

The Activities in Enhancing the Instructional Supervisory Practices of the School Heads in the Public Elementary Schools in San Andres District, Division of Quezon

Karren Padolina Villapando¹

¹School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:

Published: March 2026

Keywords:

Instructional Supervision
 School Leadership
 Teaching Quality

ABSTRACT

Instructional supervision is a core function of school leadership and a critical mechanism for improving teaching quality and learner outcomes. In the Philippine basic education system, school heads are mandated to exercise strong instructional leadership aligned with national reforms such as the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) and School-Based Management policies. This study examined the extent of instructional supervisory practices of school heads and the activities undertaken to enhance these practices in public elementary schools in the San Andres District, Division of Quezon, during School Year 2024–2025. Using a descriptive–evaluative research design, the study involved school heads and teachers as respondents. Data were collected through a validated researcher-developed questionnaire covering instructional supervisory practices in terms of direct assistance, group development, lesson planning supervision, lesson delivery supervision, assessment practices supervision, curriculum development, and professional development of teachers. The study also examined enhancement activities related to classroom observation and feedback, professional development programs, curriculum support, and data-driven decision-making. Data were analyzed using weighted mean, ranking, Kendall's coefficient of concordance, and chi-square tests. Findings revealed that instructional supervisory practices of school heads were highly evident across all dimensions, indicating consistent engagement in instructional leadership functions. Significant agreement among respondents was found regarding both the extent of supervisory practices and the enhancement activities undertaken. The results further showed that systematic supervision, professional development initiatives, and data-informed decision-making contribute to improved teaching practices and strengthened school performance. The study concludes that effective instructional supervision remains central to school improvement and teacher development. It recommends sustained capacity-building programs, strengthened supervisory systems, and policy support to further enhance the instructional leadership competencies of school heads and promote continuous improvement in public elementary schools.

1. Introduction

Improving the quality of teaching and learning remains a central priority of basic education systems worldwide. Among the most influential factors in enhancing instructional quality is the role of school leadership, particularly in the area of instructional supervision. Instructional supervision encompasses a range of leadership practices aimed at supporting teachers' professional growth, improving classroom instruction, and ensuring alignment between curriculum standards and teaching practices. When effectively implemented, instructional supervision contributes to improved teaching competence, learner engagement, and overall school performance.

In the Philippine basic education context, instructional supervision is a core responsibility of school heads and is institutionalized through national education policies and leadership standards. The Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) emphasize instructional leadership as a key domain, requiring school heads to provide direct assistance to teachers, monitor and evaluate teaching practices, facilitate professional development, and use data to inform instructional decisions. These expectations are further reinforced by the School-Based Management framework, which positions school heads as instructional leaders responsible for ensuring continuous improvement in teaching and learning at the school level.

Despite strong policy mandates, the practice of instructional supervision in public elementary schools varies across contexts. School heads often face challenges such as heavy administrative workloads, limited time for classroom observation, varying teacher competencies, and constraints in professional development resources. These challenges can affect the consistency and depth of supervisory practices, potentially limiting their impact on teaching quality and learner outcomes. Consequently, there is a need for empirical studies that examine how instructional supervision is practiced at the school level and what activities are undertaken to strengthen supervisory functions.

The San Andres District in the Division of Quezon provides a relevant context for examining instructional supervisory practices. As a district composed of public elementary schools with diverse organizational capacities and teaching contexts, it reflects the broader realities of instructional leadership in decentralized education systems. Understanding how school heads in this district exercise instructional supervision and the strategies they employ to enhance these practices can offer valuable insights for leadership development, policy formulation, and school improvement planning.

This study therefore investigates the instructional supervisory practices of school heads in public elementary schools in the San Andres District, Division of Quezon. Specifically, it examines the extent of supervisory practices across key instructional domains and identifies the activities undertaken to enhance these practices. By generating empirical evidence on instructional supervision at the school level, the study seeks to contribute to the discourse on effective school leadership and support efforts to strengthen teaching quality and learner achievement in public elementary schools.

2. Methodology

This study employed a descriptive–evaluative research design to examine the instructional supervisory practices of school heads and the activities undertaken to enhance these practices in public elementary schools in the San Andres District, Division of Quezon, during School Year 2024–2025. The design was appropriate for systematically describing existing supervisory practices, evaluating their level of implementation across key instructional domains, and determining the degree of agreement among respondents regarding both practices and enhancement activities. The study focused on assessment and evaluation rather than establishing causal relationships.

The study was conducted in selected public elementary schools in the San Andres District, which vary in size, organizational capacity, and instructional context. Respondents consisted of school heads and public elementary school teachers, who were purposively selected based on their direct involvement in instructional supervision and classroom instruction. School heads were included as primary implementers of supervisory practices, while teachers provided complementary perspectives as recipients of instructional supervision.

Data were collected using a researcher-developed structured questionnaire anchored on the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH), instructional leadership literature, and supervision frameworks in basic education. The instrument measured the extent of instructional supervisory practices in terms of direct assistance to teachers, group development activities, supervision of lesson planning, supervision of lesson delivery, supervision of assessment practices, curriculum development support, and facilitation of teachers' professional development. It also assessed enhancement activities related to classroom observation and feedback, professional development programs, curriculum support mechanisms, and data-driven instructional decision-making. Responses were measured using a Likert-type scale to allow quantitative assessment of the extent to which practices and activities were evident. Prior to administration, the instrument underwent expert validation to ensure content relevance, clarity, and alignment with the objectives of the study, and reliability testing was conducted to establish internal consistency.

Approval to conduct the study was obtained from the appropriate education authorities. Questionnaires were personally distributed and retrieved to ensure completeness of data and a high response rate. Ethical considerations were strictly observed throughout the research process, including voluntary participation, informed consent, and confidentiality of responses. No personally identifiable information was collected, and all data were used solely for academic and research purposes.

Data analysis employed both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Weighted means and rankings were used to determine the extent of instructional supervisory practices and enhancement activities across identified domains.

To assess the level of agreement among respondents in ranking supervisory practices and enhancement activities, Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) was applied, with the corresponding chi-square (χ^2) test used to determine statistical significance at the 0.05 level. These analytical procedures enabled a rigorous evaluation of instructional supervision practices and the consistency of perceptions among school heads and teachers.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1 Extent of Instructional Supervisory Practices of School Heads

Table 1 presents the extent to which school heads implement instructional supervisory practices across key instructional domains.

Table 1. Extent of Instructional Supervisory Practices

Supervisory Practice	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Direct Assistance to Teachers	4.54	Highly Evident
Group Development Activities	4.48	Highly Evident
Supervision of Lesson Planning	4.56	Highly Evident
Supervision of Lesson Delivery	4.52	Highly Evident
Supervision of Assessment Practices	4.49	Highly Evident
Curriculum Development Support	4.46	Highly Evident
Teachers' Professional Development	4.51	Highly Evident

The results indicate that instructional supervisory practices are highly evident across all domains. The highest weighted mean was observed in the supervision of lesson planning, suggesting that school heads consistently review and guide teachers' instructional plans to ensure alignment with curriculum standards and learner needs. This finding underscores the emphasis placed on pre-instructional supervision as a foundational component of instructional quality.

High ratings in direct assistance to teachers and supervision of lesson delivery reflect school heads' active engagement in classroom observation, coaching, and feedback processes. These practices align with contemporary instructional leadership models that view supervision as developmental rather than evaluative. The strong emphasis on professional development further indicates that supervision extends beyond classroom monitoring to include mentoring, coaching, and facilitation of continuous learning among teachers.

Although still rated highly, curriculum development support and group development activities obtained slightly lower means, suggesting that collaborative curriculum work and collective professional learning may be constrained by time, workload, or organizational demands. Nonetheless, the overall results affirm that instructional supervision is systematically embedded in school leadership practice.

3.2 Agreement on the Rank Order of Instructional Supervisory Practices

To determine the consistency of perceptions among respondents, Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W) was computed.

Table 2. Test of Agreement on Instructional Supervisory Practices

Kendall's W	χ^2	p-value	Interpretation
0.71	19.62	< 0.05	Significant

The statistically significant agreement indicates a shared understanding among school heads and teachers regarding the relative importance and frequency of instructional supervisory practices. This consensus suggests organizational coherence and strengthens the credibility of the reported findings.

3.3 Activities Undertaken to Enhance Instructional Supervisory Practices

Table 3 presents the enhancement activities implemented by school heads to strengthen instructional supervision.

Table 3. Activities Undertaken to Enhance Instructional Supervision

Enhancement Activity	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Classroom Observation and Feedback	4.58	Highly Evident
In-Service Trainings and LAC Sessions	4.55	Highly Evident
Curriculum Review and Alignment Activities	4.50	Highly Evident
Data-Driven Instructional Decision-Making	4.47	Highly Evident
Coaching and Mentoring Programs	4.53	Highly Evident

The findings show that enhancement activities are likewise highly evident, with classroom observation and feedback emerging as the most prominent strategy. This result highlights the centrality of formative feedback in improving instructional practices and reinforcing reflective teaching. The high rating for Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions and in-service trainings indicates that collaborative professional learning is a key mechanism for sustaining instructional improvement.

The emphasis on data-driven decision-making suggests growing awareness of the role of assessment data and learner performance indicators in guiding instructional supervision. However, its slightly lower ranking compared to observation and training activities implies that the integration of data analytics into supervisory practice may still be developing.

3.4 Agreement on the Rank Order of Enhancement Activities

Table 4. Test of Agreement on Enhancement Activities

Kendall's W	χ^2	p-value	Interpretation
0.68	17.44	< 0.05	Significant

The significant agreement among respondents indicates consistency in recognizing which activities most effectively enhance instructional supervision. This shared perception reinforces the reliability of the findings and suggests institutional alignment in leadership practices.

3.5 Discussion and Analytical Interpretation

The results provide strong evidence that instructional supervision is a core and consistently practiced leadership function among school heads in the San Andres District. The high levels of implementation across all supervisory domains demonstrate that school heads actively engage in guiding instructional planning, delivery, assessment, and teacher development. These findings align with instructional leadership theory, which emphasizes the role of school leaders in directly influencing teaching quality through sustained supervision and support.

The prominence of lesson planning supervision and classroom observation reflects a proactive supervisory orientation focused on instructional improvement rather than compliance. By providing direct assistance and timely feedback, school heads create opportunities for reflective practice and professional growth among teachers. The significant agreement among respondents further suggests that these practices are institutionalized rather than dependent on individual leadership styles.

The strong emphasis on enhancement activities—particularly professional development, coaching, and collaborative learning—indicates recognition that effective supervision requires continuous capacity-building. The integration of data-driven decision-making, although still evolving, signals a shift toward evidence-based instructional leadership. This development is critical for aligning supervision with learner outcomes and accountability mechanisms.

However, the relatively lower emphasis on curriculum development support and collective group development suggests areas for further strengthening. Expanding collaborative curriculum work and deepening the use of instructional data can enhance coherence across grade levels and subject areas. Addressing these areas may require additional structural support, such as protected time for collaboration and targeted leadership training.

Overall, the findings affirm that instructional supervisory practices in the district are systematic, coherent, and development-oriented. By sustaining and further enhancing these practices, school heads can continue to strengthen teaching quality and contribute to improved learner achievement.

4. Conclusions and Implications

4.1 Conclusions

This study examined the instructional supervisory practices of school heads and the activities undertaken to enhance these practices in public elementary schools in the San Andres District, Division of Quezon. The findings indicate that instructional supervision is highly evident across all key domains, including direct assistance to teachers, supervision of lesson planning and delivery, assessment practices, curriculum development, and professional development. School heads consistently perform their instructional leadership roles in alignment with national leadership standards, demonstrating a strong commitment to improving teaching quality and supporting teacher growth.

The results further reveal that school heads actively implement enhancement activities such as classroom observation and feedback, Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, coaching and mentoring, curriculum alignment initiatives, and data-driven instructional decision-making. These activities reinforce the developmental nature of instructional supervision and contribute to the continuous improvement of teaching practices. The significant agreement among school heads and teachers regarding both supervisory practices and enhancement activities suggests organizational coherence and shared understanding of instructional leadership priorities.

Overall, the study concludes that effective instructional supervision remains a central and well-established function of school leadership in the district. Its consistent implementation contributes to a supportive professional environment that fosters reflective teaching, instructional improvement, and sustained school effectiveness.

4.2 Implications for Policy, Practice, and Research

From a policy perspective, the findings underscore the importance of sustaining and strengthening instructional supervision within school leadership frameworks. Education authorities may consider enhancing policies that prioritize instructional leadership by providing clearer guidelines, structured supervisory tools, and sustained professional development opportunities aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads. Strengthening system-level support can help ensure consistency and depth in supervisory practices across schools.

In terms of educational practice, the results highlight the need for continuous capacity-building for school heads and teachers. Expanding professional development programs focused on coaching, mentoring, and data-informed instructional supervision can further improve teaching quality. Schools may also benefit from institutionalizing collaborative practices such as peer observation, curriculum mapping, and shared reflective sessions to complement formal supervisory activities.

For school leadership and governance, the study emphasizes the role of school heads in balancing instructional supervision with administrative responsibilities. Providing adequate administrative support and workload management can allow school heads to devote more time to instructional leadership. Strengthening collaborative cultures within schools can also enhance the effectiveness of supervision and promote collective responsibility for instructional improvement.

With respect to future research, the study suggests the value of exploring the impact of instructional supervisory practices on learner achievement and long-term school performance. Future studies may employ longitudinal or mixed-method designs to capture changes over time and provide deeper insights into the processes through which instructional supervision influences teaching and learning. Including learner perspectives and classroom-level data can further enrich understanding of supervisory effectiveness.

In conclusion, the study affirms that strong instructional supervisory practices are essential to effective school leadership and instructional improvement. Sustained policy support, targeted professional development, and collaborative school cultures are critical to maximizing the impact of instructional supervision on teaching quality and learner outcomes.

References

- [1] Bush, T. (2020). *Theories of educational leadership and management* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- [2] Department of Education. (2015). *Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH)*. DepEd Philippines.
- [3] Department of Education. (2017). *Learning action cell as a K–12 basic education program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning*. DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016.
- [4] Department of Education. (2023). *MATATAG agenda: Bansang makabata, batang makabansa*. DepEd Philippines.
- [5] Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). Pearson Education.
- [6] Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- [7] Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2018). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- [8] Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. ASCD.

- [9] Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
- [10] Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X08321509>
- [11] Sergiovanni, T. J. (2009). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.
- [12] Zepeda, S. J. (2017). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (4th ed.). Routledge.