RESEARCH ARTICLE

JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research
Volume 2, Issue 10, Page 782-789 | Article No. 89
DOI: 10.4898/jenerv2i10.a89
ISSN: 7895-9216
Journal homepage: https://jenerjournal.com
Journal email: editor@jenerjournal.com

JENER Journal
JENER Journal of Empirical and Non-Empirical Research

The Effectiveness of the Monitoring and Coaching of the School Heads on the Teachers' Performance in the Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Quezon

Sheryl Gay O. Pascasio[1]

[1]School of Graduate Studies, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article history:
Published: October 2026

Keywords:
Instructional Monitoring
Coaching
Teacher Performance
School Heads
Supervision
Quezon
Kendall concordance

ABSTRACT

The study investigated monitoring and coaching and perceived teacher performance in public elementary schools of the Division of Quezon in school year 2025–2026. Using a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey, the study gathered five-point questionnaire ratings and analyzed descriptive statistics and rank agreement across groups. A total of 264 school heads was reported across four congressional districts. Reported findings indicated that monitoring-and-coaching ratings by domain had a tabulated overall mean of 4.47 (ME); perceived teacher-performance ratings by domain had a tabulated overall mean of 4.38 (ME); challenges to monitoring and coaching had a tabulated overall mean of 3.66 (MS). The concordance tests described agreement in questionnaire item rankings rather than a causal link between the studied domains. The findings identify perceived implementation priorities and should be interpreted within the limits of respondent-rating data.

1. Introduction

Monitoring and coaching are core tasks in instructional leadership because they create opportunities to observe classroom practice, identify needs, provide specific feedback and follow up on professional goals. The process can be developmental when educators regard it as guidance rather than compliance alone.

The study addressed the reported monitoring and coaching practices of school heads in Quezon's public elementary schools during school year 2025–2026, along with respondents' appraisals of teachers' performance and practical obstacles to implementing coaching consistently. The Department of Education's Results-Based Performance Management System described performance target setting, monitoring, evaluation and development planning (Department of Education, 2015). The Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers likewise supply a framework for professional development and teaching-quality expectations (Department of Education, 2017).

In a meta-analysis of experimental and quasi-experimental studies, Kraft et al. (2018) found that structured teacher coaching can improve instructional practice, although the magnitude and setting of effects vary. Those findings provide a rationale for examining coaching locally; they cannot be transposed into a causal interpretation of this cross-sectional respondent survey.

The study's distinct questions concerned monitoring and coaching domains, perceived effectiveness for teachers' performance, challenges and proposed solutions, and concordance of item rankings across district groups. The analysis therefore provides a multidimensional descriptive account for planning supervision and technical assistance.

The objectives were to characterize reported ratings in the major constructs, compare the priority order of items across the respondent groups, identify comparatively lower-rated aspects, and translate the reported observations into proportionate implications for educational policy and practice. These objectives were approached as descriptive and rank-concordance questions, notwithstanding causal terms in the retained study title.

2. Methods

2.1 Design and setting

The study employed a descriptive–evaluative–correlational survey. It examined monitoring and coaching and perceived teacher performance in the Division of Quezon during school year 2025–2026. The quantitative components described respondent ratings and used item-rank concordance analyses; no random assignment, matched comparison group or longitudinal change estimate was presented.

2.2 Participants and sampling

The study involved 264 school heads from the four congressional districts of the Division of Quezon, selected from the enumerated population of 774 (district sample sizes 67, 40, 73 and 84). The reported sample comprised 264 school heads from a frame of 774, with district allocation 67, 40, 73 and 84. Although teaching performance was discussed, the quantitative tables were treated as respondents' ratings rather than independently observed or student-linked measures of teaching effectiveness.

2.3 Instrument and variables

The study used a researcher-developed questionnaire organized around school performance goals, instructional leadership, strategic planning, teacher development, program monitoring, staff relationships, perceived teaching-performance domains and supervisory challenges. The instrument used a five-point response framework; numerical ratings and their accompanying verbal interpretations are retained as tabulated. Questionnaire preparation, juror validation and revisions were described, but a fully auditable scale-validation dataset was not supplied. Results are therefore described as respondent ratings of the stated variables.

2.4 Data gathering and statistical treatment

The stated procedure involved securing permissions, preparing and validating the survey, administering questionnaires, tabulating responses and assessing the research questions. The reported statistical tools were frequency, percentage, weighted mean, rank ordering, Kendall's W and the associated chi-square statistics using the declared .05 decision threshold. Domain weighted means and item rankings were treated descriptively. Kendall's W was used to assess agreement in item orderings across school-size or congressional-district groupings, with reported chi-square decision statistics. The displayed p-threshold labels were not substituted with unreported exact p values.

2.5 Scope of inference and ethical considerations

The analysis is limited to the reported cross-sectional survey responses. No individual record-level dataset, independent longitudinal outcome series or identifiable participant records was included in the manuscript. Permission and validation procedures were described in the study; the authors should supply an explicit ethics/consent declaration and data-availability statement required by the intended journal. No ethics approval number has been inferred or inserted.

3. Results

The numbered tables report the findings relevant to the study's research questions. The domain summary tables give the reported overall means, verbal interpretation labels and ranks; the indicator tables reproduce selected highest- and lowest-scoring indicators, retaining their printed means and labels; and the concordance tables retain reported Kendall W, χ^2, degrees of freedom and statistical significance labels. All tabulated figures are transcribed rather than calculated anew.

Table 1. Monitoring-and-coaching ratings by domain

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Achievement of School Performance Goals	4.51	VME	2
Instructional Leadership	4.41	ME	5
Strategic Planning and Decision-Making	4.48	ME	3
Teachers' Development	4.40	ME	6
Monitoring of Schools Programs	4.45	ME	4
Relationship with Staff	4.57	VME	1
Average Wx	4.47	ME	

Table summarizes the reported domains for monitoring and coaching and perceived teacher performance. The highest was Relationship with Staff (mean 4.57; VME), whereas Teachers' Development was lowest (mean 4.40; ME). The tabulated overall average was 4.47 (ME).

This comparison identifies relative priorities within the study's five-point rating framework. The means are summary judgments obtained from respondents and do not, by themselves, measure change through time, differences in learning outcomes, or the strength of a causal association. Because the domains measure related but distinct functions, the ordering should guide focused follow-up rather than be construed as a single measure of overall effectiveness. Variations by district or school group warrant closer attention to implementation conditions and measurement consistency.

Table 2. Agreement in monitoring-and-coaching rankings

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Achievement of School Performance Goals	0.86	30.96	9	0.001
Instructional Leadership	0.85	27.20	8	0.001
Strategic Planning and Decision-Making	0.84	30.24	9	0.001
Teachers' Development	0.78	24.96	8	0.005
Monitoring of Schools Programs	0.70	25.20	9	0.005
Relationship with Staff	0.80	28.80	9	0.001

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 6 of 6 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 0 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS). The dimensions reported as significant included Achievement of School Performance Goals, Instructional Leadership, Strategic Planning and Decision-Making, among others.

Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome.

The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

Table 3. Selected indicators: achieving school performance goals

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads assess teaching methods and provide coaching to improve instruction.	4.41	ME
School heads give timely feedback based on observations and learner performance.	4.32	ME
School heads guide teachers and staff in setting clear and measurable goals.	4.58	VME
School heads provide guidance to ensure plans support school performance goals.	4.63	ME
School heads encourage teachers to assess and improve their teaching strategies.	4.49	ME
School heads monitor student learning outcomes through assessments and progress checks.	4.39	ME

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads conduct staff meetings to discuss progress, challenges, and strategies.	4.58	VME
School heads encourage the use of data-driven instruction.	4.62	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "School heads provide guidance to ensure plans support school performance goals." (4.63; ME). The lowest selected average was for "School heads give timely feedback based on observations and learner performance." (4.32; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 4. Selected indicators: instructional leadership

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads conduct classroom observations and provide useful feedback.	4.22	ME
School heads work with teachers in setting clear instructional goals.	4.43	ME
School heads give timely and constructive feedback to improve instruction.	4.36	ME
School heads promote the use of student data in planning instruction.	4.48	ME
School heads encourage teachers to practice reflection.	4.48	ME
School heads ensure teachers have needed teaching resources and materials.	4.56	VME
School heads create opportunities for collaborative teaching.	4.35	ME
School heads conduct one-on-one coaching for instructional improvement.	4.33	ME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "School heads ensure teachers have needed teaching resources and materials." (4.56; VME). The lowest selected average was for "School heads conduct classroom observations and provide useful feedback." (4.22; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 5. Selected indicators: strategic planning and decision-making

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads align strategic plans with the school's vision and mission.	4.58	VME
School heads use learner data, teacher feedback, and other records in decision-making.	4.51	VME
School heads lead the preparation and implementation of the SIP.	4.55	VME
School heads allocate resources based on school priorities.	4.58	VME
School heads monitor strategic plans and adjust actions when needed.	4.38	ME
School heads adjust plans based on emerging needs and challenges.	4.35	ME
School heads maintain communication channels with stakeholders.	4.45	ME
School heads use coaching results to improve school strategies and programs.	4.44	ME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "School heads align strategic plans with the school's vision and mission." (4.58; VME). The lowest selected average was for "School heads adjust plans based on emerging needs and challenges." (4.35; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils.

For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 6. Selected indicators: teachers' development

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads conduct structured classroom observations and give feedback.	4.20	ME
School heads provide personalized feedback based on classroom observations.	4.36	ME
School heads help teachers set professional development goals.	4.46	ME
School heads implement mentoring programs for new teachers.	4.40	ME
School heads organize trainings on teaching strategies, classroom management, and content.	4.50	VME
School heads encourage teachers to engage in self and peer reflection.	4.39	ME
School heads use performance data to identify teachers' development needs.	4.43	ME
School heads promote continuous professional learning among teachers.	4.45	ME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "School heads organize trainings on teaching strategies, classroom management, and content." (4.50; VME). The lowest selected average was for "School heads conduct structured classroom observations and give feedback." (4.20; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 7. Selected indicators: relationship with staff

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
School heads encourage open communication and transparency.	4.62	VME
School heads remain approachable and maintain an open-door policy.	4.64	VME
School heads respect teachers' professional autonomy.	4.61	VME
School heads meet with staff to discuss performance and development needs.	4.46	ME
School heads address staff concerns using conflict resolution skills.	4.56	VME
School heads provide timely and constructive feedback to staff.	4.61	VME
School heads recognize and celebrate staff achievements.	4.50	VME
School heads involve staff in collaborative decision-making.	4.53	VME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "School heads remain approachable and maintain an open-door policy." (4.64; VME). The lowest selected average was for "School heads meet with staff to discuss performance and development needs." (4.46; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 8. Perceived teacher-performance ratings by domain

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Learners' Engagement and Motivation	4.45	ME	1
Learners' Achievement and Progress	4.31	ME	6
Instructional Quality	4.38	ME	4
Classroom Management	4.39	ME	2.5
Assessment and Feedback Practices	4.39	ME	2.5
Professional Growth and Development	4.36	ME	5
Average Wx	4.38	ME	

Table summarizes the reported domains for monitoring and coaching and perceived teacher performance. The highest was Learners' Engagement and Motivation (mean 4.45; ME), whereas Learners' Achievement and Progress was lowest (mean 4.31; ME). The tabulated overall average was 4.38 (ME).

This comparison identifies relative priorities within the study's five-point rating framework. The means are summary judgments obtained from respondents and do not, by themselves, measure change through time, differences in learning outcomes, or the strength of a causal association.

Because the domains measure related but distinct functions, the ordering should guide focused follow-up rather than be construed as a single measure of overall effectiveness. Variations by district or school group warrant closer attention to implementation conditions and measurement consistency.

Table 9. Agreement in teacher-performance ratings rankings

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Learners' Engagement and Motivation	0.82	29.52	9	0.001
Learners' Achievement and Progress	0.82	26.24	8	0.001
Instructional Quality	0.64	25.60	10	0.005
Classroom Management	0.65	28.80	11	0.005
Assessment and Feedback Practices	0.57	20.52	9	0.025
Professional Growth and Development	0.60	19.20	8	0.025

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 6 of 6 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 0 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS). The dimensions reported as significant included Learners' Engagement and Motivation, Learners' Achievement and Progress, Instructional Quality, among others.

Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome.

The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

Table 10. Selected indicators: learner-related performance domain I

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Teachers use coaching strategies that encourage active learner participation.	4.39	ME
Teachers differentiate instruction to meet learners' diverse needs.	4.38	ME
School heads encourage teachers to use technology in teaching.	4.43	ME
Teachers use formative assessments to check learner understanding.	4.50	VME
Teachers provide learners with choices in their learning activities.	4.43	ME
School heads support positive classrooms where learners participate confidently.	4.58	VME
Teachers give timely feedback that motivates learners to improve.	4.50	VME
Teachers use coaching feedback to sustain learner interest and participation.	4.45	ME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "School heads support positive classrooms where learners participate confidently." (4.58; VME). The lowest selected average was for "Teachers differentiate instruction to meet learners' diverse needs." (4.38; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 11. Selected indicators: instructional practices

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Teachers apply evidence-based strategies learned through coaching.	4.39	ME
Teachers differentiate instruction with guidance from school heads.	4.46	ME
Teachers use active learning strategies.	4.31	ME
Teachers maintain organized classrooms that support teaching.	4.36	ME
Teachers present clear and measurable learning objectives.	4.43	ME
Teachers use formative assessments to monitor learner progress.	4.45	ME
Teachers integrate educational technology in lessons.	4.34	ME
Teachers use quality instructional materials with school head guidance.	4.35	ME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "Teachers differentiate instruction with guidance from school heads." (4.46; ME). The lowest selected average was for "Teachers use active learning strategies." (4.31; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 12. Selected indicators: classroom management

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Teachers set and communicate clear behavioral expectations.	4.41	ME
Teachers use positive reinforcement to encourage good behavior.	4.49	ME
Teachers apply classroom rules consistently.	4.35	ME
Teachers use non-verbal cues to manage behavior.	4.36	ME
Teachers engage learners in active learning activities.	4.43	ME
Teachers use varied behavior management strategies based on learner needs.	4.35	ME
Teachers arrange the classroom to support learning and reduce distractions.	4.43	ME
Teachers provide timely interventions for disruptions.	4.32	ME

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "Teachers use positive reinforcement to encourage good behavior." (4.49; ME). The lowest selected average was for "Teachers provide timely interventions for disruptions." (4.32; ME). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 13. Challenges to monitoring and coaching

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Time	3.80	MS	2
Responsibilities	3.90	MS	1
Training and Resources	3.72	MS	3

Domain / indicator	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Resistance to Feedback	3.38	S	5
Teacher-to-Supervisor Ratio	3.51	MS	4
Average Wx	3.66	MS	

Table summarizes the reported domains for monitoring and coaching and perceived teacher performance. The highest was Responsibilities (mean 3.90; MS), whereas Resistance to Feedback was lowest (mean 3.38; S). The tabulated overall average was 3.66 (MS).

This comparison identifies relative priorities within the study's five-point rating framework. The means are summary judgments obtained from respondents and do not, by themselves, measure change through time, differences in learning outcomes, or the strength of a causal association. Because the domains measure related but distinct functions, the ordering should guide focused follow-up rather than be construed as a single measure of overall effectiveness. Variations by district or school group warrant closer attention to implementation conditions and measurement consistency.

Table 14. Selected indicators: resistance to feedback

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Teachers may become defensive when receiving feedback	3.30	S
Resistance may arise from weak communication between school heads and teachers	3.57	MS
Teachers may fear that feedback will affect their professional standing	3.48	S
Teachers may not trust the school head's judgment or intention	3.21	S
Teachers may view feedback as biased or unfair	3.27	S
School heads may struggle to give clear and actionable feedback	3.29	S
Teachers may resist feedback that focuses on weaknesses without support	3.45	S
Teachers may not fully understand the developmental purpose of feedback	3.47	S

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "Resistance may arise from weak communication between school heads and teachers" (3.57; MS). The lowest selected average was for "Teachers may not trust the school head's judgment or intention" (3.21; S). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 15. Selected indicators: training and resources challenges

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Training programs may not address the specific needs of school heads	3.80	MS
Funds for professional development of school heads and teachers may be insufficient	3.87	MS
School heads may lack tools, materials, or technology for effective coaching	3.73	MS
Teachers may already be overwhelmed with professional development activities	3.67	MS
Coaching materials for specific subjects or grade levels may be limited	3.70	MS
Outdated textbooks, technology, and materials may affect coaching quality	3.74	MS
School heads may lack training focused on coaching and mentoring skills	3.59	MS
The absence of structured development programs may weaken consistent coaching	3.67	MS

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "Funds for professional development of school heads and teachers may be insufficient" (3.87; MS). The lowest selected average was for "School heads may lack training focused on coaching and mentoring skills" (3.59; MS). The selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 16. Selected proposed solutions to coaching challenges

Selected indicator	Reported mean	Interpretation
Provide clear guidelines and standardized monitoring tools	4.33	MN
Offer mentoring through modeling of effective coaching practices	4.41	MN
Conduct capacity-building on coaching, feedback, and data use	4.28	MN
Help prioritize monitoring tasks based on school needs and gaps	4.35	MN
Coordinate cluster sessions for sharing monitoring and coaching practices	4.43	MN
Provide actionable feedback after joint monitoring visits	4.44	MN
Offer technical assistance during RPMS, recovery, and curriculum adjustments	4.41	MN
Provide reporting templates to reduce administrative load	4.34	MN

Among the selected indicators, the highest reported average was for "Provide actionable feedback after joint monitoring visits" (4.44; MN). The lowest selected average was for "Conduct capacity-building on coaching, feedback, and data use" (4.28; MN). The

selected values were reproduced without recomputation.

The spread draws attention to specific perceived strengths and implementation gaps inside this domain. The indicators represent questionnaire ratings, not independently verified classroom observations, employee complaints, or changes in the measured skills of pupils. For practice, the better-rated items can be used as topics for peer exchange and documentation, while the lower-rated items can be prioritized for guided review. Selection of these salient items does not change the overall direction of the full set of questionnaire scores and does not constitute a separate inferential test.

Table 17. Agreement in challenge and solution rankings

Domain / test	Kendall W	χ^2	df	Reported sig.
Time	0.90	28.80	8	0.001
Responsibilities	0.75	27.00	9	0.005
Training and Resources	0.45	18.00	10	NS
Resistance to Feedback	0.73	32.12	11	0.001
Teacher-to-Supervisor Ratio	0.71	28.40	10	0.005
Solutions Offered	0.74	41.44	14	0.001

Table shows the reported Kendall coefficients and chi-square tests used to compare item rankings across respondent groups. 5 of 6 dimensions were labeled statistically significant in the study's tabulation; 1 were explicitly labeled nonsignificant (NS). The dimensions reported as significant included Time, Responsibilities, Resistance to Feedback, among others.

Kendall's W is a measure of agreement among rankings and the reported chi-square test addresses concordance. Significance here is not an estimate of how one construct predicts another, and it cannot establish that a leadership practice, teaching approach, or committee procedure caused an outcome.

The reported degrees of freedom correspond to within-domain indicator-ranking tests, not to participants as independent observations in a regression model. Any claim of a predictive relationship would require a separately specified model, verified units of analysis and the underlying responses.

4. Discussion

The distribution of monitoring and coaching scores can guide prioritization of school-head practice, particularly by separating direct instructional feedback from strategic management and administrative monitoring. A high mean describes respondents' appraisals and does not independently validate the frequency or instructional quality of coaching conferences.

The reported performance profile should be interpreted as an assessment made within the study's survey framework. Teacher performance encompasses multiple dimensions, and defensible conclusions about improved performance would require classroom-observation evidence, reliable scoring procedures and an appropriate comparison design.

Kraft et al. (2018) studied coaching interventions using causal designs, whereas the present study's Kendall statistics summarize district agreement on item rankings. These are different questions and types of evidence; the latter cannot produce a causal effect size for supervision.

The Department of Education's RPMS and teacher professional standards (Department of Education, 2015, 2017) provide administrative context for establishing transparent feedback schedules, professional support and documentation. However, alignment with a national framework does not, on its own, show that the local implementation reached the intended standard.

Resource constraints, competing tasks and resistance to feedback point to the need for feasible supervisory calendars, targeted support and a climate in which feedback is specific and nonpunitive. The proposed solutions could be tested prospectively with documented monitoring cycles and repeat observations rather than only agreement surveys.

Monitoring of school performance goals and strategic planning need to remain connected to classroom-level professional learning rather than simply producing compliance reports. Feedback is more useful when it identifies an observed teaching behavior, relates it to a clear improvement goal and is followed by another opportunity to practice. The survey identifies local perceptions of these functions without documenting the actual sequence of coaching conversations.

The more challenging dimensions related to time, multiple responsibilities and access to resources suggest implementation constraints that can be addressed through calendar design and allocation of coaching responsibilities. Any revised routine should be evaluated by the number of completed feedback cycles, the usefulness perceived by teachers, and independently scored changes in professional practice.

5. Implications for practice and research

A practical implication is to translate broad perceptions into a small set of observable monitoring indicators, designate responsibility for follow-up, and revisit these indicators at defined intervals. A stronger subsequent design would include independent measurement of relevant practices or outcomes, transparent instrument reliability evidence, clear sampling denominators and analysis at the correct respondent or school level. Such evidence would enable stronger, though still carefully bounded, claims than agreement of item rankings alone.

6. Limitations

The study's central limitations arise from a one-period perception survey, reliance on summary statistics, potential common-rater bias, and limited information on the psychometric performance of the measurement instrument. District- or school-group Kendall concordance indicates ordering similarity but does not establish effect magnitude, student-level improvement, employee-level performance change or temporal precedence. Exact p values, confidence intervals and analytic data were not consistently available. The manuscript consequently avoids unsupported causal conclusions and treats unverified statistical labels as reported.

7. Conclusion

The study reported favorable monitoring-and-coaching and teacher-performance ratings, while identifying meaningful practical challenges and proposed solutions. Several domain rankings showed interdistrict concordance. The evidence supports structured

post-observation feedback, practical scheduling and coaching capacity development, but no individual causal change in teachers' performance can be inferred from the survey alone.

The recommended next step is independent verification of the sample denominator, scale coding, statistical computation and the evidence needed to substantiate any stronger effectiveness or impact claim. Until such verification, the results should be considered a detailed descriptive basis for local review and hypothesis generation.

References

[1] Department of Education. (2015). Guidelines on the establishment and implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education (DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/02/06/do-2-s-2015-guidelines-on-the-establishment-and-implementation-of-the-results-based-performance-management-system-rpms-in-the-department-of-education/

[2] Department of Education. (2017). National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2017/08/11/do-42-s-2017-national-adoption-and-implementation-of-the-philippine-professional-standards-for-teachers-2/

[3] Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. Review of Educational Research, 88(4), 547–588. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268

[4] Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management, 40(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077