identified for age ($p = .044$), gender ($p = .041$), highest educational attainment ($p = .020$), length of service ($p = .038$), and performance rating ($p = .025$). Civil status, administrative position, and school category were not statistically significant. For classroom management, significant associations were identified for age ($p = .023$), highest educational attainment ($p = .028$), administrative position ($p = .011$), and length of service ($p = .024$). Gender, civil status, school category, and performance rating were not statistically significant. These findings indicate that selected demographic and professional characteristics were statistically associated with learners' engagement and classroom management in the regression analyses. The results suggest that these relationships may vary across supervisory dimensions, rather than following a uniform pattern. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2024) emphasized that educational leadership involves interactions among individual characteristics, professional responsibilities, and institutional conditions, providing a broader perspective for understanding differences across leadership practices.

3.4.3 Assessment and Feedback, Inclusion and Equity

Assessment and feedback showed statistically significant associations with highest educational attainment ($p = .021$) and length of service ($p = .018$), while the remaining profile variables were not significant. Inclusion and equity showed significant associations with gender ($p = .049$), administrative position ($p = .037$), length of service ($p = .039$), and school category ($p = .045$). Age, civil status, highest educational attainment, and performance rating were not statistically significant. The findings indicate that different profile characteristics were associated with assessment and feedback and inclusion and equity. The associations involving educational attainment and length of service in assessment practices suggest areas for further examination, while those involving inclusion and equity demonstrate the relevance of examining supervisory practices across distinct professional and institutional contexts. Kilag et al. (2024) emphasized the importance of inclusive leadership, educational equity, collaboration, and communication in addressing diversity within schools.

3.4.4 Technology Integration and Professional Development

Technology integration showed significant associations with age ($p = .026$), school category ($p = .033$), and performance rating ($p = .022$). Gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, administrative position, and length of service were not statistically significant. Professional development was significantly associated with administrative position ($p = .007$), length of service ($p = .032$), and performance rating ($p = .029$), while the remaining profile variables were not statistically significant. These findings indicate that selected profile variables were associated with technology integration and professional development. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2023) emphasized that technology integration depends on contextual conditions, available resources, and teacher preparation. Similarly, the Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2024) highlighted the importance of continuous leadership development and institutional support in improving educational leadership practices.

3.4.5 Learning Resources and Reflective Practice

Learning resources showed significant associations with administrative position ($p = .002$), length of service ($p = .048$), school category ($p = .008$), and performance rating ($p = .042$). Age, gender, civil status, and highest educational attainment were not statistically significant. Reflective practice showed significant associations with age ($p = .034$), highest educational attainment ($p = .027$), administrative position ($p = .044$), length of service ($p = .038$), and performance rating ($p = .041$). School category was reported at the significance threshold ($p = .050$), while gender and civil status were not statistically significant. The findings indicate that several professional and demographic characteristics were associated with learning-resource supervision and reflective practice. Balderas-Solis et al. (2022) emphasized the importance of learning resources in supporting instructional delivery, while Mohamed et al. (2022) described reflection as an essential process for professional growth and continuous improvement. These studies provide relevant perspectives for interpreting the findings without establishing causal relationships.

3.5 Challenges Encountered in Instructional Supervision

The qualitative findings identified five major challenges: time constraints and competing responsibilities, teacher resistance to change, resource limitations, inadequate teacher preparation and professional development, and communication and coordination difficulties. School heads reported that administrative workloads, overlapping activities, and urgent reporting requirements interfered with scheduled supervision. Some teachers were described as resistant to instructional changes and new methodologies. Inadequate instructional materials, funding, and technological infrastructure constrained supervisory support, while insufficient training and pedagogical preparation affected instructional delivery. Communication difficulties and conflicting schedules further disrupted supervision, with one respondent reporting completion of only 50% of planned supervisory activities because of overlapping school- and division-level responsibilities. The findings demonstrate that instructional supervision was affected by organizational, professional, and resource-related constraints. Chiwamba and Kigobe (2022) similarly identified multiple responsibilities, inadequate training, unfavorable teacher attitudes, and poor communication as obstacles to instructional supervision. Kilag et al. (2024) also emphasized resource limitations and resistance to change as challenges in managing diverse school environments. These findings highlight the relevance of examining institutional conditions alongside school heads' supervisory practices.

3.6 Initiatives Undertaken to Address Instructional Supervisory Challenges

The findings identified five major initiatives undertaken by school heads: implementation of structured supervision frameworks, professional development programs, support for new and inexperienced teachers, resource allocation, and promotion of collaboration and peer learning. School heads reported using classroom observation tools, clinical supervision, regular monitoring, task delegation, and rescheduling of supervisory activities. They also strengthened Learning Action Cell sessions, encouraged participation in training and seminars, and involved master teachers and subject coordinators in professional development activities. The BAID-HIBARO initiative was identified as a platform for professional discussions and collaborative problem-solving. Additional initiatives included mentoring novice teachers, providing technical assistance, allocating Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses funds for instructional materials and technology, conducting peer observations, and strengthening stakeholder partnerships. These initiatives demonstrate how respondents attempted to address supervisory challenges through structured processes, professional support, resource management, and collaborative practices. The Global Education Monitoring Report Team (2024) emphasized that effective educational leadership involves developing personnel, distributing responsibilities, promoting collaboration, and supporting professional learning. Likewise, Sumapal and Haramain (2023) recommended supervisory training, collaborative cultures, adequate resources, and continuous evaluation to strengthen instructional supervision. The initiatives documented in the present study provide contextual inputs for developing a professional development program responsive to the identified supervisory needs.

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

The study revealed that public school heads in the Schools Division of Calbayog City demonstrated a high level of instructional supervisory practices across all ten dimensions, with curriculum alignment and professional development receiving the highest ratings. Most respondents were female, married, master's degree holders, and principals, with outstanding performance ratings. No significant differences were generally found in supervisory practices when grouped according to demographic and professional characteristics, except for learners' engagement, classroom management, and learning resources when grouped by school category. Significant relationships were also identified between selected profile variables and specific supervisory dimensions. Despite favorable self-assessments, school heads encountered challenges involving time constraints, competing responsibilities, resistance to change, inadequate resources, teacher preparation, and communication difficulties. To address these challenges, they implemented structured supervision frameworks, professional development activities, mentoring programs, resource allocation, and collaborative learning initiatives. These findings provided the basis for a proposed professional development program to sustain and improve instructional supervisory practices.

Public school heads should continuously participate in school management and professional development training to sustain their instructional supervisory practices and strengthen their leadership competencies. They should maintain effective supervision, address existing challenges, and collaborate with teachers and other stakeholders to improve instructional delivery and learner achievement. The proposed professional development program should be implemented through regular workshops, seminars, training sessions, and collaborative activities to sustain supervisory practices across the identified dimensions. Monitoring and evaluation should be conducted to assess implementation and identify areas requiring further improvement. Future researchers are encouraged to investigate other factors associated with instructional supervision and include public school teachers as additional respondents to enable a comparative assessment of supervisory practices.

The study was limited to the self-assessed instructional supervisory practices of 128 public elementary and secondary school heads in the Schools Division of Calbayog City during School Year 2023–2024. It examined

selected demographic and professional characteristics, ten supervisory dimensions, encountered challenges, and initiatives undertaken. Consequently, the findings reflect school heads' perceptions within the specified research locale and period and do not incorporate independent assessments from public school teachers.

5. Compliance with ethical standards

The authors declare no conflicts of interest in relation to this study. The research involved public school heads in the Schools Division of Calbayog City and examined their instructional supervisory practices, challenges, and initiatives. Prior to data collection, permission was obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent and the concerned Public Schools District Supervisors. The questionnaire assured respondents of the confidentiality of their information and made the disclosure of names optional. Quantitative responses were consolidated for statistical analysis, while qualitative responses were analyzed thematically. The study focused exclusively on professional supervisory practices and involved no invasive procedures.

REFERENCES

- Amelia, C., Aprilianto, A., Supriatna, D., Rusydi, I., & Zahari, N. E. (2022). The principal's role as education supervisor in improving teacher professionalism. *Nidhomul Haq: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 7(1), 144–155. <https://doi.org/10.31538/ndh.v7i1.2075>
- Balderas-Solís, J., Roque-Hernández, R. V., Salazar-Hernández, R., & Ramos Monsivais, C. L. (2022). The importance of learning resources for university students during emergency remote learning. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 17(14), 221–234. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v17i14.30677>
- Barrot, J. S. (2023). K to 12 curriculum reform in the Philippines: Towards making students future ready. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(4), 1193–1207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1973959>
- Briones, M. R., Prudente, M., & Errabo, D. D. (2023). Stakeholders' perspective on the quality of virtual learning material in Google Classroom. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 6(4), 736–759. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.571>
- Chiwamba, S. V., & Kigobe, J. (2022). Challenges encountered by school heads in carrying out instructional supervisory activities in public secondary schools in Lindi Region-Tanzania. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 29(4), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2022/v29i430704>
- Continu Team. (2022, December 13). 9 proven strategies to increase learner engagement. *Continu*. <https://www.continu.com/blog/increase-learner-engagement>
- 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
- Diano, F. M., Jr., Kilag, O. K. T., Malbas, M. H., Catacutan, A. B., Tiongzon, B. D., & Abendan, C. F. K. (2023). Towards global competence: Innovations in the Philippine curriculum for addressing international challenges. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education*, 1(4), 295–307. <https://multijournals.org/index.php/excellencia-imje/article/view/66>
- Fatima, S., Tanweer, L., & Kirmani, N. S. (2023). Administrative problems of heads of secondary schools affecting their self-efficacy. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 7(1), 564–572. [https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2023\(7-1\)49](https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2023(7-1)49)
- Global Education Monitoring Report Team. (2023). Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms? UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54676/UZQV8501>
- Global Education Monitoring Report Team. (2024). Global education monitoring report 2024/5: Leadership in education—Lead for learning. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54676/EFLH5184>
- Hiloma, K. A., & Briones, R. R. (2022). Learning activity sheets using interactive formative assessment and feedback mechanism for grade 9 mathematics. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 11(7), 201–222. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2022.331>
- Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260>
- Kilag, O. K., Diano, F. M., Jr., Bulilan, R. S., Moralista, R. B., Allego, L. L., & Cañizares, M. C. B. (2024). Leadership strategies for building inclusive school communities: The challenges of managing diversity in schools. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence*, 1(1), 92–100. <https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrse/article/view/10>
- Lachica, R. L. (2024). School heads' leadership and supervisory skills: Their relationships to teachers' performance. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence*, 1(3), 206–223. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11043469>
- Majumdar, A. (2022). Thematic analysis in qualitative research. In *Information Resources Management Association (Ed.), Research anthology on innovative research methodologies and utilization across multiple disciplines* (pp. 604–622). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-3881-7.ch031>

- Mohamed, M., Rashid, R. A., & Alqaryouti, M. H. (2022). Conceptualizing the complexity of reflective practice in education. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 1008234. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1008234>
- Ordanel, A. R. N., & Dioso, E. D. (2023). Effects of supervisory practices of school principals to work performance of teachers. *EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management*, 10(8), 18–30. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra14013>
- Sumapal, M. L. S., & Haramain, J. T. (2023). Descriptive study on the instructional supervision practices of Bangsamoro school heads: Evaluating their impact on educational improvement. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 18(3), 1518–1532. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.18.3.1251>
- William, A., & Ligembe, N. (2022). Challenges facing instructional supervision in public secondary schools students in Nyamagana District, Tanzania. *Direct Research Journal of Education and Vocational Studies*, 4(1), 81–88. <https://doi.org/10.26765/DRJEVS52110224>