International Journal of Sustainable and Integrated Studies
Volume 1, Issue 4 | ISSN: 3155-6361
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65339/ijsis.V1.I4.319

Linking Instructional Management and Pedagogy: PPSSH–PPST Alignment Framework for Strengthening the Implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum

Rosanna S. Dacara
Master of Arts in Education, Major in Administration and Supervision
Graduate School, Cebu Technological University–Main Campus
R. Palma St., Cebu City, Philippines

Email of Corresponding Author: yvette73dacara@gmail.com

Publication history:
Received: October 25, 2026 Accepted: November 26, 2026
Revised: November 22, 2026 Published: November 27, 2026
International Journal of Sustainable and Integrated Studies, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 1–8, November 2026.

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between school heads' instructional management practices and teachers' pedagogical practices during implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in Tanauan, Leyte, in School Year 2026–2027. The quantitative descriptive-correlational study included all 35 school heads across three public elementary school districts and 245 teachers randomly selected by grade level. Parallel structured questionnaires gathered self-assessments and counterpart ratings, which were analyzed using descriptive statistics and correlation tests. Both respondent groups rated instructional management and pedagogical practices as Always Practiced overall. Leading with integrity was the highest-rated management domain, while responsiveness to learner diversity was the lowest-rated pedagogical domain in both groups. Instructional management and pedagogical practice ratings showed a statistically significant, moderate positive association ($r = .483$, $p < .001$). Higher instructional management ratings accompanied higher pedagogical practice ratings, and both groups identified differentiated instruction as a priority for improvement. School heads and master teachers should strengthen mentoring, feedback after classroom observations, and collaborative lesson planning to help teachers adapt instruction to diverse learner needs. The findings reflect questionnaire ratings from three districts in one school year, and the correlational design leaves causal effects undetermined. The study developed the proposed PPSSH–PPST Strengthened Alignment Framework, which connects the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers through coordinated instructional supervision and professional learning. The framework gives the Schools Division of Leyte a basis for planning and monitoring curriculum support and aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) through its emphasis on sustained professional learning and inclusive instruction in public elementary schools.

Keywords: Curriculum Implementation, Differentiated Instruction, Instructional Management, Pedagogical Practices, Professional Standards, School Heads

1. Introduction

The Department of Education introduced the Revised K to 10 Curriculum to reduce curriculum congestion and strengthen foundational learning, literacy, numeracy, and values formation. A pilot began in School Year 2023–2024 (Department of Education [DepEd], 2023). Implementation began in phases in School Year 2024–2025 (DepEd, 2024a) and extended to additional grade levels in School Year 2026–2027. As the rollout expanded, school heads were responsible for setting instructional priorities, managing resources, supervising teaching, and supporting professional development. Teachers were responsible for translating the revised competencies into contextualized lessons, responding to learner diversity, and using appropriate assessment strategies. The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH; DepEd, 2020) and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST; DepEd, 2017) define these complementary responsibilities. The study examined school heads' strategic leadership, management of operations and resources, focus on teaching and learning, development of self and others, building of connections, and leadership with integrity. It examined teachers' content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, responsiveness to learner diversity, curriculum and planning, assessment and reporting, community linkages and professional engagement, and personal growth and professional development.

School leadership can support instructional quality by fostering collaboration, professional learning, trust, and supportive working conditions (Kemethofer et al., 2025; Ninković & Knežević Florić, 2024). Clear direction, resources, and professional support can build teachers' confidence to adopt new instructional approaches during curriculum reform (Hsieh et al., 2026). Distributed leadership can also sustain implementation by encouraging shared responsibility and collaboration (Nadeem, 2024). Ninković and Knežević Florić (2024) reviewed the indirect pathways through which school leadership relates to classroom practice and called for closer examination of those pathways. Dorukbaşi and Cansoy (2024) identified professional learning as a mechanism linking principals' instructional leadership to teachers' instructional practices. In Nigeria, He et al. (2024) found that principals' instructional leadership predicted teachers' participation in professional development. Hsieh et al. (2026) identified teacher self-efficacy as one mechanism linking leadership to teacher innovativeness. Karsantık (2026) characterized curriculum leadership as a shared responsibility involving curriculum interpretation, implementation, professional learning, and monitoring.

The study involved 35 school heads and 245 teachers from public elementary schools in Tanauan I, Tanauan II, and Tanauan III in the Schools Division of Leyte during School Year 2026–2027. The districts followed common basic education policies, while their schools varied in size, resources, and learner populations. During the MATATAG rollout, DepEd allowed schools to adjust class schedules in response to staffing and resource constraints (DepEd, 2024b). The national pilot evaluation identified teacher training and timely resource delivery as priorities for sustaining the reform (Abrigo et al., 2025). The Second Congressional Commission on Education (2025) also identified a need for quality learning materials and reduced administrative burdens. The international studies point to professional learning and collaboration as ways school leaders can support classroom instruction. Philippine studies identify where that support is needed during curriculum implementation. In Bulacan, Reyes (2023) found that instructional leadership and teacher participation were positively associated with pupils' learning outcomes, while perceptions of the K to 12 curriculum showed no significant relationship with learner performance. In Surigao del Sur, Serrano and Fallado (2025) reported substantial implementation of the PPST alongside concerns about instructional resources, professional support, and responsiveness to learner diversity. In Negros Occidental, Caspe and Sarrosa (2025) found that Grade 1 and Grade 4 teachers showed high overall readiness for the revised curriculum, with comparatively lower readiness in curriculum knowledge and challenges involving planning time, collaboration, and training in digital technologies. Medula et al. (2024) found that teachers, school heads, and supervisors differed in their understanding of national assessment policies, underscoring the need for technical assistance and professional development. Prudente et al. (2024) identified administrative support and curriculum alignment as factors in successful Philippine professional development programs and insufficient monitoring as a barrier. Alang and Ebisa (2025) found no significant relationship between teachers' understanding of the PPST and their teaching performance, supporting the need for practical, context-specific professional learning.

The instructional leadership model developed by Hallinger and Murphy (1985) explains how school heads support teaching by defining school goals, managing instructional programs, and fostering a positive learning climate. A recent meta-analysis found a positive relationship between principals' instructional leadership and teachers' self-efficacy and collective efficacy (Hallinger et al., 2026). These responsibilities correspond to the leadership expectations in the PPSSH (DepEd, 2020). The study's theoretical framework draws on the original model (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985) to explain school heads' instructional management practices. Constructivist Learning Theory is associated with Piaget and Inhelder (1966/1972) and Vygotsky (1978). The study's framework draws on these perspectives to explain how learners construct knowledge through prior experience, interaction, inquiry, and reflection. Teachers support this process through contextualized tasks, differentiated instruction, collaboration, and authentic assessment (Piaget & Inhelder, 1966/1972; Vygotsky, 1978). These learner-centered

practices correspond to the PPST (DepEd, 2017), which guides the study's assessment of teachers' pedagogy. The Context–Input–Process–Product (CIPP) Evaluation Model, developed in early work by Stufflebeam et al. (1971), provides a structure for examining implementation and informing improvement. Dizon (2023) traced its development as a curriculum evaluation model, and Wulan et al. (2026) documented its use across educational settings. In the study's application of the model, the context is the rollout of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum in selected Leyte districts, the input is PPSSH-based instructional management, the process is PPST-based classroom pedagogy, and the product is the proposed alignment framework. The Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (2013) sets learner-centered and responsive curriculum standards. Republic Act No. 12322 (2026) amended Section 5 to give DepEd flexibility to determine the pedagogical approach used to meet grade-level learning standards. The Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 (2001) assigns school heads responsibility for instructional leadership and school management. The PPSSH and PPST are established under DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020 (DepEd, 2020) and DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017 (DepEd, 2017), respectively.

Prior studies often examined school management and classroom pedagogy separately, leaving limited local evidence on how PPSSH-based instructional management and PPST-based pedagogical practices relate during implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. School resources, leadership experience, teacher qualifications, and access to professional development may also vary across school settings. To address this gap, the study assessed the level of each set of practices and examined whether school heads' and teachers' profiles were associated with their respective practices. It also examined the relationship between instructional management and pedagogy to identify priorities for the proposed PPSSH–PPST Strengthened Alignment Framework.

The study aligns with SDG 4 – Quality Education through its focus on the leadership conditions and teaching practices that support inclusive, learner-centered instruction. Its examination of learner diversity, curriculum planning, assessment, and teacher professional development can help school heads and division officials identify where teachers need technical assistance to implement the revised curriculum and address its foundational learning priorities.

The study contributes to educational sustainability by identifying where sustained mentoring, collaborative planning, and needs-based professional learning may help teachers respond to curriculum changes and learner needs. It contributes to institutional and governance sustainability by linking school leadership standards to classroom practice. The proposed framework may help school heads and Schools Division Office officials coordinate instructional supervision, resource allocation, technical assistance, and monitoring. Curriculum writers may also use the findings to refine implementation guidance and instructional materials. Learners may benefit indirectly through more responsive teaching and stronger classroom support.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational design to describe existing practices and examine relationships among variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2023; Fraenkel et al., 2023). The descriptive component summarized the respondents' profiles and their ratings of instructional management and pedagogical practices. The correlational component examined the relationships between each respondent group's profile and its corresponding practices, as well as the relationship between school heads' instructional management practices and teachers' pedagogical practices. The study measured these variables as they occurred, without introducing an intervention or manipulating them (Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

2.2 Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in public elementary schools in Tanauan I, Tanauan II, and Tanauan III Districts under the Schools Division of Leyte, Region VIII, during School Year 2026–2027. Schools across the three districts implemented the Revised K to 10 Curriculum under common Department of Education policies and varied in size, resources, and learner population.

2.3 Respondents of the Study

The study involved 280 respondents, comprising 35 school heads and 245 public elementary school teachers. School heads were responsible for instructional management and curriculum implementation, while teachers carried out the revised curriculum through classroom instruction and assessment. The study recorded each group's sex, age, highest educational attainment, position or rank, years of service in the relevant role, and number of relevant training programs attended.

2.4 Sample and Sampling Procedure

The researcher used total enumeration to include all 35 school heads across the three districts. For teachers, the researcher used simple random sampling within each grade level, selecting one teacher from Kindergarten and

each grade from Grades 1 to 6 in participating complete elementary schools. Tanauan I contributed 8 school heads and 56 teachers, Tanauan II contributed 9 school heads and 63 teachers, and Tanauan III contributed 18 school heads and 126 teachers. In Tanauan II, two schools shared one school head.

2.5 Research Instrument

The study used an adapted structured questionnaire with parallel versions for school heads and teachers. Each version contained three parts covering respondent profiles, school heads' instructional management practices, and teachers' pedagogical practices. School heads rated their own instructional management practices and those pedagogical practices generally demonstrated by teachers in their schools. Teachers rated their own pedagogical practices and the instructional management practices of their respective school heads. The instructional management component contained 42 items, with seven items for each of the six domains: leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, building connections, and leading with integrity. The component was anchored on the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (DepEd, 2020). The pedagogical component also contained 42 items, with six items for each of the seven domains: content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment, diversity of learners, curriculum and planning, assessment and reporting, community linkages and professional engagement, and personal growth and professional development. The component was anchored on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (DepEd, 2017). Both practice components used a five-point Likert scale. A score of 5 indicated Always Practiced, 4 indicated Often Practiced, 3 indicated Sometimes Practiced, 2 indicated Seldom Practiced, and 1 indicated Never Practiced.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher secured approval from the Dean of the Graduate School and permission from the Schools Division Superintendent of Leyte. The researcher then coordinated questionnaire administration with the Public Schools District Supervisors and school heads of the three districts. Before personally administering the questionnaires, the researcher explained the study's purpose, provided instructions, and assured respondents that their responses would remain confidential. Respondents were given sufficient time to complete the questionnaires. The researcher collected the completed questionnaires, checked them for completeness, and coded the responses for analysis.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

Frequency counts and percentages summarized the respondents' profiles. Weighted means described the levels of instructional management and pedagogical practices, while standard deviations indicated the variability of ratings. Weighted means of 4.21–5.00 were interpreted as Always Practiced, 3.41–4.20 as Often Practiced, 2.61–3.40 as Sometimes Practiced, 1.81–2.60 as Seldom Practiced, and 1.00–1.80 as Never Practiced. Spearman's rho assessed associations between practice scores and ordinal profile variables, including educational attainment, position or rank, and relevant training attendance when grouped into ordered categories. The eta coefficient assessed the association between sex and the continuous composite practice scores. Pearson's r assessed associations of age and years of service with practice scores and the linear relationship between the composite instructional management and pedagogical practice scores. Relationships with $p < .05$ were considered statistically significant.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

The study observed the principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice. Before obtaining informed consent, the researcher explained the study's purpose, procedures, expected duration, and the respondents' right to decline or withdraw at any time without penalty. Questionnaires and research reports excluded names and other personally identifiable information. Data were used solely for academic and research purposes, stored securely, and accessible only to the researcher and research adviser. Findings were reported in aggregate to protect the identities of respondents and schools. The researcher followed the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (2012) in collecting, processing, storing, and disposing of the data.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Demographic and Professional Profiles of Respondents

3.1.1 School Heads

Most school heads were women (65.7%), and the largest age group was 41–50 years (45.7%), with a mean age of 47 years. Most held a master's degree with doctoral units (60.0%), and Principal I was the most common rank (37.1%). The largest group had served as school heads for 16–20 years (34.3%), with a mean of 19 years. Most had attended at least 12 relevant training activities or seminars (85.7%). The respondents' graduate preparation, administrative experience, and training participation provided a foundation for instructional leadership. Faizuddin et al. (2022) emphasized the role of professional development in strengthening leadership competencies, while Watts (2023) highlighted the importance of structured support for principals. Tai and Omar (2022) identified leadership support, trust, collaboration, organizational culture, and teacher agency as conditions for effective professional learning communities. These findings support applying leadership preparation through instructional supervision, mentoring, and collaborative school improvement.

3.1.2 Teachers

Most teachers were women (95.1%), and the largest age group was 31–40 years (40.8%), with a mean age of 39 years. Most held a bachelor's degree with master's units (70.2%), and Teacher III was the most common rank (58.4%). The largest experience group had taught for 1–5 years (31.8%), although mean teaching experience was 13.6 years. Most respondents had attended either 6–8 relevant training activities (41.2%) or 3–5 activities (40.8%). The range of teaching experience and training participation supports professional learning tailored to teachers' instructional needs. Gore et al. (2024) found no significant differences in observed pedagogical quality across experience levels among Australian primary teachers. Sims and Fletcher-Wood (2021) examined how professional development can support the practical application of instructional knowledge, while Popova et al. (2022) linked subject-specific training and opportunities to practice teaching strategies with stronger learner outcomes. These studies support mentoring, coaching, and collaborative planning that address teachers' specific classroom needs.

3.2 Instructional Management and Pedagogical Practices

3.2.1 Strategic Leadership, Resource Management, and Integrity

Both groups rated these instructional management domains Always Practiced. School heads and teachers rated strategic leadership at 4.97 and 4.68, respectively, and management of operations and resources at 4.97 and 4.72. Leading with integrity received the highest domain rating from both groups, at 5.00 and 4.88, respectively. Teachers rated policy alignment highly but gave comparatively lower ratings to participation in strategic planning. Both groups gave their lowest resource-management rating to efficient and transparent use of school resources. Within the integrity domain, teachers rated compliance with Department of Education policies highest and decisions based on learners' best interests lowest. The ratings identified opportunities to strengthen data use, teacher participation in planning, and communication about resource allocation. Sahlin (2023) emphasized that principals can support school improvement by creating opportunities for meaningful collaboration. Lleo et al. (2023) linked principals' integrity and benevolence with teacher trust and commitment. The uniformly high self-ratings in the integrity domain also warrant consideration alongside teachers' assessments, particularly when examining how ethical leadership is reflected in decisions and actions. Lleo et al. (2023) provide context for the importance of sustaining these practices in day-to-day school management.

3.2.2 Instructional Supervision, Staff Development, and Partnerships

School heads and teachers rated the focus on teaching and learning at 4.94 and 4.78, developing self and others at 4.82 and 4.79, and building connections at 4.89 and 4.86, respectively. All ratings fell within Always Practiced. School heads gave comparatively lower ratings to post-observation feedback, monitoring learner achievement, and mentoring. Teachers gave comparatively lower ratings to promoting varied assessment strategies and recognizing teachers' accomplishments. Strengthening community support for school programs was the lowest-rated partnership indicator among school heads and the highest-rated among teachers. The ratings point to opportunities to strengthen feedback, coaching, and assessment support within existing supervisory practices. Sims et al. (2025) emphasized professional development that helps teachers acquire, practice, and apply instructional techniques. Sims and Fletcher-Wood (2021) also emphasized grounding professional learning in evidence about how teachers develop skills, supporting structured mentoring and opportunities for practice. The difference in community-support ratings suggests that school heads and teachers may experience partnership activities differently. Sahlin (2023) supports considering both perspectives when planning and reviewing stakeholder collaboration.

3.2.3 Overall Instructional Management Practices

School heads' instructional management practices were rated Always Practiced overall by school heads ($M = 4.93$, $SD = 0.05$) and teachers ($M = 4.78$, $SD = 0.10$). Both groups rated leading with integrity highest. Developing self and others received the lowest mean from school heads, while leading strategically received the lowest mean from teachers. The two groups identified different priorities within generally favorable ratings. Sahlin (2023) emphasized collaborative leadership relationships, which are relevant to teachers' comparatively lower ratings of strategic participation. Sims et al. (2025) highlighted the contribution of well-designed professional development to teaching and learning, supporting continued attention to coaching, mentoring, and sustained instructional improvement.

3.2.4 Content Knowledge, Learning Environment, and Learner Diversity

School heads and teachers rated content knowledge and pedagogy at 4.82 and 4.79, the learning environment at 4.79 and 4.84, and responsiveness to learner diversity at 4.64 and 4.75, respectively. Both groups rated all three domains Always Practiced. They rated subject mastery highly and gave comparatively lower ratings to the use of varied teaching approaches. School heads rated establishing a safe and inclusive classroom highest among learning-environment indicators, while teachers rated fostering a supportive classroom climate highest. In the learner diversity domain, both groups rated respect for individual differences highest and differentiated instruction lowest. The results identify varied teaching strategies and differentiation as priorities alongside subject mastery

and supportive classroom practice. Sims and Fletcher-Wood (2021) addressed professional development that strengthens practical teaching competencies, and Popova et al. (2022) linked subject-specific learning and opportunities to practice instructional strategies with stronger learner outcomes. Erdem and Kaya (2024) found that classroom climate was associated with academic achievement. Dell'Anna et al. (2026) found that teachers commonly adapted instruction to learner readiness or profiles, while Pozas et al. (2021) examined pupils' perceptions of differentiated instruction.

3.2.5 Curriculum Planning, Assessment, and Reporting

School heads and teachers rated curriculum and planning at 4.83 and 4.84, and assessment and reporting at 4.73 and 4.84, respectively. Both domains were rated Always Practiced. Teachers rated curriculum-aligned lesson plans and learning activities highly. School heads rated the use of appropriate instructional resources lowest among the planning indicators. Both groups gave comparatively lower ratings to timely feedback for learners. Teachers also rated varied assessment strategies and the use of assessment results to improve instruction among the lowest practices in that domain. The findings indicate areas for support in selecting instructional resources, giving feedback, and applying assessment evidence. Popova et al. (2022) emphasized subject-specific professional development with opportunities to practice instructional strategies. Sims and Fletcher-Wood (2021) likewise highlighted the application of professional learning in classroom settings. Sims et al. (2025) identified mechanisms through which teachers can acquire, practice, and apply skills, providing context for sustained professional support in assessment and feedback.

3.2.6 Community Engagement and Professional Growth

School heads and teachers rated community linkages and professional engagement at 4.79 and 4.82, and personal growth and professional development at 4.68 and 4.86, respectively. Both domains were rated Always Practiced. Teachers rated participation in professional learning communities highest within the community engagement domain, while both groups gave comparatively lower ratings to collaboration with parents. Both groups gave their lowest professional-growth rating to seeking feedback to improve instruction. The comparatively lower ratings identify parent collaboration and feedback-seeking as areas for continued attention. Sims and Fletcher-Wood (2021) emphasized evaluating collaborative professional learning by how it supports teaching practice. Popova et al. (2022) and Sims et al. (2025) highlighted opportunities to practice and apply instructional skills, supporting professional development that incorporates feedback, reflection, and classroom application.

3.2.7 Overall Pedagogical Practices

Teachers' pedagogical practices were rated Always Practiced overall by school heads ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 0.08$) and teachers ($M = 4.82$, $SD = 0.14$). School heads rated curriculum and planning highest, while teachers rated personal growth and professional development highest. Both groups rated responsiveness to learner diversity lowest. The agreement on learner diversity identifies differentiated instruction as a priority for the proposed framework. Pozas et al. (2021) showed how learner perspectives can provide additional evidence about the use of differentiation in classrooms. Sims et al. (2025) emphasized evidence-informed professional development, supporting targeted technical assistance, collaborative lesson planning, and classroom coaching to help teachers address diverse learner needs.

3.3 Relationships Among Respondent Profiles and Practices

3.3.1 School Heads' Profiles and Instructional Management Practices

Position or rank was the only school head profile variable significantly associated with instructional management practices (reported coefficient = −0.355, $p = .036$). Sex, age, educational attainment, years as a school head, and relevant training attendance showed no statistically significant associations. The negative coefficient describes the association with the numerical coding of rank. Its practical direction depends on how the ranks were ordered. Popova et al. (2022) found that the effectiveness of professional learning varied with program content, delivery, and opportunities for practical application. This provides context for tailoring leadership mentoring and professional development to the responsibilities and needs of school heads across ranks.

3.3.2 Teachers' Profiles and Pedagogical Practices

None of the six teacher profile variables was significantly associated with pedagogical practices. The associations with sex, age, educational attainment, position or rank, teaching experience, and relevant training attendance were weak, with p values above .05. Within this sample, the profile variables provided limited information about differences in reported classroom practice. Gore et al. (2024) similarly found no significant differences in observed teaching quality across experience levels. Popova et al. (2022) emphasized program design, opportunities to practice instructional strategies, and follow-up support. These findings support identifying teachers' professional development needs through classroom observation, coaching, and collaborative planning.

3.3.3 Instructional Management and Pedagogical Practices

School heads' instructional management practices and teachers' pedagogical practices showed a statistically significant, moderate positive relationship ($r = .483$, $p < .001$). Higher instructional management ratings tended

to accompany higher pedagogical practice ratings. This association provided the empirical basis for linking instructional supervision, mentoring, technical assistance, and collaborative curriculum planning in the proposed PPSSH–PPST Strengthened Alignment Framework. Popova et al. (2022) showed the value of practical professional learning and follow-up support. Dorukbaşi and Cansoy (2024) found that teacher professional learning mediated the relationship between principals' instructional leadership and teachers' instructional practices. Hallinger et al. (2025) reported a moderate positive relationship between principals' instructional leadership and teachers' professional attitudes. In the present study, the correlational design supports interpreting the result as an association within the study sample.

4. Conclusion & Recommendations

In the selected public elementary school districts of the Schools Division of Leyte, school heads and teachers rated both instructional management and pedagogical practices as Always Practiced during the implementation of the Revised K to 10 Curriculum. Both groups identified leading with integrity as a strength and responsiveness to learner diversity as the lowest-rated pedagogical domain. The ratings also highlighted opportunities to improve strategic planning, mentoring, and instructional feedback. Position or rank was the only school head profile characteristic significantly associated with instructional management, while none of the teacher profile characteristics examined was significantly associated with pedagogical practices. The moderate positive association between instructional management and pedagogical practices shows that higher ratings in one tended to accompany higher ratings in the other. Together, these findings informed the proposed PPSSH–PPST Strengthened Alignment Framework, which connects school leadership, professional learning, and classroom support around the priorities identified by both respondent groups.

School heads should prioritize differentiated instruction and timely feedback by using school performance data and classroom observations to identify where teachers need support. They should provide constructive feedback after observations and work with master teachers to organize peer mentoring, collaborative lesson planning, and Learning Action Cell sessions focused on adapting lessons to diverse learner needs. Teachers should use formative assessment results to adjust instruction, vary their teaching strategies, and provide timely feedback to learners. School heads and teachers should also involve parents and community partners in supporting inclusive learning. Public Schools District Supervisors should provide targeted technical assistance and review progress through classroom observation records, coaching records, and instructional plans. The Schools Division Office, through the Curriculum Implementation Division, should consider piloting the proposed PPSSH–PPST Strengthened Alignment Framework and using periodic reviews to refine its components before incorporating them into existing instructional supervision and professional development activities.

The study involved 35 school heads and 245 teachers from Tanauan I, II, and III in the Schools Division of Leyte during School Year 2026–2027. The findings therefore reflect these districts and this stage of the curriculum rollout. The questionnaires captured self-assessments and counterpart ratings of reported practices. The descriptive-correlational design can identify associations, but causal effects remain undetermined. Future studies may combine surveys with classroom observations and interviews across more districts to examine whether the same patterns emerge in other settings. Longitudinal research may also assess how practices change over time and evaluate the proposed framework after implementation.

5. Compliance with ethical standards

The Dean of the Graduate School and the Schools Division Superintendent of Leyte granted administrative permission to conduct the study. All respondents gave informed consent before participating and were informed that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time without penalty. The researcher excluded personal identifiers from questionnaires and reports, restricted access to the securely stored data to the researcher and adviser, and reported findings in aggregate. The data were used solely for academic and research purposes and handled in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (2012).

REFERENCES

Abrigo, M. R. M., Lingatong, E. E., Daga, E. D. J. C., Apostol, G. C., Cagasan, L. P., Jr., Gavan, D. S. A., Paquibot, J. L., Perez, T. D. S., & Relos, C. M. L. (2025). *Promise and growing pains in curriculum reform: A mixed-methods evaluation of MATATAG K-to-10 curriculum's first-year pilot implementation* (Discussion Paper No. 2025-53). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2025.53

Alang, A. H., & Ebisa, E. E. (2025). Teachers' conceptual understanding of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers and their performance. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 44*(3), 370–382. https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.440308

Caspe, G. M. F., & Sarrosa, A. V., Jr. (2025). Teacher readiness for the implementation of enhanced K–10 curriculum: Basis for support mechanism program. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9*(6), 2308–2345. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.906000178

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Data Privacy Act of 2012, Republic Act No. 10173 (2012). https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2012/ra_10173_2012.html

Dell'Anna, S., Frizzarin, A., & Biagiotti, G. (2026). Practice-oriented research on differentiation strategies in primary and secondary education: A systematic review. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 177*, Article 105559. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2026.105559

Department of Education. (2017, August 11). *National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers* (DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/DO_s2017_042-1.pdf

Department of Education. (2020, September 7). *National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads* (DepEd Order No. 024, s. 2020). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf

Department of Education. (2023, September 8). *Pilot implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum* (DepEd Memorandum No. 054, s. 2023). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DM_s2023_054.pdf

Department of Education. (2024a, July 23). *Policy guidelines on the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum* (DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2024/07/23/july-23-2024-do-010-s-2024-policy-guidelines-on-the-implementation-of-the-matatag-curriculum/

Department of Education. (2024b, September 19). *DepEd grants schools flexibility in MATATAG Curriculum amid teacher and resource concerns*. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2024/09/19/deped-grants-schools-flexibility-in-matatag-curriculum-amid-teacher-and-resource-concerns/

Dizon, A. G. (2023). Historical development of CIPP as a curriculum evaluation model. *History of Education, 52*(1), 109–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2022.2098390

Dorukbaşi, E., & Cansoy, R. (2024). Examining the mediating role of teacher professional learning between perceived instructional leadership and teacher instructional practices. *European Journal of Education, 59*(3), Article e12672. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12672

Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, Republic Act No. 10533 (2013). https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2013/ra_10533_2013.html

Erdem, C., & Kaya, M. (2024). The relationship between school and classroom climate, and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *School Psychology International, 45*(4), 380–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/01430343231202923

Faizuddin, A., Azizan, N. A., Othman, A., & Ismail, S. N. (2022). Continuous professional development programmes for school principals in the 21st century: Lessons learned from educational leadership practices. *Frontiers in Education, 7*, Article 983807. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.983807

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2023). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (11th ed.). McGraw Hill.

Gore, J., Rosser, B., Jaremus, F., Miller, A., & Harris, J. (2024). Fresh evidence on the relationship between years of experience and teaching quality. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 51*(2), 547–570. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-023-00612-0

Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, Republic Act No. 9155 (2001). https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2001/ra_9155_2001.html

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal, 86*(2), 217–247. https://doi.org/10.1086/461445

Hallinger, P., Liu, S., & Chen, L. (2025). Principal instructional leadership and teacher attitudes: A meta-analytic review, 1989–2024. *European Journal of Education, 60*(4), Article e70199. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70199

Hallinger, P., Liu, S., & Niu, X. (2026). Cultural context, principal instructional leadership, and teacher efficacy: A meta-analytic review, 1989–2024. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 54*(6), 1997–2017. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432251349810

He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teacher's professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 9*(1), Article 63. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00290-0

Hsieh, C.-C., Tai, S.-E., & Li, H.-C. (2026). Impact of school leadership on teacher innovativeness: Evidence from multilevel analysis of Taiwan TALIS 2018. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 46*(3), 835–852. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2024.2397040

Karsantık, Y. (2026). A systematic review of curriculum leadership research: Descriptive, methodological and outcomes-based synthesis. *British Educational Research Journal, 52*(1), 720–749. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.70032

Kemethofer, D., Helm, C., & Warwas, J. (2025). Does educational leadership enhance instructional quality and student achievement? The case of Austrian primary school leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 28*(3), 461–485. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2021.2021294

Lleo, A., Ruiz-Palomino, P., Guillen, M., & Marrades-Pastor, E. (2023). The role of ethical trustworthiness in shaping trust and affective commitment in schools. *Ethics & Behavior, 33*(2), 151–173. https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2022.2034504

Medula, C. T., Jr., Maslang, J. A. L., Balagtas, M. U., Lapinid, M. R. C., & Gonzales, R. D. L. C. (2024). *Teachers', school heads', and supervisors' understanding and use of K to 12 assessment policies* (Policy Brief No. 2024-05-031). Angelo King Institute for Economic and Business Studies, De La Salle University. https://www.dlsu-aki.com/uploads/1/0/2/2/102266760/dlsu-aki_policy_brief_2024-05-031.pdf

Nadeem, M. (2024). Distributed leadership in educational contexts: A catalyst for school improvement. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 9*, Article 100835. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100835

Ninković, S., & Knežević Florić, O. (2024). School leadership and teaching practice: A systematic review of studies of the indirect effects. *Journal of Educational Administration, 62*(4), 357–372. https://doi.org/10.1108/jea-08-2023-0190

Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (1972). *The psychology of the child* (H. Weaver, Trans.). Basic Books. (Original work published 1966)

Popova, A., Evans, D. K., Breeding, M. E., & Arancibia, V. (2022). Teacher professional development around the world: The gap between evidence and practice. *The World Bank Research Observer, 37*(1), 107–136. https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkab006

Pozas, M., González Trujillo, C. J., & Letzel, V. (2021). A change of perspective—Exploring Mexican primary and secondary school students' perceptions of their teachers differentiated instructional practice. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs, 21*(3), 222–232. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-3802.12514

Prudente, M. S., Garcia, J. A. S., Mistades, V. M., Roleda, L. S., & Talaue, F. T. (2024). *Systematic review of professional development programs for teachers in the Philippines* (Research Paper Series No. 003). Second Congressional Commission on Education. https://edcom2.gov.ph/media/2024/02/18_Prudente-et-al-Systematic-Review-of-Professional-1.pdf

Republic Act No. 12322 (2026). https://www.lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2026/ra_12322_2026.html

Reyes, S. A. B. (2023). Instructional leadership, teachers' participation and K to 12 curriculum: Impact on pupils' learning outcomes. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 18*(2), 1227–1256. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.18.2.0937

Sahlin, S. (2023). Teachers making sense of principals' leadership in collaboration within and beyond school. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 67*(5), 754–774. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2022.2043429

Second Congressional Commission on Education. (2025). *Fixing the foundations: A matter of national survival* (Year Two Report). https://edcom2.gov.ph/publications/year2report/

Serrano, D. M. L., & Fallado, J. G. (2025). Assessing the extent of PPST implementation and teacher challenges in elementary schools. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management, 13*(5), 4113–4125. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsrm/v13i05.el06

Sims, S., & Fletcher-Wood, H. (2021). Identifying the characteristics of effective teacher professional development: A critical review. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 32*(1), 47–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2020.1772841

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

Stufflebeam, D. L., Foley, W. J., Gephart, W. J., Guba, E. G., Hammond, R. L., Merriman, H. O., & Provus, M. M. (1971). *Educational evaluation and decision making*. F. E. Peacock Publishers.

Tai, M. K., & Omar, A. K. (2022). Essential practices of school principals in developing professional learning communities in schools: A systematic literature review 2010–2019. *International Journal of Learning and Intellectual Capital, 19*(4), 291–311. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJLIC.2022.123900

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Harvard University Press.

Watts, J. L. (2023). Supporting beginning principals to survive and thrive in the role: A systematic review of literature. *School Leadership & Management, 43*(1), 28–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2022.2137726

Wulan, M. P., Listyasari, W. D., Santosa, H., & Huda, S. A. (2026). A systematic literature review on the CIPP evaluation model in education: Examining its trends, applications, and research gaps. *Journal of Educational Sciences, 10*(3), 307–320. https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.3.p.307-320