

Profile and Instructional Leadership Performance of the Elementary School Heads

Rollet A. Egloso¹ and Noel G. Benavides²

^{1,2}Member, Sorsogon State University Graduate School, Sorsogon City, Philippines

Email: ¹rollet.abarnas001@deped.gov.ph and ²benavides.noel@sorsu.edu.ph

Abstract— This study aimed to determine the profile and instructional leadership performance of the elementary school heads in the Second Congressional District of Sorsogon for school year 2022-2023. It employed a descriptive-survey method of research. Also, a questionnaire was used in gathering the data from the 40 school heads and 200 teachers in the 2nd Congressional District of Sorsogon. The statistical tools utilized were the frequency, percentage, and weighted mean. This study revealed that majority of the elementary school heads are male, aged 31 to 40 years old, married, and with master's units or master's degree holder. Also, most of them have 6 to 10 years as school heads and have supervised 3 schools and below. The elementary school heads have very satisfactory instructional leadership performance as perceived by themselves and teachers along management of curriculum, professional development of teachers, and conducive environment for teaching and learning. However, they are satisfactory in performance level of learners. Recommendations were given based on the results of the study.

Keywords— conducive environment, instructional leadership, professional development, profile, school heads.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the term instructional leadership has become a common language used by the school heads in managing a school. They need to have a strong command on this aspect since it creates a supportive learning environment for teachers, students, and leaders. Also, this concept is important for schools because it provides a framework in evaluating the current approaches and practices of leadership.

Instructional leadership is a model of school leadership in which a principal works alongside teachers to provide support and guidance in establishing best practices in teaching. Principals employing this model of leadership communicate with their staff and together set clear goals related to student achievement (Brolund, 2016). It is also define as leadership that supports the development of teaching and learning. It is referred to using different names including pedagogical leadership, learning-centered leadership, leadership for learning, and student-centered leadership. These terms can be considered under the broad umbrella of instructional leadership and represent the specific and focused practices in which school leaders engage to intentionally support the development of effective teaching and learning in schools (Le Fevre, 2021).

With this, school principal as a leader of school should actively promotes more effective practices in the teaching and learning processes and recognizing

instructional priorities rather than by serving as a school manager (Yunas & Iqbal, 2013). Tedla (2012) has identified instructional leaders role as establishing clear instructional goals, being resourceful for staff, creating a school culture and climate conducive to learning, communicating the vision and mission of the school, setting high expectations for staff, developing teacher leaders, maintaining positive attitudes toward students, staff, and parents.

Furthermore, Ylimakia et al (2007) noted, four characteristics and practices for effective principals which seeming to matter the most: setting directions that secure the physical environment and achieve high academic standards, developing people to use effective instructional strategies and interventions, redesigning the organization to include teachers and parents in decision-making, and managing the curriculum effectively by staffing the school with teachers who align with the mission and direction and buffering them from distractions.

As part of the instructional leadership, teachers should be provided the supports that they needed in order to execute the lesson well and to promote learning in general. Teachers are on the front lines of schools, working with the students every day. Instructional leadership means that principals provide support for teachers in their teaching practice, professional development, and resource management (Làrudsóttir,

2015). Additionally, principals should be an instructional resource in their school (“Four Instructional Leadership Skills,” 2015). In supporting teachers and encouraging them to improve their teaching practice continuously, principals who are also instructional leaders positively affect student learning.

In order for teachers to teach students effectively, it is necessary that they have access to both formal and informal professional development opportunities. Principals of high-performing schools encourage teachers to attend professional development sessions beyond the ones mandated by the state (Kaparou & Bush, 2015). Facilitating professional development activities and encouraging teachers to take risks for innovation in their instruction also has positive effects on student learning (duPlessis, 2013). An instructional leader encourages and supports teachers to improve their teaching practices, leading to increased student achievement.

In addition, teachers require a variety of materials and resources in order to do their jobs effectively. Instructional leaders ensure that teachers have what they need in order to do the best possible job for students (“Four Instructional Leadership Skills,” 2015). Along with material things, teachers require knowledge and access to people with the expertise to deliver the knowledge. An instructional leader recognizes that expertise can belong to many people and that it is their job to bring the experts together in order for teachers to have access to everything that they need (Graczewski et al., 2009). Instructional leaders support teachers by providing them with the required resources, material and otherwise.

However, despite that the instructional leadership were exercised by the school principals, many principals perceive roadblocks to becoming effective instructional leaders. Principals have reported that they have little time to focus on instructional tasks, they are uncomfortable visiting teachers’ classrooms, and they do not have the knowledge or capacity to guide teachers’ practice (Carraway & Young, 2014).

Furthermore, principals reported that they do not have enough time to complete their instructional tasks, they are not comfortable having difficult conversations, and they sometimes lack the knowledge base to support teachers fully. Blocking off time in a day, creating an environment based on trust and openness, and taking

initiative to learn about the topics relevant to staff are all ways to overcome the challenges of becoming an instructional leader (Brolund, 2016).

In the Philippines, Lincuna & Caingcoy (2020) noted that teachers are more challenging to deal with because they assumed they already knew everything. In reality, many of them spared their time in getting a degree and learning the subject matter. They feel they have already mastered all that is necessary to teach. It is suggested that teachers need to value continuing learning through supervision. It cannot be denied as well that some teachers have limited experience and knowledge on educational theories and teaching techniques. Additionally, school heads considered time management as one of the challenges in their leadership. School administrators function in the school like supervising instruction, attending seminars and training, and many other things. Time, indeed, is a scarce resource. Participants had a difficulty on how to allocate their time among these competing demands.

In addition, the study of Buban and Digo (2021) concluded that school heads have high regards on their beliefs on two-dimensional constructs. Almost all school heads believed and strongly agreed that the instructional leadership functions and processes are helpful in achieving good instructional leadership. Likewise, the teachers observed that school heads have many duties and responsibilities besides from being an instructional leader.

With the given background and considerations about instructional leadership, the researcher felt the need to conduct the level of instructional leadership of elementary schools. The researcher desired to cover data on how the school heads and teachers perceived instructional leadership. This study was conducted in the second congressional district of Sorsogon Province.

Generally, this study aimed to determine the profile and instructional leadership performance of the elementary school heads in the Second Congressional District of Sorsogon for school year 2022-2023. Specifically, it aimed to (1) describe the profile of the school heads in terms of sex, age, civil status, highest degree earned, number of years as school head, and number of schools supervised; and (2) determine the instructional leadership performance of elementary school heads in terms of management of curriculum, professional

development of teachers, performance level of learners, and conducive environment for teaching and learning.

II. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study aimed to determine the profile and instructional leadership performance of elementary school heads in the Second Congressional District of Sorsogon for school year 2022-2023. It used the descriptive-survey research method since a questionnaire was utilized to gather the primary data from the respondents. Likewise, unstructured interview was employed to validate the collected data.

The respondents were the 40 school heads (principals and head teachers) and 200 teachers from the different elementary schools in the Second Congressional District of Sorsogon. The collected data were analyzed and interpreted with the use of appropriate statistical tools such as frequency count, percentage, and weighted mean.

The Sample

The primary sources of data were the school heads and teachers from the elementary schools in the Second Congressional District of Sorsogon. The elementary school heads composed of principals and head teachers were purposively selected in which 5 from each municipality in the said district.

The selected school heads were combination of senior, middle-aged and novice in their functions. The senior school heads are those who served for more than 10 years, the middle-aged school heads have length of service of 6 to 10 years, and novice school heads are those with 5 years or fewer experience.

In the same manner, there were 5 teachers randomly selected from every school head chosen in which the criteria observed include the willingness to participate, length of service in the school, and know-how about their school head. The number of respondents is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The Respondents

Respondents	f	%
School heads	40	17
Teachers	200	83
Total	240	100

From the table, it can be gleaned that there are 40 (17%) school heads chosen from the elementary schools. Also, 200 (83%) teachers were involved in validating the responses of their respective school heads.

The Instrument

The researcher with the assistance of the adviser drafted the questionnaire in order to deal with the various issues covered in this study. It included two parts in which Part I consisted of the profile of school heads along sex, age, civil status, highest degree earned, number of years as school head, and number of schools supervised. The, Part II covered the instructional leadership performance of elementary school heads along management of curriculum, professional development of teachers, performance level of learners, and conducive environment for teaching and learning. The indicators for the said part were taken from different sources and pre-interview was made with the school heads.

Upon completion of the contents of the questionnaire, it was sent to the panel members for critiquing and the same activity was done with the experts for

validation. There were 2 sets of questionnaires prepared to which the first set was intended for the school heads and the other set was for the teachers. With the final form ready for administration, a dry run of the questionnaire was conducted with the selected 5 school heads and 10 teachers from the private schools in municipalities of Bulan and Irosin.

The sample questionnaires were distributed to the said respondents on February 6, 2024 and retrieved on February 8, 2024. Then, the accomplished questionnaires from the dry run were subjected to Cronbach alpha test of reliability. The instrument intended for the school heads gave a value of 0.7 which is interpreted as good and acceptable while the instrument for teachers has a value of 0.8 that is described as reliable. Finally, the questionnaires were readied for administration to the target respondents.

Data Collection Procedures

With the instrument ready for administration, a letter of request for the conduct of the study was prepared and personally handed to the Superintendent of Schools

Division of Sorsogon. Upon the granting of the approval on February 2, 2024, the researcher then asked permission to the public school district supervision for each district for the actual conduct of the study specifically the involvement of the school heads and teachers.

With the granting of the approval, the questionnaires were distributed to the respondents starting on February 3, 2024 and then retrieved until February 23, 2024.

The researcher was able to attain the target of a 100 percent retrieval rate of the questionnaires. The data gathered from the respondents were collated, tallied, and analyzed for statistical interpretation.

Data Analysis Procedures

The data gathered from the respondents were subjected to various statistical data analysis. The statistical tools applied depend on the level of measurement of the data.

The frequency and percentage were utilized in presenting the profile of school heads along sex, age, civil status, highest degree earned, number of years as school head, and number of schools supervised. Then, the weighted mean was employed in presenting the instructional leadership performance of elementary school heads in terms of management of curriculum, professional development of teachers, performance level of learners, and conducive environment for teaching and learning. The scale below was used in interpreting the results: 1.00 – 1.49 (Poor); 1.50 – 2.49 (Fairly Satisfactory); 2.50 – 3.49 (Satisfactory); 3.50 – 4.49 (Very Satisfactory); 4.50 – 5.00 (Outstanding).

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Profile of the School Heads

Table 2 presents the frequency and percentage of the profile of school heads in terms of sex, age, civil status, educational attainment, position, number of years as school head, and number of schools supervised.

Table 2. Profile of the School Heads

Variables	f(n=40)	%
Sex		
Male	28	70
Female	12	30
Age (in years)		
30 and below	1	3
31 to 40	30	75
41 to 50	6	15
51 and above	3	7
Civil Status		
Single	4	10
Married	35	88
Widowed	1	2
Highest Degree earned		
Bachelor's degree	18	45
Master's Degree	20	50
Doctorate degree	2	5
Number of Years as School Head		
5 and below	5	12
6 to 10	32	80
11 to 15	2	5
16 and above	1	3
Number of schools supervised		
3 and below	37	92
4 and above	3	8

The profile of elementary school heads reveals interesting patterns in terms of sex, age, civil status,

highest degree earned, number of years as school head, and the number of schools supervised. The data

indicates that the majority of elementary school heads are male, constituting 70% of the sample. It implies that this gender disparity suggests potential challenges in achieving gender diversity in leadership roles within the educational system. Efforts to encourage and support female educators to pursue leadership roles could contribute to a more balanced representation. The strategies to encourage and support female educators in pursuing leadership roles should be considered to promote gender diversity in school leadership. This result is similar to the study of Janer and Deri (2020) which revealed that there are more males who become school heads in the Public Elementary Schools than females. However, this finding is challenged by the study of Dometita and Benavides (2023) which revealed that majority of the school heads are 41 years old and above, female, married, and have 16 years and above teaching experience. However, with the introduction of gender issues related to school management, this belief paved its way to provide equal opportunities to both sexes.

In terms of age, the predominant group among elementary school heads falls within the 31 to 40 age range, comprising 75% of the sample. This trend suggests a relatively young leadership demographic, which may bring fresh perspectives and energy to school leadership. Professional development programs should consider tailoring strategies to address the needs and aspirations of this age group, fostering a dynamic and forward-thinking educational leadership culture. This suggests a relatively young leadership demographic, which may contribute to fresh perspectives. Continued professional development programs should be tailored to address the needs and aspirations of this age group. The study of Gerola and Meimban (2023) corroborate this finding which concluded that a more significant number of school administrators belong to the age bracket of 31 to 40 years old, 81 or 37%.

In addition, the civil status of elementary school heads reveals that the majority, 35 (88%) are married. This finding implies a level of personal stability associated with marriage, which could positively influence leadership effectiveness. In supporting the well-being of school leaders, consideration of work-life balance strategies and robust support systems may further enhance their performance and job satisfaction. Results on civil status coincided with the findings of Rivera and Ibarra (2020) noting that majority of school head respondents were also married. He also stated that

married principals possessed a higher degree of sense of responsibility and accountability.

Regarding highest degree earned, a significant portion of school heads have earned a master's degree, with 50% having completed master's units. This underscores the commitment to ongoing education and professional development. Recognizing the value of advanced degrees in enhancing leadership competencies, educational institutions may encourage and incentivize school heads to pursue further academic qualifications. It implies that educational institutions may consider recognizing the value of ongoing education and professional development, encouraging school heads to pursue advanced degrees to enhance leadership competencies. The finding is confirmed with the study of Co, Trinidad, and Sadang (2018) revealed that that majority of the school principals had bachelor's degree with units in masteral, that graduate studies were seen as very important in the academe.

In terms of number of years as school heads, a noteworthy 80% of school heads have served in their positions for 6 to 10 years, indicating a relatively experienced leadership group. This length of service is an accumulation of their experience in their assignment to various schools. It has been a practice in the Division of Sorsogon that school heads have to rotate/reassign in the different elementary schools in the district in which the term of office is sometimes not defined. School heads with longer tenures have the opportunity to develop deep institutional knowledge, build strong relationships within the school community, and implement long-term strategic initiatives that contribute to sustained improvement and innovation. Leveraging this experience, mentoring programs, and collaborative platforms can be established to support newer school heads, facilitating knowledge transfer and enhancing leadership continuity. This indicates a relatively experienced leadership group. Mentoring programs and collaborative platforms can leverage this experience to support newer school heads. The study of Goden, Lumbab, Niez and Coton (2016) supports this result that greater number of the school heads held the position for 5-9 years and the least number of the school heads were in the position for more than 25 years.

In relation to the number of schools supervised by elementary school heads is another significant aspect, with overseeing three (92%) schools or fewer and 8% of them having assigned to four schools and more. This

number is an accumulation of the schools in which the school head was assigned to the various schools in the district. Recognizing the challenges associated with managing multiple schools, professional development initiatives can target effective strategies for leadership in such complex environments. It implies that recognizing the challenges of overseeing multiple schools, professional development initiatives can target effective strategies for managing and leading multiple school environments. The finding is supported by the study of Mislant and Junio (2019) which found out that school heads have served the public for less than 10 years and supervised less than five schools.

While the presented data provides a comprehensive snapshot of the demographic profile of elementary school heads, specific information on instructional leadership performance is not included. Future assessments and evaluations should incorporate metrics

related to instructional leadership to gain a more nuanced understanding of the impact of school heads on teaching and learning outcomes.

2. Instructional Leadership Performance of Elementary School Heads

This section provides instructional leadership performance of elementary school heads in terms of management of curriculum, professional development of teachers, performance level of learners, and conducive learning environment for teaching and learning. The weighted mean was used in the analysis of data.

Management of Curriculum. Table 3A contains the weighted mean and interpretation of the instructional leadership performance of elementary school heads in terms of management of curriculum as assessed by themselves and teachers.

Table 3A. Instructional Leadership Performance in terms of Management of Curriculum

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	I	WM	I
1. Recognizes the importance of familiarization on different subject areas as overall school curriculum.	4.43	VS	3.21	S
2. Provides technical assistance to the teachers especially to the proficient teachers.	4.16	VS	3.00	S
3. Prepares and craft school programs based on its needs and target goals.	4.72	O	2.74	S
4. Sees to it that promotion of learning through conducting monitoring and evaluation and classroom observation to the teachers.	4.22	VS	2.83	S
5. Recognize teachers as partners in developing and promoting learners in accordance with the curriculum objectives.	4.81	O	2.62	S
Composite Mean	4.47	VS	2.88	S

The instructional leadership performance of school heads in terms of curriculum management is a critical aspect influencing the overall educational environment. A comprehensive analysis of key indicators reveals a commendable commitment to effective leadership practices. The school head's recognition of the importance of familiarization with different subject areas for the overall school curriculum, rated as "Very Satisfactory" with a weighted mean of 4.43, indicates a holistic approach to curriculum understanding. This recognition is foundational for informed decision-making and strategic planning in curriculum development. The school heads in a certain district mentioned in an informal interview that they conducted re-orientation to the teachers during the in-service training specifically to the newly appointed teachers just

for them to be acquainted with the updates in the revised basic education curriculum.

Furthermore, the provision of technical assistance to proficient teachers, rated as "Very Satisfactory" with a weighted mean of 4.16, underscores the school head's commitment to supporting the professional growth of teachers. This approach fosters a collaborative and growth-oriented teaching environment, contributing to the continuous improvement of teaching practices. There are schools in the district which practiced mentoring and team teaching wherein the novice teachers are coached by proficient teachers. Also, there are instances that lesson demonstrations conducted by master teachers during the LAC session.

A standout aspect is the preparation and crafting of school programs based on needs and target goals, rated as "Outstanding" with a weighted mean of 4.72. This outstanding rating reflects a proactive leadership approach, aligning school initiatives with identified needs and goals. Such strategic planning enhances organizational effectiveness and contributes to the achievement of educational objectives.

The commitment to promoting learning through monitoring, evaluation, and classroom observation is noteworthy, rated as "Very Satisfactory" with a weighted mean of 4.26. This commitment underscores accountability and continuous improvement, contributing to the overall quality of education by identifying areas for enhancement and celebrating successful teaching practices.

Moreover, the recognition of teachers as partners in developing and promoting learners, rated as "Outstanding" with a weighted mean of 4.81, signifies a collaborative leadership style. Recognizing teachers as essential partners fosters a positive and empowering school culture, ultimately enhancing teacher morale and student outcomes.

The overall composite mean of 4.47, categorized as "Very Satisfactory," reflects commendable instructional leadership performance in curriculum management. While celebrating these achievements, continuous efforts to strengthen areas with slightly lower ratings will further elevate the overall effectiveness of leadership in curriculum-related matters. This analysis aligns with research emphasizing the impact of leadership on student outcomes (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Leithwood et al., 2004).

One example of effective management of curriculum in instructional leadership performance by school heads in the district can be seen in the implementation of a comprehensive curriculum review and alignment process. In this example, the school head takes a proactive approach to ensure that the curriculum meets the needs of students, aligns with educational standards, and reflects current pedagogical best practices. The school head initiates a collaborative effort involving teachers, subject coordinators, and master teachers to review the existing curriculum. They analyze curriculum documents, instructional materials, and assessment strategies to identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement. Through this process, they

gather input from stakeholders to ensure that diverse perspectives are considered.

Based on the findings of the curriculum review, the school head in the district leads the development of a plan to revise and align the curriculum. They prioritize areas needing attention, set clear goals and objectives, and allocate resources accordingly. The school head also provides support and professional development opportunities for teachers to enhance their instructional practices and align their teaching with the revised curriculum. Throughout the implementation process, the school head monitors progress, gathers feedback, and makes adjustments as needed. They communicate regularly with stakeholders to keep them informed and engaged in the curriculum improvement efforts. By demonstrating strong leadership and management skills, the school head fosters a culture of continuous improvement and ensures that the curriculum remains responsive to the evolving needs of students and the community.

On the other hand, the instructional leadership performance of schools, specifically focusing on the management of curriculum from the perspective of teachers, reveals a satisfactory rating across key indicators. The recognition of the importance of familiarization with different subject areas is deemed satisfactory rated 3.21, indicating a baseline acknowledgment but with room for enhancement. This implies that There is an opportunity for school leadership to deepen its understanding and appreciation of subject-specific intricacies within the curriculum. Engaging in targeted professional development or collaborative initiatives with subject experts may contribute to a more nuanced approach.

The provision of technical assistance is rated as satisfactory rated 3.00, suggesting a general but not highly differentiated level of support for teachers. It implies that School leaders could explore tailored professional development opportunities and mentorship programs, focusing on addressing the specific needs and strengths of proficient teachers. This targeted support may lead to enhanced instructional practices and overall teacher effectiveness.

The preparation and crafting of school programs are considered satisfactory with weighted mean of 2.74, signaling an acknowledgment of needs and goals but with potential for improvement. It implies that There is

an opportunity for school leaders to refine the strategic alignment of school programs with identified needs and goals. A more robust and data-informed approach to program development could contribute to greater impact and effectiveness.

The promotion of learning through monitoring, evaluation, and classroom observation is rated as satisfactory rated 2.81, indicating a basic but not highly advanced approach. It means that schools could explore more robust mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation, incorporating actionable feedback loops for continuous improvement. This may involve adopting evidence-based observation strategies and leveraging technology for more effective data-driven decision-making.

The recognition of teachers as partners is rated as satisfactory rated as 2.63, suggesting an acknowledgment but room for strengthening the collaborative aspect. It implies that School leaders can explore strategies to enhance collaboration, fostering a sense of shared ownership in curriculum development

and learner promotion. Cultivating a culture of open communication and involving teachers in decision-making processes may contribute to a more synergistic educational environment.

The overall composite mean of 2.88 indicates a satisfactory level of instructional leadership performance in curriculum management from the teachers' perspective. While satisfactory, there is an opportunity for schools to aspire to higher levels of excellence, Fullan, (2014). Strategic investments in professional development, tailored support, and collaborative initiatives may contribute to elevating the overall instructional leadership performance, Harris, A. (2002).

Professional Development of Teachers. The weighted mean and interpretation of the instructional leadership performance of elementary school heads in terms of professional development of teachers as assessed by themselves and teachers are listed in Table 3B.

Table 3B. Instructional Leadership Performance in terms of Professional Development of teachers

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	I	WM	I
1. Encourage teachers to enroll and earn units in master's degree.	4.74	O	3.32	S
2. Orients teachers on various DepEd orders with regards to promotion.	4.81	O	3.73	VS
3. Sees to it that the new programs and projects implemented by the DepEd in terms of curriculum were introduced and stated clearly to the teachers.	4.76	O	2.73	S
4. Sends teachers to various seminars in developing lesson using the K-12 teaching pedagogies.	3.36	S	2.18	FS
5. Allows teachers to benchmark and modelled the best practices.	3.21	S	2.00	FS
Composite Mean	4.18	VS	2.79	S

The instructional leadership performance of schools, focusing on the professional development of teachers as perceived by the school heads, reveals commendable ratings across key indicators. The outstanding rating in encouraging teachers to pursue master's degree programs rated as 4.74 indicates a strong commitment to advancing the academic qualifications of the teaching staff. This proactive encouragement aligns with research emphasizing the positive impact of advanced degrees on teacher effectiveness and student outcomes (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). The outstanding rating implies a recognition of the transformative potential of higher education on teaching practices. It was reflected in their profile that most of the school heads have acquired advanced education units and degrees so it is just

essential that they can encourage them pursue similar undertaking.

The outstanding rating in orienting teachers on DepEd orders rated as 4.81 underscores a thorough approach to keeping educators informed and aligned with educational policies. A well-informed teaching faculty is crucial for effective implementation of educational initiatives. This outstanding rating suggests a commitment to transparent communication and adherence to DepEd regulations, contributing to a cohesive and well-managed educational environment.

The outstanding rating in introducing DepEd programs to teachers rated as 4.76 reflects a strong leadership

approach in keeping the faculty abreast of curriculum changes. Clear communication about new programs is essential for successful implementation. This outstanding rating suggests that the school head is proactive in providing necessary information, fostering a supportive environment for adapting to evolving educational landscapes.

The satisfactory rating in sending teachers to seminars on K-12 pedagogies rated as 3.36 indicates a commitment to professional development, albeit with room for improvement. While the effort to expose teachers to pedagogical seminars is recognized, the satisfactory rating suggests a potential for enhancing the selection and diversity of such seminars. A more diversified approach may better address the varied needs and preferences of educators (Garet et al., 2001).

The satisfactory rating in allowing teachers to benchmark and model best practices rated as 3.24 indicates a recognition of the importance of learning from exemplary approaches. While the effort to encourage benchmarking is acknowledged, the satisfactory rating suggests a potential for refining strategies to showcase and disseminate best practices. Incorporating structured mechanisms for sharing successful teaching strategies may enhance this aspect.

The overall composite means of 4.18, categorized as "Very Satisfactory," reflects a commendable instructional leadership performance in terms of professional development for teachers. This very satisfactory rating signifies an overall commitment to fostering a culture of continuous learning and professional growth. Continuous refinement of professional development strategies based on teacher feedback and evolving educational needs could further elevate the effectiveness of these initiatives.

In the same manner, the instructional leadership performance of schools, specifically in terms of professional development for teachers as perceived by the teachers themselves, presents a mixed assessment across key indicators. The satisfactory rating of 3.32 suggests a moderate level of encouragement for teachers to pursue master's degree programs. While satisfactory, there is room for strengthening the encouragement for advanced education. Research indicates that advanced degrees can positively impact teacher effectiveness (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Enhancing incentives and

support mechanisms may further motivate teachers to pursue higher qualifications.

The very satisfactory rating of 3.73 indicates that teachers feel well-oriented regarding DepEd orders related to promotion. This positive rating suggests effective communication and orientation practices. It is crucial for teachers to be informed about promotion-related policies to ensure a transparent and fair system. The very satisfactory rating implies a commendable effort in this aspect.

The satisfactory rating of 2.73 in introducing new DepEd programs to teachers suggests a moderate effectiveness in this aspect. It implies that there is an opportunity for improvement in ensuring that the introduction of new programs is clear and comprehensible to teachers. A more targeted and collaborative approach to communication may enhance teachers' understanding and engagement with new initiatives.

The fairly satisfactory rating of 2.18 indicates a need for improvement in sending teachers to seminars on K-12 pedagogies. Professional development through seminars is crucial for staying updated on evolving pedagogical approaches. The fairly satisfactory rating suggests that there might be challenges or gaps in the current approach. A strategic reassessment of seminar selection and frequency may enhance the impact on teacher development.

The fairly satisfactory rating of 2.00 suggests that teachers perceive room for improvement in opportunities to benchmark and model best practices. While the initiative to allow benchmarking is acknowledged, the fairly satisfactory rating indicates potential areas for enhancement. Facilitating structured processes for sharing successful practices and encouraging collaboration among teachers may contribute to a more robust professional development culture.

The overall composite mean of 2.79, categorized as "Satisfactory," indicates a baseline level of satisfaction among teachers regarding the school's instructional leadership in professional development. While satisfactory, there are clear areas for refinement. This suggests an opportunity for the school leadership to engage in dialogue with teachers, gather feedback, and

collaboratively design targeted strategies for improvement in professional development initiatives.

Several examples of school heads initiatives in providing professional development for teachers as disclosed by some of them in an informal interview include pedagogical training workshops during LAC sessions, curriculum alignment sessions, technology integration training, and peer observation and feedback. Also, action research projects and mentoring programs. These professional development initiatives empower teachers to enhance their instructional practices, foster a culture of continuous improvement, and ultimately contribute to the overall instructional leadership performance of school heads.

Performance Level of Learners. Table 3C presents the weighted mean and interpretation of the instructional

leadership performance of elementary school heads in terms of performance level of learners as assessed by themselves and teachers.

The instructional leadership performance of school heads, as reflected in Table 3C, portrays an outstanding commitment to fostering high performance levels among learners through various strategic initiatives. The outstanding rating of 4.82 indicates that the provision of technical assistance to teachers is highly effective in contributing to the high-performance levels of learners. This result underscores the critical role of technical support in enhancing teaching practices and, consequently, positively impacting student outcomes. The school head's commitment to providing targeted assistance aligns with research emphasizing the importance of instructional leadership in improving student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2004).

Table 3C. Instructional Leadership Performance in terms of Performance Level of Learners

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	I	WM	I
1. Provides technical assistance to the teachers resulting in high PL of learners.	4.82	O	2.23	FS
2. Set goals and objectives and supports learning training resulting to high performance.	4.64	O	2.41	FS
3. Directs the teachers to monitor the learners especially those learners at risk in dropping out through home visitation.	4.82	O	2.46	FS
4. Directs teachers to assess the reading skills of the learners and asked to craft and prepare necessary reading program for struggling learners.	4.71	O	2.23	FS
5. Assist the teachers in attaining a 100% of learners passing from 1st to 3rd quarter of school year.	4.84	O	2.00	FS
Composite Mean	4.77	O	2.27	FS

The outstanding rating of 4.64 suggests that the establishment of goals and objectives, coupled with support for teacher training, significantly contributes to high learner performance. Goal-setting and professional development support are integral components of effective instructional leadership (Hallinger & Heck, 1996). The outstanding rating signifies a strategic alignment of leadership practices with research-backed strategies for enhancing student achievement.

The outstanding rating of 4.82 indicates that directing teachers to monitor at-risk learners through home visitation is highly effective. It implies that Home visitation is a proactive approach to addressing barriers to learning and promoting student success (Epstein et al., 2009). The outstanding rating suggests a strong commitment to personalized support for students facing challenges, aligning with the principles of effective instructional leadership.

The outstanding rating of 4.71 suggests that directing teachers to assess reading skills and create tailored programs for struggling learners is highly effective. Identifying and addressing specific academic needs, especially in foundational skills like reading, is crucial for overall student success (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 2013). The outstanding rating reflects a proactive approach to individualized instruction.

The outstanding rating of 4.84 implies that the school head's assistance contributes significantly to achieving a 100% passing rate for learners. The commitment to a 100% passing rate underscores a high standard of academic excellence. This result aligns with the literature emphasizing the impact of high expectations on student achievement (Hattie, 2009).

The outstanding composite mean of 4.77 suggests a consistently high level of effectiveness across all

indicators. This exceptional overall rating indicates a comprehensive and strategic approach to instructional leadership. The school head's initiatives align with best practices, contributing to a positive learning environment and high levels of student achievement.

However, the instructional leadership performance of school heads as assessed by teachers, as indicated by the Fairly Satisfactory ratings suggests that there is room for improvement in fostering high performance levels among learners through collaborative efforts. The Fairly Satisfactory rating of 2.23 indicates that providing technical assistance to teachers for enhancing learner performance is at a moderate level of effectiveness. This suggests that while some technical support is being provided, there is potential for further refinement and expansion of assistance strategies. The instructional leadership might benefit from a more targeted and systematic approach to technical guidance (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985).

The Fairly Satisfactory rating of 2.41 implies that the establishment of goals and objectives, along with support for teacher training, is moderately effective in contributing to high learner performance. This indicates a need for a more robust goal-setting process and professional development support to better align with research-backed strategies for improving student achievement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990).

The Fairly Satisfactory rating of 2.46 suggests that directing teachers to monitor at-risk learners through home visitation is moderately effective. While home visitation is initiated, there may be opportunities to enhance the effectiveness of this strategy, perhaps by providing additional resources or training to teachers involved in home visitation (Epstein et al., 2002).

The Fairly Satisfactory rating of 2.23 indicates that directing teachers to assess reading skills and create tailored programs for struggling learners is moderately effective. There is potential for improvement in the design and implementation of reading programs. A more targeted approach to addressing individual student needs

may lead to more positive outcomes (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 2009).

The Fairly Satisfactory rating of 2.00 implies that assistance provided to teachers in achieving a 100% passing rate for learners is at a moderate level of effectiveness. This suggests that the support mechanisms in place might need further refinement or expansion to ensure the achievement of the high standard set for learner success (Hattie, 2012).

The Fairly Satisfactory composite mean of 2.27 indicates a moderate level of overall effectiveness in instructional leadership practices related to learner performance. This result underscores the importance of continuous improvement efforts to elevate instructional leadership practices for enhanced learner outcomes. Overall, the instructional leadership performance of school heads plays a crucial role in shaping the performance level of learners, influencing their academic achievement, engagement, motivation, skills development, and overall well-being.

Conducive Environment for teaching and learning. The weighted mean and interpretation of the instructional leadership performance of elementary school heads in terms of conducive environment for teaching and learning as assessed by themselves and teachers are listed in Table 3D.

The outstanding instructional leadership performance of school heads in creating a conducive environment for teaching and learning, as indicated by the Composite Mean of 4.65 in Table 3D.1, underscores the effectiveness of various initiatives aimed at ensuring a safe and supportive educational setting. The Outstanding rating of 4.63 suggests that the installation of a hazard map inside the school premises is highly effective in promoting a safe learning environment. This initiative demonstrates proactive efforts to enhance school safety, aligning with best practices for disaster preparedness in educational institutions (UNESCO, 2007).

Table 3D. Instructional Leadership Performance in terms of Conducive Environment for teaching and learning

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	I	WM	I
1. Installs hazard map inside the school premises.	4.63	O	4.63	O
2. Complies with the child friendly school standard	4.63	O	4.24	VS

3. Allots budget in the MOOE for preventive and maintenance of learning facilities	4.63	O	4.24	VS
4. Discusses with the teachers and learners the Safe Spaces Act (SSA)	4.72	O	3.63	VS
5. Invites the division property and engineering office in assessing the condition of school learning facilities.	4.63	O	3.00	S
Composite Mean	4.65	O	3.95	VS

The Outstanding rating of 4.63 indicates that compliance with the child-friendly school standard is highly effective in fostering an environment conducive to teaching and learning. Adhering to child-friendly school standards promotes a holistic and inclusive approach to education, creating a positive atmosphere for students' overall development (UNICEF, 2009). The Outstanding rating of 4.6 suggests that allocating budget for preventive and maintenance measures in the MOOE is highly effective in sustaining quality learning facilities. Financial commitment to facility upkeep reflects a dedication to providing students with a well-maintained and conducive learning environment (ADB, 2005). The Outstanding rating of 4.7 implies that discussions on the Safe Spaces Act with teachers and learners are highly effective in creating a safe and supportive atmosphere. Raising awareness about legislation related to safe spaces enhances the school community's understanding and commitment to fostering a secure environment (UNESCO, 2016).

The Outstanding rating of 4.63 suggests that involving the Division Property and Engineering Office in facility assessments is highly effective in ensuring the quality of learning spaces. Collaborating with experts for facility assessments reflects a proactive approach to maintaining and improving the overall condition of school facilities (ADB, 2005).

The Outstanding composite mean of 4.62 reflects an exceptional overall performance in creating a conducive environment for teaching and learning. This high rating indicates that the instructional leadership practices related to a conducive environment are consistently effective and aligned with international standards, contributing to a positive learning atmosphere.

Consequently, the instructional leadership performance of teachers in creating a conducive environment for teaching and learning, as depicted by the Composite Mean of 3.95 in Table 3D.2, indicates a very satisfactory level of effectiveness in various initiatives aimed at fostering a positive learning atmosphere. The "Outstanding" rating of 4.63 suggests that the installation of a hazard map inside the school premises

is highly effective in promoting a safe learning environment. Teachers actively participating in creating a safe environment aligns with best practices for disaster preparedness in educational institutions (UNESCO, 2007).

The "Very Satisfactory" rating of 4.24 indicates that compliance with the child-friendly school standard is effective in creating a positive learning atmosphere. While effective, there might be areas for improvement in fully aligning practices with the holistic principles of a child-friendly school (UNICEF, 2009). The "Very Satisfactory" rating of 4.24 suggests that allocating budget for preventive and maintenance measures in the MOOE is effective in sustaining quality learning facilities. Teachers contributing to budget allocation reflects a commitment to maintaining conducive learning spaces (ADB, 2005).

The "Very Satisfactory" rating of 3.63 implies that discussions on the Safe Spaces Act with teachers and learners are effective in promoting a safe and supportive atmosphere. There is room for enhancement in fully integrating Safe Spaces Act discussions into teaching practices to ensure a comprehensive understanding (UNESCO, 2016). The "Satisfactory" rating of 3.00 suggests that involving the Division Property and Engineering Office in facility assessments is effective, but there may be room for improvement. Teachers engaging with external expertise indicates a positive step, yet further collaboration may enhance the overall quality of facility assessments (ADB, 2005).

The "Very Satisfactory" composite mean of 3.95 indicates a commendable overall performance in creating a conducive environment for teaching and learning among teachers. While effective, there may be opportunities for refining and enhancing specific practices to achieve an even more optimal learning environment.

Overall, instructional leadership performance of school heads is crucial for creating a conducive environment for teaching and learning. Through supportive professional development, clear communication, empowerment,

resource allocation, and positive school culture, school heads can cultivate an environment where all learners can reach their full potential.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study concluded that majority of the elementary school heads are male, aged 31 to 40 years old, married, and with master's units or master's degree holder. Also, most of them have 6 to 10 years as school heads and have supervised 3 schools and below. The elementary school heads have very satisfactory instructional leadership performance as perceived by themselves and teachers along management of curriculum, professional development of teachers, and conducive environment for teaching and learning. However, they are satisfactory in performance level of learners.

It was recommended that the elementary school heads may continuously improve their personal qualifications through professional development activities such as advanced education, leadership training, personality development and the like. The school head may consider upskilling their instructional leadership performance by constant collaboration with peers and teachers especially on the aspect of conducive environment for teaching and learning. Further study may be conducted which will cover the other school heads in the province and the inclusion of other variables about instructional leadership performance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to express their deepest gratitude to the school heads and teachers who share their stories and time in the completion of this study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Allington, R. L., & McGill-Franzen, A. (2013). School response to reading failure: Instruction for the low-performing students. In M. J. Rueda & S. H. Silverman (Eds.), *Handbook of reading and research in the United States: Vol. II* (pp. 590–606). Routledge.
- [2] Allington, R. L., & McGill-Franzen, A. (2009). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching*. Guilford Press.
- [3] Asian Development Bank. (2005). *Guidelines for School Building Programs*. Asian Development Bank's guidelines offer recommendations for designing and maintaining school facilities.
- [4] Buban, L. M., & Digo, G. S. (2021). Management beliefs and practices of elementary school heads on instructional leadership. *International Journal of Research - GRANTHAALAYAH*, 9(7), 170-178. doi: 10.29121/granthaalayah.v9.i7.2021.4088
- [5] Bush, T. (2016). School Leadership and management in post-conflict situations: The importance of context.
- [6] Co, G. A., Trinidad, M. A. H. and Sadang, G. A. (2018). *School Principals' Profile and Public Elementary Schools Performance in the Schools Division Office of Imus City*. Retrieved from www.iafor.org on April 13, 2024
- [7] Day, C., Sammons, P., Leithwood, K., Hopkins, D., Gu, Q., Brown, E., & Ahtaridou, E. (2011). *Successful school leadership: What it is and how it influences pupil learning*.
- [8] Dometita, J. E. and Benavide, N. G. (2023). Profile of School Heads and their Proficiency in Information and Communication Technology (ICT). *United International Journal of Research and Technology*, 4(5), 70-86.
- [9] Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 807-834.
- [10] Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2009). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- [11] Epstein, J. L., Sanders, M. G., Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Jansorn, N. R., & Van Voorhis, F. L. (2002). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- [12] Fullan, M. (2014). *The Principal: Three Keys to Maximizing Impact*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [13] Gerola, C. S. and Meimban, L. V. (2023). *Educational Management Practices among Secondary School Administrators*. Retrieved from https://academia.com on April 13, 2024
- [14] Goden, L. T., Lumbab, N. T., Niez, R. A., and Coton, V. G. (2016). Influence of School Heads' Instructional Competencies on Teachers' Management in Leyte Division, Philippines. *International Journal of Engineering Sciences and Research Technology*, 5(7), 513-530.
- [15] Hallinger, P., and Murphy, J.F. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of

- principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217-247. Fullan, M.(2014)
- [16] Harris, A. (2002). *Distributed Leadership and School Improvement: Leading or Misleading? Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 30(3), 287–308.
- [17] Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.
- [18] Ingersoll, R. M., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers: A critical review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201-233.
- [19] Janer, S. S. and Deri, R. A. (2020). Demographic Perspective of Public Elementary Schools in the Province of Sorsogon. *Asia Pacific Higher Education Research Journal*, 7(2), 15-28.
- [20] Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 496-528.
- [21] Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York: Wallace Foundation.
- [22] Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1990). Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 1(4), 249-280.
- [23] Mislang-Sison, D., & Junio, A. (2019). School Heads' Supervision Practices and Teachers' Instructional Performance: Basis for a Proposed Mentoring Program. *ASEAN Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 3(1). Retrieved from <https://paressu.org/online/index.php/aseanmrj/article/view/237>
- [24] Rivera, P. A. J. and Ibarra, F. P. (2020). The Extent of Principals' Empowerment and Their Functions towards Management of Public Elementary Schools. *Indonesian Research Journal in Education*, 1(4), 188-203.
- [25] Robinson, V. M., 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.
- [26] UNESCO. (2007). *Integrating disaster risk reduction in the school curriculum: Policy and practice*.
- [27] UNESCO. (2016). *International technical guidance on sexuality education: An evidence-informed approach*.
- [28] UNICEF. (2009). *Child-friendly schools manual*. UNICEF's manual outlines principles and practices for creating child-friendly schools, emphasizing holistic development.