

The School Heads' Instructional Leadership Practices in Improving the School Performance in the Public Elementary Schools in Sipocot South District, Division of Camarines Sur

Violeta P. Lanuza¹

¹School of Graduate Studies and Research, University of Northeastern Philippines

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
Article history: Published: October 2026	The study examined school heads' instructional leadership practices and perceived school performance in public elementary schools in Sipocot South District, Division of Camarines Sur, during school year 2025–2026. A descriptive-evaluative-correlational design was used. A formulated and validated modified questionnaire was completed by 15 school heads and 15 Teachers' Organization presidents, for 30 respondents. Weighted means and ranks described six leadership domains and six performance domains; Kendall's coefficient of concordance and chi-square comparisons assessed agreement among four sectors at the 0.05 level. Curriculum implementation received the highest leadership domain rating (4.64, Very Much Practiced), while educational technology received the lowest (4.32, Much Practiced). Academic performance (3.66, Much Evident) and learning environment (3.60, Much Evident) were rated above the other performance domains. Learners' discipline received the lowest domain rating (3.33, Evident). Significant agreement was reported only for instructional supervision and feedback ($\chi^2 = 17.28$, $df = 9$). No performance domain showed significant agreement. The findings support context-sensitive planning, focused instructional support, parent participation, and coordinated resource provision. These ratings describe perceived practices and performance; the agreement tests do not estimate a causal effect of leadership or a correlation between leadership and achievement.
Keywords: Instructional Leadership School Performance School Heads Elementary Education Kendall Concordance Sipocot South District	

1. Introduction

Instructional leadership concerns how school heads organize the conditions in which teachers teach and learners learn. Curriculum alignment, supervision, assessment, professional learning, educational technology, and the management of learning environments represent related but distinguishable responsibilities. Their implementation can differ across schools even within a single district. A district profile must therefore consider both the level of reported practice and whether respondents prioritize the same indicators within each domain.

Hallinger (2011) located leadership for learning within organizational and community contexts and emphasized the processes through which leaders influence learning conditions. This perspective makes local context relevant to interpreting respondents' ratings. A high rating for a leadership activity can identify a perceived strength, but does not by itself establish that the activity improved achievement.

Robinson et al. (2008) examined leadership and student outcomes through a synthesis of published studies. Their framework includes strategic resourcing, curriculum coordination, teacher learning, and an orderly environment. These areas provide a useful basis for interpreting the domains examined in the study. They also indicate why instructional leadership should be evaluated through specific practices rather than treated as a single administrative trait.

Leithwood et al. (2020) revisited evidence about successful school leadership, including the importance of context and the pathways connecting leadership with school processes. Such research supports examining leadership alongside teaching conditions and organizational capacity. It does not warrant importing international effect estimates into a small local survey or interpreting agreement among raters as evidence of improved student outcomes.

In Sipocot South District, the study addressed how extensively school heads practiced six dimensions of instructional leadership and how respondents perceived performance in academic achievement, instructional quality, learning environment, learners' discipline, stakeholders' collaboration, and resource management. It also asked whether the four sectors significantly agreed on the rank ordering of indicators within each domain. The final objective was to formulate policy recommendations grounded in the observed priorities.

The study contributes a local descriptive profile and a comparison of sector rankings. Its practical value lies in identifying areas for school and district deliberation. Separating ratings of leadership activity from ratings of school performance is necessary because the two sets of measures represent different judgments. Likewise, agreement within a domain and a relationship between domains are different statistical questions.

2. Methods

2.1 Research design and setting

The study used a descriptive-evaluative-correlational research design in the public elementary schools of Sipocot South District, Division of Camarines Sur. The period identified was school year 2025–2026. Descriptive ratings addressed the extent of instructional leadership

practice and the perceived evidence of school performance. The reported inferential analyses assessed concordance among sector rankings within domains; they did not provide a direct test of the relationship between leadership scores and performance scores.

2.2 Participants and instrument

The respondents were 15 school heads and 15 Teachers' Organization presidents, totaling 30. The results were organized into four sectors labeled Sector 1, Sector 2, Sector 3, and Sector 4. These sector labels are retained as reported. The number of respondents within each sector and their allocation by respondent role were not specified. Consequently, sector contrasts are not interpreted as comparisons between school heads and teacher representatives.

The study used a formulated and validated modified questionnaire. Leadership practices were organized into six domains: support for curriculum implementation; instructional supervision and feedback; assessment of learning outcomes; promoting professional learning; integration of educational technology; and management of learning environments. The performance section covered academic performance, instructional quality, learning environment, learners' discipline, stakeholders' collaboration, and resource management. The indicator wording is retained in the results tables.

The questionnaire was accomplished by the respondents in the participating public elementary schools. The available methodological account did not specify a sampling procedure, response rate, administration dates, validation panel or criteria, reliability coefficient, or procedures for missing responses. These details cannot be inferred from the reported sample size or from the statement that the instrument was validated. No unreported recruitment or validation procedure is assumed.

2.3 Scoring and statistical analysis

The statistical tools identified for the study were weighted mean, standard deviation, frequency, percentage, rank order, and Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W). The findings presented weighted means, interpretation codes, ranks, and concordance statistics. No unreported standard deviations, respondent frequencies, or individual scores have been reconstructed. Practice ratings used the reported intervals 4.50–5.00, Very Much Practiced; 3.50–4.49, Much Practiced; 2.50–3.49, Practiced; 1.50–2.49, Fairly Practiced; and 1.00–1.49, Not At All.

Performance tables use Very Much Evident (VME), Much Evident (ME), and Evident (E). Interpretation codes, decimal precision, and tied ranks are reproduced as reported, including instances of the code MI. Each rating cell in Tables 1–7 and 9–15 combines the weighted mean, interpretation, and rank to retain the sector and average results in a readable format. The statistical tables preserve all reported comparison thresholds and decisions.

Kendall's W was used to examine agreement in rank ordering across the four sectors. The stated significance level was 0.05. Chi-square statistics were compared with tabular values using the reported degrees of freedom. The original decision labels "Accepted" and "Rejected" are retained in the tables. A nonsignificant result is interpreted as insufficient evidence of concordance at the stated level, rather than proof that every sector disagreed or that the practices were ineffective.

The analysis was confined to the reported aggregate results. No individual-level data, school-level achievement series, pretest–posttest comparison, or intervention allocation was reported. Accordingly, the title's reference to improving performance is treated as the study's substantive focus, rather than an established causal finding. Research ethics approval, informed consent procedures, and data protection arrangements were not specified in the available methodological account.

3. Results

The results first describe instructional leadership practices, followed by sector concordance. Perceived school performance and its concordance tests are then presented. All numerical entries and interpretation labels in the tables retain their reported form. Overall summary rows and inferential statistics are presented without recalculation; their implications are interpreted within the limits of the reported measures.

Table 1. Support for curriculum implementation

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Provides adequate instructional materials and digital resources.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 4.5	4.80 VMP / 3	4.50 VMP / 2	4.70 VMP / 3
2. Monitors the alignment of daily lesson plans with the prescribed national curriculum standards.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 4.5	4.90 VMP / 1.5	4.50 VMP / 2	4.73 VMP / 1.5
3. Organizes collaborative planning sessions for teachers.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 4.5	4.90 VMP / 1.5	4.50 VMP / 2	4.73 VMP / 1.5
4. Allocates funds for the procurement of supplementary learning modules.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.40 MP / 7.5	4.60 VMP / 7	3.92 MP / 9	4.48 MP / 9
5. Encourages the use of innovative pedagogical approaches suited for the diverse needs of learners.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 4.5	4.60 VMP / 7	4.42 MP / 5	4.63 VMP / 6
6. Facilitates school-based learning action cells (SLAC).	5.00 VMP / 5	4.60 VMP / 1.5	4.60 VMP / 7	4.36 MP / 7	4.64 VMP / 5
7. Ensures that the school's learning environment is safe and conducive.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.60 VMP / 1.5	4.60 VMP / 7	4.42 MP / 5	4.66 VMP / 4
8. Tracks achievement data to identify areas where the curriculum needs adjustment.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.20 MP / 9	4.70 VMP / 4	4.33 MP / 8	4.56 VMP / 8

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
9. Supports the localization and contextualization of lesson content.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.40 MP / 7.5	4.60 VMP / 7	4.42 MP / 5	4.61 VMP / 7
Average	5.00 VMP	4.47 MP	4.70 VMP	4.37 MP	4.64 VMP

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VMP = Very Much Practiced; MP = Much Practiced.

Curriculum implementation received a domain average of 4.64, classified as Very Much Practiced. Planning and alignment activities were prominent strengths, whereas supplementary learning-module funding had the lowest average rank. The contrast suggests that maintaining formal curricular alignment and securing supplementary materials are distinct tasks. Sector 1 reported uniformly high scores, while the other sectors differentiated more among indicators. This pattern supports examining resource provision alongside planning routines, without assuming that uniform maximum ratings indicate superior independently measured performance.

Table 2. Instructional supervision and feedback

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Provides immediate and constructive feedback to teachers.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.60 VMP / 1	4.50 VMP / 4	4.08 MP / 4.5	4.55 VMP / 3
2. Schedules post-observation conferences to discuss strengths and areas for improvement in teaching.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 3	4.60 VMP / 1.5	4.17 MP / 2	4.57 VMP / 1.5
3. Uses clinical supervision techniques to help teachers address the specific needs of learners.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 3	4.60 VMP / 1.5	4.17 MP / 2	4.57 VMP / 1.5
4. Checks teacher-made logs and records to ensure consistent progress tracking of learners.	4.50 VMP / 10	4.20 MP / 10	4.50 VMP / 4	3.50 MP / 10	4.18 MP / 10
5. Suggests remedial teaching strategies for teachers handling struggling learners.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.30 MP / 8.5	4.30 MP / 10	3.92 MP / 9	4.38 MP / 9
6. Maintains an open-door policy for teachers seeking advice on managing learner behavior.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.30 MP / 8.5	4.40 MP / 7.5	4.00 MP / 7	4.43 MP / 8
7. Demonstrates effective teaching techniques through actual classroom modeling.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 3	4.50 VMP / 4	4.08 MP / 4.5	4.52 VMP / 4
8. Utilizes observation data to collaboratively set professional growth goals with teachers.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.40 MP / 6	4.40 MP / 7.5	4.17 MP / 2	4.49 MP / 5
9. Encourages peer-to-peer observation and feedback among faculty members.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.40 MP / 6	4.40 MP / 7.5	4.00 MP / 7	4.45 MP / 6.5
10. Provides immediate and constructive feedback to teachers.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.40 MP / 6	4.40 MP / 7.5	4.00 MP / 7	4.45 MP / 6.5
Average	4.95 VMP	4.41 MP	4.46 MP	4.01 MP	4.46 MP

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VMP = Very Much Practiced; MP = Much Practiced.

The domain average was 4.46, Much Practiced. The sector means indicate that supervision was experienced differently across the district: Sector 1 remained near the upper scale boundary, whereas Sector 4 reported a lower domain mean. The indicators distinguish observation and feedback from the monitoring of records and instructional follow-through. These results make consistency of the supervision cycle a relevant planning issue. An observation schedule alone cannot establish whether feedback was acted upon or improved classroom teaching.

Table 3. Assessment of learning outcomes

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Analyzes periodic test results.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.40 MP / 7	4.60 VMP / 3.5	4.25 MP / 2.5	4.56 VMP / 2
2. Leads faculty meetings to discuss the assessment data and performance of learners.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.60 VMP / 1.5	4.70 VMP / 1	4.25 MP / 2.5	4.64 VMP / 1
3. Directs the development of localized assessment tools.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.40 MP / 7	4.50 VMP / 6	4.25 MP / 2.5	4.54 VMP / 5.5
4. Ensures that assessment results are communicated promptly to the parents.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.60 VMP / 1.5	4.60 VMP / 3.5	4.00 MP / 8	4.55 VMP / 3.5

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
5. Monitors the implementation of remediation programs.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.44 MP / 4	4.60 VMP / 3.5	4.17 MP / 5.5	4.55 VMP / 3.5
6. Encourages the use of authentic assessment methods.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 3	4.40 MP / 7.5	4.25 MP / 2.5	4.54 VMP / 5.5
7. Verifies the accuracy and integrity of grading systems used.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.40 MP / 7	4.60 VMP / 3.5	3.75 MP / 9	4.44 MP / 9
8. Uses assessment data to inform school-wide instructional planning.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.40 MP / 7	4.40 MP / 7.5	4.17 MP / 5.5	4.49 MP / 7
9. Recognizes teachers who effectively implement innovative assessment strategies.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.40 MP / 7	4.30 MP / 9	4.08 MP / 7	4.45 MP / 8
Average	5.00 VMP	4.46 MP	4.52 VMP	4.13 MP	4.53 VMP

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VMP = Very Much Practiced; MP = Much Practiced.

Assessment practices were rated Very Much Practiced overall, with an average of 4.53. The indicators address the organization and use of assessment, so their ratings concern administrative and instructional support around assessment rather than verified gains in learner attainment. The sector profile suggests that a common assessment expectation may coexist with different perceptions of implementation. Reviewing grading templates and progress records can therefore be considered alongside the substantive use of assessment evidence for instructional decisions.

Table 4. Promoting professional learning

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Identifies the training needs of teachers.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.60 VMP / 1.5	4.60 VMP / 2	4.08 MP / 1.5	4.57 VMP / 1
2. Encourages teachers to attend seminars and workshops.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 4.5	4.60 VMP / 2	3.92 MP / 6	4.51 VMP / 3
3. Supports the pursuit of graduate studies to improve the quality of education.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.60 VMP / 1.5	4.60 VMP / 2	3.92 MP / 6	4.53 VMP / 2
4. Provides time for teachers to engage in peer-coaching.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 4.5	4.50 VMP / 4.5	3.92 MP / 6	4.48 MP / 4.5
5. Recognizes teachers who implement innovative projects.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.40 MP / 7	4.30 MP / 8	3.83 MP / 9	4.38 MP / 8.5
6. Allocates school resources to build a professional library for teachers of learners.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.20 MP / 9	4.30 MP / 8	4.00 MP / 3	4.38 MP / 8.5
7. Facilitates the sharing of best practices among staff to improve learner outcomes.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 4.5	4.50 VMP / 4.5	3.92 MP / 6	4.48 MP / 4.5
8. Invites educational experts to speak on modern trends in teaching today's learners.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 4.5	4.30 MP / 8	3.92 MP / 6	4.43 MP / 7
9. Promotes a culture of continuous research to solve problems faced by learners.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.30 MP / 8	4.40 MP / 6	4.08 MP / 1.5	4.45 MP / 6
Average	5.00 VMP	4.46 MP	4.46 MP	3.95 MP	4.47 MP

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VMP = Very Much Practiced; MP = Much Practiced.

Professional learning received 4.47, Much Practiced. Identifying training needs was more strongly rated than recognizing innovation or building a professional library. This distinction suggests that diagnosing development needs does not automatically ensure the resources and follow-up needed to meet them. Robinson et al. (2008) identified teacher learning as a relevant leadership dimension. In the study, the ratings provide a reason to examine how needs assessment connects with peer support and accessible professional resources; they do not measure the effectiveness of particular training activities.

Table 5. Integration of educational technology

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Acquires digital tools and software that enhance the interactive experience of learners.	5.00 VMP / 5.5	4.40 MP / 5	4.20 MP / 9	3.67 MP / 6.5	4.32 MP / 5

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
2. Assists teachers in utilizing ICT to simplify complex concepts for learners.	5.00 VMP / 5.5	4.40 MP / 5	4.20 MP / 9	3.42 P / 11	4.26 MP / 10
3. Monitors the regular use of computer laboratories or gadgets by the learners.	4.50 VMP / 11	4.30 MP / 9.5	4.30 MP / 4	3.50 MP / 9.5	4.15 MP / 11
4. Promotes the use of online platforms for supplemental learning.	5.00 VMP / 5.5	4.40 MP / 5	4.20 MP / 9	3.58 MP / 8	4.30 MP / 7.5
5. Ensures that teachers are trained in using technology.	5.00 VMP / 5.5	4.40 MP / 5	4.30 MP / 4	3.75 MP / 3.5	4.36 MP / 2.5
6. Advocates for stable internet connectivity.	5.00 VMP / 5.5	4.40 MP / 5	4.20 MP / 9	3.75 MP / 3.5	4.34 MP / 4
7. Provides technical assistance to teachers experiencing difficulties with educational technology.	5.00 VMP / 5.5	4.40 MP / 5	4.30 MP / 4	3.50 MP / 9.5	4.30 MP / 7.5
8. Establishes partnerships to secure additional technological resources for the school.	5.00 VMP / 5.5	4.30 MP / 9.5	4.20 MP / 9	3.75 MP / 3.5	4.31 MP / 6
9. Sets clear policies for the responsible and ethical use of technology by learners and teachers.	5.00 VMP / 5.5	4.40 MP / 5	4.30 MP / 4	3.75 MP / 3.5	4.36 MP / 2.5
10. Allocates school funds for the maintenance and repair of technological equipment.	5.00 VMP / 5.5	4.20 MP / 11	4.30 MP / 4	3.67 MP / 6.5	4.29 MP / 9
11. Encourages the creation and sharing of digital instructional materials among teachers.	5.00 VMP / 5.5	4.50 VMP / 1	4.50 VMP / 1	4.25 MP / 1	4.56 VMP / 1
Average	4.95 VMP	4.37 MP	4.27 MP	3.69 MP	4.32 MP

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VMP = Very Much Practiced; MP = Much Practiced.

Educational technology had the lowest leadership domain mean, 4.32, although it remained Much Practiced. The sector distribution is especially relevant because a district average can conceal differences in reported access, assistance, and implementation. The results support giving attention to the routines that sustain technology use, including technical help and equipment management. They do not identify whether lower ratings arose from connectivity, equipment shortages, staff confidence, or competing demands; those explanations require direct investigation.

Table 6. Management of learning environments

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Ensures that classrooms are physically safe and conducive.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.80 VMP / 1	4.70 VMP / 1.5	3.92 MP / 7	4.61 VMP / 3
2. Oversees the cleanliness and orderliness of facilities.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.70 VMP / 3.5	4.70 VMP / 1.5	3.92 MP / 7	4.58 VMP / 5
3. Enforces school-wide discipline policies that protect the rights of learners.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.70 VMP / 3.5	4.60 VMP / 5	3.92 MP / 7	4.56 VMP / 6
4. Provides adequate space and furniture.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 8.5	4.50 VMP / 8	3.75 MP / 9	4.44 MP / 9
5. Promotes a positive school climate that fosters the emotional well-being of learners.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.60 VMP / 6.5	4.60 VMP / 5	4.33 MP / 1	4.63 VMP / 1
6. Manages the proper ventilation and lighting in areas where the learners study.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.60 VMP / 6.5	4.40 MP / 9	4.00 MP / 4.5	4.50 VMP / 8
7. Establishes emergency and disaster preparedness protocols in the school.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.50 VMP / 8.5	4.60 VMP / 5	4.00 MP / 4.5	4.53 VMP / 7
8. Coordinates with the community to maintain a peaceful environment.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.70 VMP / 3.5	4.60 VMP / 5	4.17 MP / 2	4.62 VMP / 2
9. Ensures that school facilities are accessible and inclusive for learners with diverse needs.	5.00 VMP / 5	4.70 VMP / 3.5	4.60 VMP / 5	4.08 MP / 3	4.60 VMP / 4
Average	5.00 VMP	4.64 VMP	4.59 VMP	4.01 MP	4.56 VMP

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VMP = Very Much Practiced; MP = Much Practiced.

Management of learning environments received 4.56, Very Much Practiced. The domain addresses conditions intended to support teaching and learning, extending leadership beyond curriculum documents and lesson supervision. The lower mean in Sector 4 indicates that the favorable district profile should not erase local concerns. Maintaining safe, supportive environments requires attention to the conditions reported by individual schools. The ratings represent perceptions of management activity and should not substitute for a facilities inspection or a direct assessment of learner well-being.

Table 7. Summary of instructional leadership practices

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Support for curriculum implementation	5.00 VMP / 2.5	4.47 MP / 2	4.70 VMP / 1	4.37 MP / 1	4.64 VMP / 1
2. Instructional supervision and feedback	4.95 VMP / 5.5	4.41 MP / 5	4.46 MP / 4.5	4.01 MP / 3.5	4.46 MP / 5
3. Assessment of learning outcomes	5.00 VMP / 2.5	4.46 MP / 3.5	4.52 VMP / 3	4.13 MP / 2	4.53 VMP / 3
4. Promoting professional learning	5.00 VMP / 2.5	4.46 MP / 3.5	4.46 MP / 4.5	3.95 MP / 5	4.47 MP / 4
5. Integration of educational technology	4.95 VMP / 5.5	4.37 MP / 6	4.27 MP / 6	3.69 MP / 6	4.32 MP / 6
6. Management of learning environments	5.00 VMP / 2.5	4.64 VMP / 1	4.59 VMP / 2	4.01 MP / 3.5	4.56 VMP / 2
Average	5.00 VMP	4.64 VMP	4.59 VMP	4.01 MP	4.56 VMP

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VMP = Very Much Practiced; MP = Much Practiced.

The domain ordering places curriculum implementation first and technology integration sixth. This identifies a relative priority within an otherwise favorable practice profile. The reported Average row repeats the values shown for management of learning environments; it is retained rather than treated as an independently verified grand mean. Thus, domain comparisons provide a firmer descriptive basis than the overall row. The study's general conclusion characterized leadership as Much Practiced, while this summary row carries a Very Much Practiced label. A single unqualified overall classification would obscure that discrepancy.

Table 8. Agreement on instructional leadership rankings

Domain	Squared deviation	Items	W	χ^2	df	Ho	Agreement
Support for Curriculum Implementation	261.5	9	0.28	8.96	8	Accepted	Not Significant
Instructional Supervision and Feedback	624	10	0.47	17.28	9	Rejected	0.05
Assessment of Learning Outcomes	225.5	9	0.23	7.68	8	Accepted	Not Significant
Promoting Professional Learning	255	9	0.27	8.64	8	Accepted	Not Significant
Integration of Educational Technology	493	11	0.28	11.6	10	Accepted	Not Significant
Management of Learning Environments	222.5	9	0.23	7.68	8	Accepted	Not Significant

Table 8 continued. Reported tabular chi-square values

Domain	0.05	0.025	0.01	0.005	0.001
Support for Curriculum Implementation	15.51	18.17	20.09	21.96	26.12
Instructional Supervision and Feedback	16.92	19.68	21.67	23.59	27.88
Assessment of Learning Outcomes	15.51	18.17	20.09	21.96	26.12
Promoting Professional Learning	15.51	18.17	20.09	21.96	26.12

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Domain	0.05	0.025	0.01	0.005	0.001
Integration of Educational Technology	18.31	20.48	23.21	25.19	29.59
Management of Learning Environments	15.51	18.17	20.09	21.96	26.12

Note. Squared deviation refers to the reported summation of squared deviation. W = Kendall's coefficient of concordance; χ^2 = computed chi-square; df = degrees of freedom. H_0 and agreement reproduce the reported decision and significance labels. The significance level used for the study was 0.05.

Only instructional supervision and feedback exceeded the reported 0.05 chi-square threshold: 17.28 against 16.92, with 9 degrees of freedom. The table reports $W = 0.47$ for this domain. The other domains did not show significant concordance. This result concerns similarity in indicator rankings; it does not mean that supervision was more effective than curriculum support. Nor does nonsignificance prove opposing views. Different rating levels, tied rankings, and the small number of sector rank profiles limit what can be concluded about consensus.

Table 9. Academic performance

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Helps increase the overall passing rate of learners in quarterly examinations.	3.00 E / 7.5	3.80 ME / 7.5	3.90 ME / 3	3.50 ME / 7	3.55 ME / 7
2. Leads to measurable improvements in learners' national or division achievement test scores.	3.00 E / 7.5	3.80 ME / 7.5	3.90 ME / 3	3.58 ME / 2	3.57 ME / 6
3. Effectively reduces the number of learners who are at risk of failing.	3.50 ME / 5	3.90 ME / 3.5	3.90 ME / 3	3.58 ME / 2	3.72 ME / 5
4. Ensures that more learners reach "proficient" or "advanced" academic performance levels.	2.50 E / 10	3.70 ME / 10	3.80 ME / 5.5	3.50 ME / 7	3.38 E / 10
5. Improves the numeracy and problem-solving skills of the learners.	3.00 E / 7.5	3.80 ME / 7.5	3.70 ME / 8	3.50 ME / 7	3.50 ME / 8.5
6. Enhances the reading and literacy levels of learners across all grade levels.	4.00 ME / 3	3.90 ME / 3.5	3.80 ME / 5.5	3.50 ME / 7	3.80 ME / 3
7. Motivates teachers to use data-driven remediation programs for struggling learners.	4.50 VME / 1	3.80 ME / 7.5	3.70 ME / 8	3.50 ME / 7	3.88 ME / 2
8. Boosts the school's overall academic standing and learner performance compared to previous school years.	4.00 ME / 3	3.90 ME / 3.5	3.70 ME / 8	3.50 ME / 7	3.78 ME / 4
9. Results in the timely graduation or promotion of learners to the next grade level.	3.00 E / 7.5	3.90 ME / 3.5	3.60 ME / 10	3.50 ME / 7	3.50 ME / 8.5
10. Encourages the consistent tracking and monitoring of learner academic progress.	4.00 MI / 3	4.10 ME / 1	4.00 ME / 1	3.58 ME / 2	3.92 ME / 1
Average	3.45 E	3.86 ME	3.80 ME	3.52 ME	3.66 ME

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VME = Very Much Evident; ME = Much Evident; E = Evident. MI is retained where reported.

Academic performance received 3.66, Much Evident, the highest performance domain mean. The indicators concern perceived academic conditions and outcomes, including remediation and learner attainment. These are questionnaire judgments rather than an independently analyzed achievement dataset. The pattern gives a basis for reviewing both support for struggling learners and opportunities for higher-achieving learners. It cannot establish how much achievement changed, whether improvement was sustained, or whether leadership accounted for any change.

Table 10. Instructional quality

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Results in the timely and constructive checking of learners' performance tasks.	3.00 E / 3.5	4.10 ME / 1.5	3.90 ME / 7	3.33 E / 6	3.58 ME / 2
2. Leads to the use of more effective and creative teaching strategies in the classroom.	3.00 E / 3.5	3.90 ME / 4	3.90 ME / 7	3.42 E / 1.5	3.56 ME / 4
3. Encourages teachers to use localized or contextualized examples during discussions.	3.00 E / 3.5	3.70 ME / 9	4.00 ME / 2.5	3.42 E / 1.5	3.53 ME / 5.5
4. Helps teachers align their daily lesson plans with prescribed curriculum standards.	3.00 E / 3.5	4.00 ME / 3	4.00 ME / 2.5	3.33 E / 6	3.58 ME / 2

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
5. Encourages teachers to use a variety of instructional materials to fit different learning styles.	3.00 E / 3.5	4.10 ME / 1.5	3.90 ME / 7	3.33 E / 6	3.58 ME / 2
6. Ensures that classroom instruction directly addresses the diverse needs of learners.	2.50 E / 7.5	3.80 ME / 6.5	3.90 ME / 7	3.33 E / 6	3.38 E / 8
7. Motivates teachers to constantly improve their mastery of the subjects they teach.	2.50 E / 7.5	3.80 ME / 6.5	4.00 ME / 2.5	3.25 E / 10	3.39 E / 7
8. Enhances the overall delivery and effectiveness of daily classroom instruction.	2.00 FE / 9.5	3.80 ME / 6.5	3.70 ME / 10	3.33 E / 6	3.21 E / 9.5
9. Drives teachers to design lessons that encourage learners to think critically.	2.00 FE / 9.5	3.60 ME / 10	3.90 ME / 7	3.33 E / 6	3.21 E / 9.5
10. Promotes the sharing of best teaching practices during grade-level or department meetings.	3.00 E / 3.5	3.80 ME / 6.5	4.00 ME / 2.5	3.33 E / 6	3.53 ME / 5.5
Average	2.70 E	3.86 ME	3.92 ME	3.34 E	3.46 E

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VME = Very Much Evident; ME = Much Evident; E = Evident. MI is retained where reported.

Instructional quality received 3.46, Evident. Sector 1 reported the lowest domain mean, whereas Sectors 2 and 3 reported Much Evident ratings. This distribution differs from the leadership-practice profile, where Sector 1 consistently gave very high ratings. The contrast is analytically important: respondents can perceive frequent leadership activity without giving equally strong ratings to teaching conditions. It suggests that the content and follow-through of instructional support warrant examination, while the aggregate data cannot test a statistical relationship between the two constructs.

Table 11. Learning environment

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Promotes a positive, inclusive, and welcoming school atmosphere for all learners.	3.50 ME / 5	4.00 ME / 3.5	3.60 ME / 11	3.08 E / 9.5	3.55 ME / 10
2. Ensures that classroom seating arrangements support active learner participation.	3.50 ME / 5	4.10 ME / 1	3.80 ME / 10	3.17 E / 6.5	3.64 ME / 3.5
3. Helps minimize external noise and distractions during class hours.	3.50 ME / 5	3.80 ME / 8.5	3.90 ME / 7.5	3.08 E / 9.5	3.57 ME / 8
4. Results in a school environment where learners feel emotionally safe and happy to learn.	3.00 E / 10.5	3.80 ME / 8.5	4.00 ME / 3	3.08 E / 9.5	3.47 E / 11
5. Provides clean and accessible washing and restroom facilities for learners.	3.50 ME / 5	3.70 ME / 10.5	4.00 ME / 3	3.17 E / 6.5	3.59 ME / 6.5
6. Encourages the setup of functional reading corners and learning centers in classrooms.	3.50 ME / 5	4.00 ME / 3.5	3.90 ME / 7.5	3.08 E / 9.5	3.62 ME / 5
7. Motivates teachers to establish clear and positive classroom routines.	3.50 ME / 5	3.90 ME / 6.5	4.00 ME / 3	3.25 E / 3	3.66 ME / 2
8. Keeps the school campus secure and free from physical hazards or dangers.	3.50 ME / 5	3.70 ME / 10.5	3.90 ME / 7.5	3.25 E / 3	3.59 ME / 6.5
9. Helps maintain well-ventilated and well-lighted spaces that are conducive to learning.	3.50 ME / 5	3.90 ME / 6.5	3.90 ME / 7.5	3.25 E / 3	3.64 ME / 3.5
10. Ensures that classrooms are physically clean, safe, and orderly for learners.	3.50 ME / 5	4.00 ME / 3.5	4.00 ME / 3	3.25 E / 3	3.69 ME / 1
11. Fosters a learning space that is free from any form of discrimination or bullying.	3.00 E / 10.5	4.00 ME / 3.5	4.00 ME / 3	3.25 E / 3	3.56 ME / 9
Average	3.41 E	3.90 ME	3.91 ME	3.17 E	3.60 ME

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VME = Very Much Evident; ME = Much Evident; E = Evident. MI is retained where reported.

The learning environment was rated 3.60, Much Evident. This favorable assessment coexisted with lower sector ratings, particularly in Sector 4. Leadership activity devoted to managing the environment and the experienced quality of that environment are related

concepts, but they are not identical measures. The result supports school-level checks of physical safety, emotional support, and access to learning conditions. A district-wide label should therefore be accompanied by attention to specific local priorities rather than applied uniformly to every school.

Table 12. Learners' discipline

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Promotes the active use of positive discipline strategies instead of punishments.	2.50 E / 8.5	3.90 ME / 1	3.70 ME / 3.5	3.33 E / 5.5	3.36 E / 5
2. Helps learners develop a strong sense of responsibility for their own actions.	2.00 FE / 11	3.80 ME / 3	3.70 ME / 3.5	3.33 E / 5.5	3.21 E / 10
3. Effectively reduces the rate of learner absenteeism and tardiness.	2.50 E / 8.5	3.80 ME / 3	3.70 ME / 3.5	3.45 E / 1	3.36 E / 5
4. Leads to the clear implementation of the school's code of conduct for learners.	3.00 E / 3.5	3.70 ME / 5.5	3.70 ME / 3.5	3.33 E / 5.5	3.43 E / 1
5. Decreases the number of behavioral infractions or misconduct cases in school.	3.00 E / 3.5	3.40 E / 11	3.60 ME / 9	3.33 E / 5.5	3.33 E / 8
6. Ensures that the guidance office or counseling services actively support learners.	3.00 E / 3.5	3.60 ME / 7.5	3.60 ME / 9	3.42 E / 2	3.41 E / 2
7. Encourages learners to properly care for school property and facilities.	3.00 E / 3.5	3.50 ME / 9.5	3.60 ME / 9	3.33 E / 5.5	3.36 E / 5
8. Motivates learners to practice honesty in taking examinations and doing schoolwork.	2.50 E / 8.5	3.60 ME / 7.5	3.60 ME / 9	3.33 E / 5.5	3.26 E / 9
9. Strengthens the cooperation between teachers and parents in correcting learner behavior.	2.50 E / 8.5	3.80 MI / 3	3.60 MI / 9	2.83 E / 11	3.18 E / 11
10. Results in peaceful and orderly movements of learners outside the classrooms.	3.00 E / 3.5	3.70 MI / 5.5	3.70 MI / 3.5	3.17 E / 9.5	3.39 E / 3
11. Encourages learners to show respect toward teachers, school staff, and peers.	3.00 E / 3.5	3.50 MI / 9.5	3.70 MI / 3.5	3.17 E / 9.5	3.34 E / 7
Average	2.73 E	3.66 MI	3.65 MI	3.27 E	3.33 E

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VME = Very Much Evident; ME = Much Evident; E = Evident. MI is retained where reported.

Learners' discipline had the lowest domain mean, 3.33, Evident. The rating indicates a relative area for attention rather than a measured prevalence of misconduct. Sector means and indicator rankings can help schools identify which routines need discussion with teachers and parents. The reported MI codes are retained in the sector results without redefining the scale. The practical response proposed by the study emphasizes early parent involvement, consistent behavioral routines, and emotional support; the survey did not evaluate the effects of those responses.

Table 13. Stakeholders' collaboration

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Creates opportunities for stakeholders to volunteer in school activities.	3.00 E / 6.5	3.90 ME / 1.5	3.60 ME / 8	2.83 E / 8	3.33 E / 6
2. Encourages local businesses and private donors to sponsor school programs and projects.	3.00 E / 6.5	3.70 ME / 5.5	3.70 ME / 5	2.83 E / 8	3.31 E / 8
3. Leads to collaborative feeding programs or health projects with community partners.	3.00 E / 6.5	3.80 ME / 3	3.50 ME / 10	3.00 E / 2	3.33 E / 6
4. Maintains a high level of trust and cooperation between the school and the community.	3.00 E / 6.5	3.90 ME / 1.5	3.60 ME / 8	2.83 E / 8	3.33 E / 6
5. Builds strong relationships with alumni to support school improvement initiatives.	3.00 E / 6.5	3.70 ME / 5.5	3.60 ME / 8	2.83 E / 8	3.28 E / 9
6. Keeps parents regularly updated on school achievements, activities, and challenges.	3.50 ME / 1.5	3.70 ME / 5.5	3.70 ME / 5	2.92 E / 4	3.46 E / 2.5
7. Strengthens the partnership between the school and the General PTA (Parent-Teacher Association).	3.50 ME / 1.5	3.60 ME / 8.5	3.80 ME / 3	2.92 E / 4	3.46 E / 2.5

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
8. Involves community members in school planning and decision- making processes.	3.00 E / 6.5	3.40 E / 10	3.70 ME / 5	2.83 E / 8	3.23 E / 10
9. Secures active support and assistance from the Local Government Unit (LGU) or Barangay Council.	3.00 E / 6.5	3.60 ME / 8.5	3.90 ME / 2	2.92 E / 4	3.36 E / 4
10. Increases the active attendance of parents during Brigada Eskwela and school assemblies.	3.00 E / 6.5	3.70 ME / 5.5	4.10 ME / 1	3.08 E / 1	3.47 E / 1
Average	3.10 E	3.70 ME	3.72 ME	2.90 E	3.36 E

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VME = Very Much Evident; ME = Much Evident; E = Evident. MI is retained where reported.

Stakeholders' collaboration received 3.36, Evident. The spread of sector means shows that opportunities for participation were not perceived equally across the district. Partnership with the General PTA was among the visible components, but participation in meetings alone cannot establish shared influence over planning. The study's recommendations to involve parents in working committees and stakeholders in improvement projects address this distinction. These proposals should be understood as responses to the rating profile, not as tested explanations for school performance.

Table 14. Resource management

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Practices transparency and accountability in reporting school financial expenses.	3.00 E / 6	3.90 ME / 2.5	3.80 ME / 4	3.08 E / 6	3.45 E / 3.5
2. Allocates resources efficiently to prevent the wastage of school water, electricity, and supplies.	3.00 E / 6	3.70 ME / 6.5	3.80 ME / 4	3.17 E / 2	3.42 E / 6
3. Guarantees that classroom furniture (chairs, desks, blackboards) is well- maintained.	3.00 E / 6	4.10 ME / 1	3.60 ME / 9	3.08 E / 6	3.45 E / 3.5
4. Ensures that ICT equipment (laptops, projectors, smart TVs) is functional and accessible.	3.00 E / 6	3.80 ME / 5	3.80 ME / 4	3.17 E / 2	3.44 E / 5
5. Maximizes the use of the school MOOE (Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses) budget for learner needs.	3.00 E / 6	3.70 ME / 6.5	3.70 ME / 7.5	3.17 E / 2	3.39 E / 8
6. Provides teachers with necessary teaching supplies, papers, and printing materials.	3.00 E / 6	3.60 ME / 8.5	3.90 ME / 1	3.08 E / 6	3.40 E / 7
7. Successfully sources additional funds or materials for school repairs and facilities upgrades.	3.00 E / 6	3.60 ME / 8.5	3.80 ME / 4	3.08 E / 6	3.37 E / 9
8. Promotes the proper storage, inventory, and tracking of school properties.	3.50 ME / 1.5	3.90 ME / 2.5	3.80 ME / 4	3.08 E / 6	3.57 ME / 1
9. Ensures the fair and equal distribution of textbooks and learning materials to classrooms.	3.50 ME / 1.5	3.89 ME / 4	3.70 ME / 7.5	2.92 E / 9	3.50 ME / 2
Average	3.11 E	3.80 ME	3.77 ME	3.09 E	3.44 E

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VME = Very Much Evident; ME = Much Evident; E = Evident. MI is retained where reported.

Resource management received 3.44, Evident. Its indicators encompass accountability, operational efficiency, equipment, supplies, and physical assets. These activities involve both the stewardship of existing resources and the capacity to obtain additional support. Sector differences suggest that a common district expectation may require locally differentiated assistance. The findings justify reviewing how schools document needs and communicate them to partners. They do not provide expenditure records, inventory verification, or cost-effectiveness evidence with which to judge financial efficiency.

Table 15. Summary of perceived school performance

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
1. Academic Performance	3.45 E / 1	3.86 ME / 2.5	3.80 ME / 3	3.52 ME / 1	3.66 ME / 1
2. Instructional Quality	2.70 E / 6	3.86 ME / 2.5	3.92 ME / 1	3.34 E / 2	3.46 E / 3

Indicator	Sector 1	Sector 2	Sector 3	Sector 4	Average
3. Learning Environment	3.41 E / 2	3.90 ME / 1	3.91 ME / 2	3.17 E / 4	3.60 ME / 2
4. Learners' Discipline	2.73 E / 5	3.66 ME / 6	3.65 ME / 6	3.27 E / 3	3.33 E / 6
5. Stakeholders' Collaboration	3.10 E / 4	3.70 ME / 5	3.72 ME / 5	2.90 E / 6	3.36 E / 5
6. Resource Management	3.11 E / 3	3.80 ME / 4	3.77 ME / 4	3.09 E / 5	3.44 E / 4
Average	3.08 E	3.80 ME	3.80 ME	3.22 E	3.48 E

Note. Each cell reports the weighted mean, interpretation code, and rank (mean; code / rank). A rank is omitted where none is reported. VME = Very Much Evident; ME = Much Evident; E = Evident. MI is retained where reported.

Academic performance and learning environment were classified as Much Evident; the remaining four domains were Evident. The reported overall average was 3.48, Evident. This is retained alongside the study's written conclusion that performance was Much Evident, without treating the conflicting descriptions as interchangeable. The domain profile identifies discipline and stakeholder collaboration as relative priorities. It does not demonstrate that stronger leadership ratings produced stronger performance ratings, because no cross-domain association or longitudinal change analysis was reported.

Table 16. Agreement on perceived school performance rankings

Domain	Squared deviation	Items	W	χ^2	df	H ₀	Agreement
Academic Performance	532	10	0.40	14.76	9	Accepted	Not Significant
Instructional Quality	415	10	0.32	11.52	9	Accepted	Not Significant
Learning Environment	285.5	11	0.16	6.80	10	Accepted	Not Significant
Learner Discipline	279	11	0.16	6.40	10	Accepted	Not Significant
Stakeholder Collaboration	235.5	10	0.18	6.48	9	Accepted	Not Significant
Resource Management	84	9	0.09	2.88	8	Accepted	Not Significant

Table 16 continued. Reported tabular chi-square values

Domain	0.05	0.025	0.01	0.005	0.001
Academic Performance	16.92	19.68	21.67	23.59	27.88
Instructional Quality	16.92	19.68	21.67	23.59	27.88
Learning Environment	18.31	20.48	23.21	25.19	29.59
Learner Discipline	18.31	20.48	23.21	25.19	29.59
Stakeholder Collaboration	16.92	19.68	21.67	23.59	27.88
Resource Management	15.51	18.17	20.09	21.96	26.12

Note. Squared deviation refers to the reported summation of squared deviation. W = Kendall's coefficient of concordance; χ^2 = computed chi-square; df = degrees of freedom. H₀ and agreement reproduce the reported decision and significance labels. The significance level used for the study was 0.05.

All six performance-domain agreement tests were reported as nonsignificant. Academic performance had the largest computed chi-square, 14.76, but remained below the reported 0.05 threshold of 16.92. The results therefore do not establish a common sector ordering of the performance indicators at the stated level. They also do not establish complete disagreement or the absence of useful common priorities. Shared district benchmarks can be considered alongside school-specific diagnostic work, with the distinction between policy coordination and statistical concordance kept explicit.

4. Discussion

4.1 Leadership activity and perceived performance

The findings portray an active instructional leadership environment with uneven perceived performance across domains. Curriculum support, assessment, and environmental management received Very Much Practiced domain ratings. Yet instructional quality, discipline, collaboration, and resource management were classified as Evident. This difference matters because implementation frequency and experienced outcomes are separate dimensions of school functioning. A favorable practice score should prompt examination of quality and follow-through, rather than be taken as a sufficient indicator of improvement.

Hallinger's (2011) account of context and mediated leadership influence helps frame this distinction. Leadership practices operate through school processes and conditions. In the study, however, those pathways were not estimated. The juxtaposition of high

practice ratings and more moderate performance ratings is therefore a descriptive observation, not evidence that a particular mediating process succeeded or failed.

The findings also make the distribution of ratings important. Sector 1 gave exceptionally high practice ratings while rating several performance domains less favorably. Sector 4 often reported lower practice and performance means. These patterns discourage treating a district average as a complete description of school experience. They do not reveal the causes of variation, because sector composition, school characteristics, and individual response patterns were not reported.

4.2 Priority setting and the meaning of agreement

The research questions about agreement address a different issue from the questions about level of practice. Two sectors may rate a domain differently while ordering its indicators similarly. Conversely, they may assign comparable means but prioritize indicators differently. The significant supervision result suggests a shared ordering in that domain under the reported test. The absence of significant concordance elsewhere provides limited support for assuming a common priority order across sectors.

The study's recommendation for district benchmarks can be understood as a governance response to this uncertainty. Benchmarks could establish common expectations while allowing schools to identify their own immediate needs. They should not be presented as a statistically demonstrated remedy. Leithwood et al. (2020) provide a broader basis for attending to context in leadership practice; the present findings offer local priorities for deliberation rather than a test of their framework.

Technology, professional learning, and resource management warrant coordinated consideration. Technology was the lowest leadership domain, while resource management was among the more moderately rated performance domains. This combination suggests a practical reason to review assistance, access, maintenance, and staff learning together. It does not establish a shortage or a competency deficit. Robinson et al. (2008) identified strategic resourcing and teacher learning as leadership dimensions, supporting this conceptual connection without supplying a causal explanation for the local ratings.

4.3 Implications for school and district action

The policy recommendations assign related responsibilities to school heads, teachers, parents, community partners, barangay officials, and the Public Schools District Supervisor. School heads were advised to expand resource generation and facility repair through local partners, corporate sponsors, and the General PTA; monitor teacher logs and progress trackers through monthly checking or streamlined submission; and check automated grading templates at the end of each grading period. A resource and innovation repository, recognition of innovative classroom projects, and a simplified digital logbook managed by ICT coordinators were also proposed.

Further recommendations for school heads included preparing a physical asset optimization layout plan for furniture allocation; providing advanced elective modules, specialized science or mathematics clubs, and competitive review sessions for high-achieving learners; and organizing quarterly parenting seminars on positive discipline and emotional support. Community-linked mental health and wellness mechanisms were proposed alongside the presentation of diagnostic information to the community. These are proposed actions, and their feasibility and outcomes were not evaluated in the study.

Teachers were encouraged to involve parents early in behavior correction, co-design modest home-school reward systems, check learners' emotional well-being before instruction, embed proactive behavioral routines in daily lessons, and use feedback channels to communicate technology and resource needs. Parents were encouraged to join specialized PTA committees and cooperate with teachers. Stakeholders were invited to participate in school improvement planning and local interventions. Together, these recommendations address participation and consistency rather than treating discipline as solely an administrative responsibility.

At district and community levels, the Public Schools District Supervisor was advised to lead instructional governance alignment workshops, establish data-informed performance benchmarks, strengthen guidance for emotionally protective environments, and connect schools with provincial assistance through the Adopt-a-School Program. Barangay officials were encouraged to establish an education committee seat for district school representatives and align youth development budgets and ordinances with school improvement goals. The study's findings identify reasons to consider these proposals; they do not establish their effectiveness or prescribe an unreported implementation budget or timetable.

5. Conclusion

The study found favorable ratings of instructional leadership in Sipocot South District, with curriculum implementation rated highest and educational technology lowest among six domains. Academic performance and learning environment were rated Much Evident, whereas instructional quality, learners' discipline, stakeholders' collaboration, and resource management were rated Evident. Significant sector agreement was reported only for instructional supervision and feedback, and no performance domain showed significant concordance. These findings support locally informed planning, stronger instructional follow-through, coordinated resources, and sustained parent and community participation.

The study's general conclusions described leadership as Much Practiced and school performance as Much Evident. The reported summary tables contain differing overall classifications, which remain unresolved. The findings should consequently be interpreted primarily through the domain-level results. They identify perceived strengths and priorities; they do not demonstrate that leadership practices caused improvement in school performance.

References

- [1] 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>
- [2] 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>
- [3] 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.

Published by JENER Journal | Homepage: <https://jenerjournal.com> | Email: editor@jenerjournal.com