



THE PHILIPPINE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL HEADS BASED - INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT COMPETENCIES

ELIZABETH RIOSA-TOLENTINO

Batangas State University, Batangas Philippines
Education Program Supervisor-Mathematics
Curriculum Implementation Division-Batangas Province
elizabeth.tolentino@g.batstate-u.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

The study assessed the level of school heads instructional management competence focusing on teaching and learning along school-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards, teaching standards and pedagogies, teacher performance feedback, learner achievement, learning assessment and learning environment based on the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) with the goal of developing competency-based instructional management plan. Moreover, it investigated the school heads' level of instructional management competence and analyzed the relationships between the school heads' level of instructional management competence and their profile. The study utilized the descriptive-correlational research design with the questionnaire serving as the main tool to gather data from the first group of respondents comprised of 37 supervisors and 370 teachers and the second group of respondents comprised of 37 school heads. Frequency count, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, t-test and chi-square were the statistical tools used in the study. Findings revealed that most of the school head-respondents are occupying Principal I-IV, with eleven to twenty years of service as school head, had obtained doctorate degrees, generalists, not active and had insufficient number of trainings and seminars attended, and had limited number of awards received relative to instruction for the last three years. The assessment of supervisors and teachers are consistent. The supervisors rated lower degree of assessment than the teachers. Of all competencies, learning environment registered the highest level of school heads' instructional

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



management competence, while the least level of instructional management competency is the learner achievement. Based on the interview, school heads initiated much programs projects and activities to strengthen their instructional management competencies. As a result, the instructional management plan was proposed to strengthen the school heads' instructional competencies.

Keywords: *instructional management competencies, PPSSH, school heads, teaching and learning*

INTRODUCTION

Quality education is a global goal to promote lifelong learning. Through education, people can get better jobs and can have better lives. It can also break from the cycle of poverty and empower people everywhere to live healthier and sustainable lives. The school head as key driver of the school plays a significant role towards quality education. As stipulated in Republic Act 9155, otherwise known as the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 [1] the school head is a person responsible for the administrative and instructional management of the school. They have the authority, responsibility for ensuring access to, promoting equity in, and improving the quality of basic education.

Indeed, the school head must be an expert consultant in teaching and learning to enthuse and inspire teachers to plan and carry out the tasks of teaching. They must have the skills in managing instruction that could improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools. International research shows that teacher quality is vital in raising the learner achievement. However, without strong leadership and instructional management, a teacher cannot make significant changes on their own. Therefore, school heads should innovate more activities to strengthen their instructional management towards quality education.

One of the innovations of DepEd is the National Adoption and Implementation of Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (DO 24, s. 2020) or abbreviated called as

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue I

August 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



PPSSH [2]. It was developed as school heads' guide in doing their functions as school leader to manage effective school and effective people. Through PPSSH, there is now a reference on how school principals can help themselves improve to be truly beneficial to the government. During online orientation of PPSSH, it was reiterated that teacher quality in the Philippines is not just about teachers [3]. Lopez 2020 The scenario of placing pressure on teachers alone is unfair and thus led to the creation of the PPSSH. In fact, the teachers need support of a competent school leaders. If the role of the teachers is to make her lesson easy to be understood by the learners, then the school leaders' role is to guide teachers in achieving quality education.

Thus, school heads have only one main job, to make it easier for teachers to do their jobs well, and nothing else. If the school heads perform well, then, the teachers would probably perform better and can produce high performing learners. Through PPSSH, the school heads can realize the extent of their instructional management and other managerial practices stipulated in the five domains, including leading strategically, managing school operations and resources, focusing on teaching and learning, developing self and others, and building connections.

All the domains are integral and constitute a broad conceptual sphere of instructional and administrative practices defined by specific strands in the PPSSH. However, in this study, the researcher focused only on Domain 3 - focusing on teaching and learning as response to the duties and responsibilities and Key Result Areas (KRA's) of Education Program Supervisor (EPS). The school heads' instructional management should be enhanced so that they can provide technical assistance in teaching and learning and therefore would result to improvement of learners' performance. It concentrates on the work of the school heads along school-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standard, teaching standards and pedagogies, teacher performance feedback, learner achievement, learning assessment, and learning environment.

In the first instructional management competency of the school heads based on the PPSSH, focusing on Teaching and Learning, the school head should be able to demonstrate

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue I

August 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



knowledge and understand the school-based curriculum review, contextualization, and its implementation. The school head to be considered expert in managing instruction must share exemplary practices in the review of school-based curriculum, contextualization, and its implementation. They should understand the key concepts, the general processes involved in contextualizing the curriculum and its implication to teaching and learning.

According to the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 (RA 9155), Section 2, curriculum contextualization is the process of matching the curriculum content and instructional strategies relevant to learners. The school heads are mandated by law to encourage local initiatives for improving the quality of basic education. Thus, revising and modifying the curriculum are expected for the school heads to follow to make the curriculum relevant, meaningful, and useful for diverse learners.

On the other hand, the school heads should engage school personnel such as master teachers, head teachers and department heads in the implementation of teaching standards and pedagogies. They should demonstrate and exhibit best practices in providing technical assistance on teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas. In line with this, school heads must undergo different professional advancement trainings relative to teaching and learning that would enhance their instructional management to better understand their roles and functions as instructional leaders.

Another significant role of the school heads that could enhance their instructional management competence is utilizing performance feedback. They must collaborate with school personnel and exhibit exemplary skills in effectively using validated feedback obtained from learners, parents, and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance. The performance feedback should be delivered in an effective manner [4]. Reynold 2017. If feedback is not delivered on time, the moment is lost, and the student might not connect the feedback with the action.

In addition to instructional management competencies of the school heads and can be considered as the core responsibility of the school heads is to focus on learners' achievement. In this competency, the school heads are expected to utilize learning outcomes in developing

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue I

August 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



data-based interventions. This responsibility requires school heads to put learner performance at the forefront of their instructional management. They should develop new strategies centered around data, curriculum, pedagogy, and human capital development to meet the required learner achievement as utilization of technology has a great impact of teaching and learning nowadays.

Moreover, school heads should analyze learning assessment to be efficient and effective instructional leaders. As school heads, they are expected to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of learning assessment tools, strategies, and utilization of results to ensure accountability in achieving higher learning outcomes. In fact, it can motivate teachers and learners to perform their best when they are properly recognized. It is therefore necessary to track student accomplishment and school progress toward goals in a variety of ways [5]. Silva, et al. (2011)

Furthermore, creating a learning environment that is conducive to learning is also one of the instructional management competencies that should be given priority by the school heads. In this competency of the school heads, they are expected to demonstrate understanding of managing a learner-friendly, inclusive, and healthy learning environment. Thus, to be expert school heads, they need to empower the wider school community in promoting and sustaining an inclusive and healthy learning environment. All the instructional management competencies cited were based on the PPSSH that are mandated for the school heads to follow and demonstrate. However, indicators are not yet presented in the said department order, and still are waiting for the release of the standard-specific objectives to be used in assessing the school heads' instructional management competencies such as school-based curriculum review, contextualization and

Knowing the level and extent of instructional management competence of the school heads, appropriate technical assistance on instruction that relates to curriculum contextualization, practices, and performance may be further investigated to address the mentioned gap. Although there are existing studies on instructional leadership, and instructional management, this study fills in the gaps as to how instructional leaders manage

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



teaching and learning practices. The result of the study may serve as useful document and guide as to what technical assistance is appropriate for school heads and teachers to improve the quality of the teaching and learning process particularly on school-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards, teaching standards and pedagogies, teacher performance feedback, learner achievement and other performance indicators, learning assessment, and the learning environment.

In addition, the output of the study, the PPSSH competency-based instructional management plan for school heads in SDO Batangas may help them enhance their instructional management competencies to support the standards for school heads or the framework for quality instruction. The researcher believes that the school leaders have a great impact in the performance of the teachers and must be equipped and demonstrate exemplary practices on managing instruction to produce quality teachers and improve learners' performance.

OBJECTIVES

This study determined the instructional management competence of school heads in the Division of Batangas anchored to the Philippine Professional Standard for School Heads (PPSSH), with the goal of proposing instructional management plan to strengthen those competencies.

Specifically, it sought to attain the following objectives:

1. Describe the profile of the school heads in terms of:
 - 1.1 current position,
 - 1.2 length of service as school head,
 - 1.3 highest educational attainment,
 - 1.4 field of specialization,
 - 1.5 number of trainings and seminars attended relative to instruction for the last three years, and
 - 1.6 number awards received relative to instruction for the last three years.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



2. Determine the level of instructional management competence of school heads as assessed by supervisors and teachers relative to the following:

2.1 school-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards,

2.2 teaching standards and pedagogies,

2.3 teacher performance feedback,

2.4 learner achievement,

2.5 learning assessment, and

2.6 learning environment.

3. Find out the difference in the level of instructional management competence of school heads as assessed by the two groups of respondents.

4. Ascertain the relationship between the school heads' level of instructional management competence and their profile.

5. Identify the initiatives of the school heads to strengthen their instructional competency.

6. Prepare competency-based instructional management plan for school heads in SDO Batangas.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study applied the descriptive-correlational method of research utilizing a self-constructed questionnaire as the main data-gathering instrument, complemented by an interview and focus group discussion to substantiate and validate the quantitative data.

There were two groups of respondents in the study with a total number of 444. The stratified random sampling technique was used in the selection of the first group of respondents. It was comprised of 37 supervisors and 370 teachers who responded on the survey in assessing instructional management competence of the school heads with a total of

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



407 respondents. The second group of respondents are the 37 school heads selected through purposive sampling.

The responses of the study were treated with the following statistical tools: frequency count and percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, t-test, and Chi-square test.

Frequency Count and Percentage. These were used to describe the profile of the respondents.

Weighted Mean. This was used to describe the level of instructional management competency of the school heads.

Standard Deviation. This was used to a measure the spread of the level of instructional management competency of the school heads.

t-test. This was applied in testing significant difference between the assessment of administrators and teachers on the level of instructional competency of the school heads.

Chi-square Test. This was used to determine the significant relationship between the profile of the school heads and their level of instructional competence.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of data regarding the instructional management competence of school heads of Schools Division Office of Batangas (SDO Batangas).

1. Profile of the School Heads

School heads work collaboratively and efficiently to produce quality teachers and quality learners. In assessing the school heads' instructional management based on the competencies of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads, it is important to anchor the assessment on relevant profile variables. This study identified the profile of school heads in terms of current position, length of service as school head, highest educational

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



attainment, field of specialization, number of trainings and seminars attended for the last three years, and number of awards received for the last three years. The distribution of school heads in terms of their profile is presented in Tables 2 to 8.

1.1 Current Position. This refers to the school heads' designation upon responding the questionnaire. Table 2 presents the data on the profile of the respondents in terms of current position.

Table 2
Distribution of the School Heads in terms of Current Position

Current Position	Frequency	Percentage
Officer In - Charge	4	10.81
Head Teacher I-IV	15	40.54
Principal I-IV	18	48.65
Total	37	100

1.2 Length of Service as School Head. One of the key factors in attaining necessary skills and competencies as a school leader is professional experience. Table 3 contains the data on the profile of respondents in terms of length of service.

Table 3
Distribution of School Heads in terms of Length of Service

Length of Service Frequency Percentage Verbal Interpretation

Less than 10 years	12	32.43	Beginning / Aspiring
11 – 20 years	14	37.84	Proficient
21 – 30 years	8	21.62	Highly Proficient

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



31 and above	3	8.11	Distinguished
Total	37	100.00	

1.3 Highest Educational Attainment. This variable refers to the school heads' highest degree or level of completed schooling. This will be a vehicle for school leaders to meet advanced learning and insights that will be useful in their work. In the teaching profession, the greater a person's educational qualification, the more likely they are to be promoted and assigned to be a school leader, largely because of the supposed advanced competencies they have gained in the process of obtaining advanced degrees.

Table 4 presents the data on the profile of the respondents in terms of highest educational attainment.

Table 4
Distribution of School Heads in terms of
Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment Frequency Percentage

Bachelor's Degree	10	27.03
Master's Degree	12	32.43
Doctoral Degree	15	40.54
Total	37	100.00

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



1.4 Field of Specialization. This refers to the school heads' major on their Bachelors' degree. Table 5 exhibits the data on the profile of the respondents in terms of field of specialization.

Table 5
Distribution of School Heads in terms of
Field of Specialization

Field of Specialization	Frequency	Percentage
-------------------------	-----------	------------

Generalist	30	81.08
NSAT Subjects	6	16.22
Non-NSAT Subjects	1	2.70
Total	37	100.00

1.5 Number of Trainings and Seminars Attended. The trainings and seminars attended by the school heads relative to instruction for the last three years is shown in the succeeding table. Table 6 indicates the trainings and seminars attended relative to instruction by the school heads for school years 2019 to 2020, 2020 to 2021 and 2021-2022.

Table 6
Distribution of School Heads' Number of Trainings
and Seminars Attended

Number of trainings and seminars attended	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
10 and below	Not Active	9	24.32
11-20	Rarely Active	7	18.92

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



21-30	Moderately Active	8	21.62
31-40	Active	6	16.22
41-50	Highly Active	7	18.92
Total		37	100.00

1.6 Number of Awards Received. The number of awards received by the school heads relative to instruction for the last three years were also analyzed. Table 7 shows the awards received by the school heads for school years 2019 to 2020, 2020 to 2021 and 2021-2022.

Table 7
Distribution of School Heads' Number of Awards Received

Number of awards received	Verbal Interpretation	Frequency	Percentage
0-5	Rarely Recognized	25	67.57
6-10	Recognized	7	18.92
more than 10	Highly Recognized	5	13.51
Total		37	100.00

2. School Heads' Level of Instructional Management Competence

The study looked into the school heads' level of instructional management competence with respect to school-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards, teaching standards and pedagogies, teacher performance feedback, learner achievement and other performance indicators, learning assessment and learning environment. Data are shown in Tables 8 to 13.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



2.1 School - based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards. This refers to one of the strands in the Philippine Professional Standard for School Heads in Domain 3 Focusing on Teaching and Learning that need to be given technical assistance by the school heads in the teaching and learning process. The assessment on the school heads' level of instructional management competence relative to school- based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards is presented in Table 8.

Table 8
Level of School Heads' Instructional Management Competence in terms of School-based Curriculum Review, Contextualization and Implementation of Learning Standard

Indicators	Supervisors			Teachers		
	WM	SD	VI	WM	SD	VI
1. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of school-based curriculum review.	3.19	0.74	Advanced	3.56	0.55	Expert
2. Creates a review process of learning standards in all learning areas.	3.19	0.66	Advanced	3.50	0.60	Expert
3. Works with teams in the conduct of review of learning standards to make the curriculum relevant for learners.	3.27	0.65	Advanced	3.60	0.58	Expert
4. Revises the curriculum based on the review of content and instructional strategies relevant to learners.	3.24	0.68	Advanced	3.59	0.55	Expert
5. Relates the curriculum to a setting, situation or area of application to make the competencies relevant, meaningful and useful to all learners.	3.27	0.69	Advanced	3.57	0.56	Expert

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue I

August 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



6. Share exemplary practice in the review of school-based curriculum, contextualization and implementation of learning standards	3.14	0.71	Advanced	3.54	0.58	Expert
7. Engages teachers in writing and revising some alternative models and strategies relevant for learners.	3.16	0.73	Advanced	3.54	0.58	Expert
8. Leads on the school learning action cell on contextualizing learning standards.	3.32	0.71	Advanced	3.58	0.60	Expert
9. Assists teachers need on designing activities, procedures, processes and disciplines on how and when to apply skills and knowledge in a given context.	3.24	0.64	Advanced	3.58	0.59	Expert
10. Requires school-based contextualized learning materials and instructions relevant for learners.	3.22	0.63	Advanced	3.55	0.59	Expert
11. Demonstrates deeper knowledge and understanding on the implementation of learning standards.	3.22	0.71	Advanced	3.56	0.58	Expert
12. Reviews the content of learning standards	3.30	0.66	Advanced	3.55	0.58	Expert
13. Monitors the implementation of learning standards.	3.32	0.67	Advanced	3.56	0.59	Expert
14. Evaluates the implementation of learning.	3.24	0.68	Advanced	3.57	0.59	Expert
15. Adjusts the implementation plan for learning standards to cope the most essential learning competencies	3.16	0.76	Advanced	3.54	0.61	Expert
COMPOSITE MEAN	3.23	0.62	Advanced	3.56	0.51	Expert

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



2.2 Teaching Standards and Pedagogies. This involves the process of making decisions about what to learn, why, and how to organize the teaching and learning process, considering existing curriculum requirements and the resources available. Table 9 displays the assessment of school heads' level of instructional management competence in terms of teaching standards and pedagogies.

It can be gleaned in the table that based on the assessment of supervisors, the school heads were advanced in *engaging* school personnel such as master teachers, head teachers and department heads and in *providing* technical assistance to teachers through coaching and mentoring and in *conducting* school-based trainings on teaching standards and pedagogies in all learning areas to improve their teaching practices. This is a clear fact that supervisors group confirmed that there is collaboration between and among school heads, master teachers, head teachers and department heads in providing TA. The findings also indicates that public school heads assisted their teachers in the teaching and learning process through coaching and mentoring during school learning action cell.

Table 9

Level of School Heads' Instructional Management Competence in terms of Teaching Standards and Pedagogies

Indicators	Supervisors			Teachers		
	WM	SD	VI	WM	SD	VI
1. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of teaching standards and pedagogies within and across learning areas.	3.30	0.70	Advanced	3.59	0.55	Expert
2. Provides technical assistance to teachers through coaching and mentoring.	3.35	0.71	Advanced	3.59	0.56	Expert
3. Engages school personnel such as master teachers, head teachers and department heads	3.41	0.73	Advanced	3.58	0.58	Expert

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue I

August 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



4. Exhibits best practices in providing technical assistance to teachers for them to develop exemplary practices.	3.24	0.72	Advanced	3.53	0.61	Expert
5. Introduces new and effective modes of instruction that focuses on the current trends	3.27	0.69	Advanced	3.47	0.61	Expert
6. Offers educational programs, projects and services which provide equitable opportunities for all types of learners.	3.22	0.63	Advanced	3.52	0.61	Expert
7. Conducts school-based trainings on teaching standards and pedagogies in all learning areas	3.35	0.68	Advanced	3.58	0.60	Expert
8. Discusses Constructivist, Collaborative, Integrative, Reflective and Inquiry Based Learning (2C-2I-1R).	3.30	0.66	Advanced	3.52	0.60	Expert
9. Ensures the implementation of blended learning during the time of pandemic.	3.19	0.70	Advanced	3.60	0.56	Expert
10. Encourages teachers to use experiential learning approaches.	3.32	0.71	Advanced	3.61	0.57	Expert
11. Encourages to create differentiated ready formix-ability learners.	3.32	0.67	Advanced	3.58	0.60	Expert
12. Motivates teachers to use teachnology and social media flatforms in teaching	3.32	0.71	Advanced	3.62	0.57	Expert
13. Monitors the implementation of blended learning during the time of pandemic.	3.30	0.70	Advanced	3.55	0.60	Expert
14. Evaluates the implementation of blended learning during the time of pandemic.	3.24	0.68	Advanced	3.54	0.60	Expert

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



15. Guarantees the availability of necessary learning materials, learning activity sheets and learning modules	3.27	0.69	Advanced	3.59	0.57	Expert
COMPOSITE MEAN	3.29	0.62	Advanced	3.56	0.52	Expert

2.3 Teacher Performance Feedback. The assessment on the school heads’ level of instructional management competence relative to teacher performance feedback is presented in Table 10.

As evident in the table, the result of composite mean as assessed by supervisors and teachers registered advanced and expert respectively in all competencies of teacher performance feedback. This means that supervisors marked lower assessment than the assessment of teachers on the school heads’ level of instructional management competence in terms of the teacher performance feedback.

Table 10
Level of School Heads’ Instructional Management Competence
in terms of Teacher Performance Feedback

Indicators	Supervisors		Teachers			
	WMSD	VI	WMSD	VI	WMSD	VI
1. Demonstrates understanding of the use of feedback obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance.	3.19	0.62	Advanced	3.59	0.57	Expert
2. Builds positive relationship with the learners by taking time to interact with them individually, listening to their comments or concerns and showing enthusiasm when sharing their experiences and stories during teaching and learning.	3.32	0.71	Advanced	3.58	0.58	Expert

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue I

August 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



3. Encourages parents and other stakeholders to give feedbacks based on the learners' interactions to their teachers during teaching and learning	3.30	0.70	Advanced	3.59	0.58	Expert
4. Uses validated feedback obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders to help teachers improve their performance	3.16	0.69	Advanced	3.57	0.58	Expert
5. Collaborates with school personnel in effectively using validated feedback obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders.	3.32	0.71	Advanced	3.59	0.58	Expert
6. Recognizes teachers' great works based on feedback	3.32	0.71	Advanced	3.61	0.59	Expert
7. Spends time and exerted efforts to give substantial feedback on teachers' performance .	3.41	0.69	Advanced	3.66	0.54	Expert
8. Appreciates the positive results gathered on the result of feedback based on teachers performance and focuses on the negativities for better results.	3.43	0.69	Advanced	3.63	0.56	Expert
9. Encourages teachers to attend training workshops based on feedback	3.27	0.77	Advanced	3.70	0.49	Expert
10. Provides allocation of budget and other supplementary learning materials for teachers training and development on upgrading their performance based on the result of feedback	3.30	0.81	Advanced	3.61	0.60	Expert
11. Leads on the training workshop on the feedback mechanism for teachers' priority need based obtained from learners, parents and other stakeholders for the improvement of teacher's performance	3.24	0.760	Advanced	3.58	0.59	Expert
COMPOSITE MEAN	3.30	0.65	Advanced	3.61	0.51	Expert

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



2.4 Learner Achievement. It is essential for the school leaders to recognize and support the achievements of the learners. In this way it could help develop their confidence and motivation for learning. It can also help them to reflect on their own learning and plan appropriate next steps. Table 11 presents analysis of the responses on school heads' level of instructional management competence relative to learner achievement.

Table 11
Level of School Heads' Instructional Management Competence in terms of Learner Achievement

Indicators	Supervisors		Teachers			
	WMSD	VI	WMSD	VI		
1. Sets achievable and challenging learning outcomes to support learner achievement.	3.24	0.68	Advanced	3.59	0.58	Expert
2. Utilizes learning outcomes in developing data-based interventions.	3.29	0.66	Advanced	3.56	0.60	Expert
3. Mentors teachers in sustaining learner achievement to promote accountability of school best performance.	3.27	0.65	Advanced	3.60	0.59	Expert
4. Assesses the curriculum delivery strategies, and assessment procedures.	3.16	0.69	Advanced	3.54	0.60	Expert
5. Formulates other performance indicators that could support on the intended outcome leading to learner achievement.	3.14	0.63	Advanced	3.53	0.61	Expert
6. Sets quantifiable measurements to gauge performance of teachers and learners.	3.05	0.67	Advanced	3.51	0.62	Expert
7. Measures the effectiveness of data-based interventions and its progress towards achieving its goals.	3.14	0.66	Advanced	3.53	0.62	Expert

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



8. Recognizes high performing learners and provides moral support to struggling learners.	3.30	0.70	Advanced	3.61	0.58	Expert
9. Conducts school learning action cell on utilizing technology and other interventions to improve learning outcomes.	3.43	0.69	Advanced	3.63	0.57	Expert
10. Monitors student progress through data-based information to determine if intervention is improving student outcomes.	3.27	0.65	Advanced	3.60	0.55	Expert
11. Evaluates data-based interventions to maintain and sustain learner achievement.	3.27	0.65	Advanced	3.57	0.59	Expert
12. Adjusts or redesigns school learning action cell on modifying data-based interventions suited on the results of the indicators set for achieving high performance.	3.19	0.70	Advanced	3.56	0.60	Expert
COMPOSITE MEAN	3.23	0.560	Advanced	3.57	0.53	Expert

2.5 Learning Assessment. This refers to the functions of school heads in monitoring and evaluating learning assessment tools, strategies, and utilization of result to ensure higher learning outcomes.

Table 12

Level of School Heads' Instructional Management Competence in terms of Learning Assessment

Indicators	Supervisors		Teachers	
	WMSD	VI	WMSD	VI

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue I

August 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



1. Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of learning assessment tools, strategies and utilization of results consistent with curriculum requirements.	3.24	0.64	Advanced	3.61	0.55	Expert
2. Engages initiatives on the innovative use of learning assessment tools.	3.16	0.65	Advanced	3.57	0.58	Expert
3. Focuses on the learning outcomes of each students and gives feedback for improvement.	3.19	0.62	Advanced	3.58	0.57	Expert
4. Encourages teachers to be creative and flexible in assessing student learning on written works and performance tasks	3.27	0.65	Advanced	3.62	0.57	Expert
5. Provides technical assistance to teachers in designing performance task to provide opportunities for learners to apply learning into real life situations.	3.30	0.66	Advanced	3.60	0.60	Expert
6. Ensures that all assessment data includes formative and summative tests aligned with the most essential learning competencies	3.30	0.66	Advanced	3.61	0.57	Expert
7. Emphasizes that learning standards shall be attained and assessed with the provision of reasonable leniency and considerations for possible difficulties met by the learner.	3.19	0.66	Advanced	3.61	0.57	Expert
8. Communicates to teachers, learners and parents/guardians the design and standards for grading learning assessment.	3.27	0.732	Advanced	3.66	0.57	Expert
9. Facilitates teachers on how to conduct remediation for learners who need further guidance.	3.19	0.74	Advanced	3.63	0.59	Expert
10. Monitors learners' portfolio which include written works and performance tasks.	3.30	0.66	Advanced	3.56	0.60	Expert

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



11. Prepares training design for school learning action cell on the innovative use of learning assessment tools, strategies and its utilization.	3.24	0.68	Advanced	3.57	0.60	Expert
12. Leads on the school learning action cell on the innovative use of learning assessment tools, strategies and its utilization.	3.24	0.68	Advanced	3.61	0.59	Expert
COMPOSITE MEAN	3.24	0.61	Advanced	3.60	0.53	Expert

2.6 Learning Environment. The assessment on the school heads' level of instructional management competence relative to learning environment is presented in Table 13.

One of the significant findings as assessed by the supervisor's, registered advanced, and with the highest weighted mean along learning environment, is *providing* learners a physical environment of a classroom structure which can decrease stress levels and help them feel more comfortable in class. This manifests that school heads ensure the safe and orderly environment which students and teachers are safe from both physical and psychological harm. The staff support each other and hold each other accountable for the success of all students.

Table 13
Level of School Heads' Instructional Management Competence in terms of Learning Environment

Indicators	Supervisors		Teachers			
	WMSD VI		WMSD VI			
1. Demonstrates understanding of managing a learner-friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment.	3.43	0.65	Advanced	3.68	0.53	Expert

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue I

August 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



2. Establishes safe and conducive learning environment to enhance teaching and learning.	3.46	0.65	Advanced	3.68	0.52	Expert
3. Sets guidelines such as classroom rules and learners' behavior expected during teaching and learning activities.	3.41	0.64	Advanced	3.66	0.53	Expert
4. Supports teachers and learners by accepting and listening to their voices and suggestions to create a healthy learning environment.	3.32	0.63	Advanced	3.65	0.54	Expert
5. Provides learners a physical environment of a classroom structure which can decrease stress levels and help them feel more comfortable in class.	3.49	0.65	Advanced	3.64	0.55	Expert
6. Ensures effective and constructive behavior management skills of teachers in applying positive and non-violent discipline	3.35	0.63	Advanced	3.65	0.56	Expert
7. Facilitates as a resource person for policies, guidelines and procedures that relate to the implementation of safe and secure learning environments for learners.	3.32	0.63	Advanced	3.62	0.54	Expert
8. Creates an environment within the school that is conducive to teaching and learning	3.43	0.65	Advanced	3.65	0.55	Expert
9. Fosters nurturing learning environments that help children grow and develop.	3.45	0.63	Advanced	3.61	0.57	Expert
10. Monitors school-based practices on achieving a learner friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment.	3.38	0.64	Advanced	3.64	0.57	Expert
11. Evaluates school-based practices on achieving learner friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment.	3.32	0.67	Advanced	3.63	0.57	Expert

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas,
Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



12. Adjusts school-based practices on achieving learner friendly, inclusive and healthy learning environment.	3.38	0.64	Advanced	3.62	0.58	Expert
COMPOSITE MEAN	3.39	0.58	Advanced	3.64	0.51	Expert

Summary of Findings on the School Heads’ Level of Instructional Management Competence. The findings on the school heads’ instructional management competence as assessed by the two groups of respondents were summarized. Table 14 presents the summary of findings on the level of school heads’ instructional management competence along school-based curriculum review, contextualization, and implementation of learning standards, teaching standards and pedagogies, teacher performance feedback, learner achievement, learning assessment and learning environment.

Table 14
Summary of Findings on the School Heads’ Level of Instructional Management Competence

Strands	Supervisors		Teachers			Composite Mean			
	CM	SDVI	CM	SDVI	AWMASD	DAVI			
1. School-based Curriculum Review, Contextualization, Implementation of Learning Standards	3.23	.62	Advanced	3.56	.51	Expert	3.40	.57	Advanced
2. Teaching Standards and Pedagogies	3.29	.62	Advanced	3.56	.52	Expert	3.43	.57	Advanced
3. Teacher Performance Feedback	3.30	.65	Advanced	3.61	.51	Expert	3.45	.58	Advanced
4. Learner achievement	3.23	.60	Advanced	3.57	.53	Expert	3.40	.57	Advanced

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan
Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista
Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



5. Learning Assessment	3.24	.61	Advanced	3.60	.53	Expert	3.43	.57	Advanced
6. Learning Environment	3.39	.58	Advanced	3.64	.51	Expert	3.52	.55	Expert
AVERAGE COMPOSITE MEAN/SD	3.28	.61	Advanced	3.59	.52	Expert	3.44	.57	Advanced

Summary of Findings on the School Heads’ Level of Instructional Management Competence. The findings on the school heads’ instructional management competence as assessed by the two groups of respondents were summarized. Table 14 presents the summary of findings on the level of school heads’ instructional management competence along school-based curriculum review, contextualization, and implementation of learning standards, teaching standards and pedagogies, teacher performance feedback, learner achievement, learning assessment and learning environment.

Table 14

Summary of Findings on the School Heads’ Level of Instructional Management Competence

Strands	Supervisors		Teachers			Composite Mean			
	CM	SD VI	CM	SD VI	AWM	ASD	DAVI		
1. School-based Curriculum Review, Contextualization, Implementation of Learning Standards	3.23	.62	Advanced	3.56	.51	Expert	3.40	.57	Advanced
2. Teaching Standards and Pedagogies	3.29	.62	Advanced	3.56	.52	Expert	3.43	.57	Advanced
3. Teacher Performance Feedback	3.30	.65	Advanced	3.61	.51	Expert	3.45	.58	Advanced
4. Learner achievement	3.23	.60	Advanced	3.57	.53	Expert	3.40	.57	Advanced

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



5. Learning Assessment	3.24	.61	Advanced	3.60	.53	Expert	3.43	.57	Advanced
6. Learning Environment	3.39	.58	Advanced	3.64	.51	Expert	3.52	.55	Expert
AVERAGE COMPOSITE MEAN/SD	3.28	.61	Advanced	3.59	.52	Expert	3.44	.57	Advanced

3. Difference Between the Assessment of the Two Groups of Respondents

This study also examined if there is a difference between the assessment of the two groups of respondents. Table 15 shows the difference between the assessment of the supervisors and teachers on the level of school heads’ instructional management competence.

The table reveals that assessments of the two groups of respondents registered significant difference in the overall level of instructional management competence of the school heads. This indicates that the computed p-value is lower than the 0.05 level of significance, and the decision is to reject the null hypothesis. The results are consistent with significant differences in all strands of instructional management competencies and indicate that the supervisors’ assessment is lower than the teachers’ assessments based on the result of its weighted mean.

Table 15

Difference on the Assessment of Supervisors and Teachers on the Level of School Heads’ Instructional Management Competence

Strands	Supervisors		Teachers		Computed p-t-value	Decision values on Ho	Interpretation
	WM	SD	WM	SD			

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



School-based Curriculum Review, Contextualization and Implementation of Learning Standards	3.23	.62	3.56	.51	-3.62	<.001	Reject	Significant
Teaching Standards and Pedagogies	3.29	.62	3.56	.52	-2.95	0.003	Reject	Significant
Performance Feedback	3.30	.65	3.61	.51	-3.48	<.001	Reject	Significant
Learner Achievement	3.22	.60	3.57	.53	-3.75	<.001	Reject	Significant
Learning Assessment	3.24	.61	3.60	.53	-3.91	<.001	Reject	Significant
Learning Environment	3.39	.58	3.65	.51	-2.90	0.004	Reject	Significant
Overall Total	3.28	.590	3.59	.49	-3.63	<.001	Reject	SIGNIFICANT

4. Relationship Between the School Heads' Level of Instructional Management Competence and their Profile

This study also identified the relationship of the school heads' level of instructional management competence with their profile as to current position, length of service, field of specialization, number of trainings and seminars attended for the last three years relative to instruction, and number of awards received for the last three years relative to instruction.

Table 16 shows the relationship between the school heads' level of instructional management competence and their profile in terms of current position.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Table 16

Relationship Between the School Heads' Level of Instructional Management Competence and their Current Position

Variables	Computed χ^2 values	p-values	Decision on Verbal Interpretation	
			Ho	Interpretation
School-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards	11.30	.003	Reject	Significant
Teaching standards and pedagogies	5.13	.077	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Teacher performance feedback	3.68	.159	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learner achievement	1.52	.467	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning assessment	5.13	.077	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning environment	7.03	.030	Reject	Significant
Over-all Competence	7.03	.030	Reject	Significant

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Table 17 reflects the relationship between the school heads' level of instructional management competence and their profile as to length of service as school head.

Table 17

Relationship Between the School Heads' Level of Instructional Management Competence and their Length of Service

Variables	Computed χ^2 values	p-values	Decision on H_0	Verbal Interpretation
School-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards	1.34	.07	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Teaching standards and pedagogies	1.99	.58	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Teacher performance feedback	.592	.90	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learner achievement	2.61	.46	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning assessment	.765	.86	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning environment	1.98	.58		Not Significant

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



			Failed	to
			Reject	
Overall Competence	1.98	.58	Failed	to
			Reject	

Table 18

Relationship Between the School Heads' Level of Instructional Management Competence and their Highest Educational Attainment

Variables	Computed χ^2 values	p-values on Ho	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
School-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards	4.227a	.121	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Teaching standards and pedagogies	6.654a	.036	Reject	Significant
Teacher performance feedback	6.651a	.036	Reject	Significant
Learner achievement	1.500a	.472	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning assessment	2.775a	.250	Failed to Reject	Not Significant

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Learning environment	4.690a	.096	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Overall competence	4.690a	.096	Failed to Reject	Not Significant

Table 19 shows the relationship between the school heads' level of instructional management competencies and their profile in terms of field of specialization.

It can be inferred from these findings that among the strands and indicators of instructional management competencies of school heads in terms of field of specialization, teaching standards and pedagogies registered significant relationship. This rejected the null hypothesis and showed significant relationship to the school heads' field of specialization.

Table 19

Relationship Between the School Heads' Level of Instructional Management Competence and their Field of Specialization

Variables	Computed χ^2 values	p-values on Ho	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
School-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards	3.81	.149	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Teaching standards and pedagogies	6.43	.040	Reject	Significant

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Teacher performance feedback	5.41	.067	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learner achievement	2.99	.225	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning assessment	3.38	.184	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning environment	4.13	.127	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Overall competence	4.13	.127	Failed to Reject	Not Significant

Meanwhile, Table 20 shows the relationship between the school heads' level of instructional management competencies and their profile in terms of number of training and seminars attended for the last three years relative to instruction.

Table 20

Relationship Between the School Heads' Level of Instructional Management Competence of and their Active Participation to Trainings and Seminars

Variables	Computed χ^2 values	p-values on Ho	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
-----------	--------------------------	----------------	----------	-----------------------

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



School-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards	4.82	.438	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Teaching standards and pedagogies	6.11	.296	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Teacher performance feedback	7.30	.200	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learner achievement	9.16	.103	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning assessment	6.11	.296	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning environment	5.66	.341	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Overall competence	5.66	.341	Failed to Reject	Not Significant

Table 21

Relationship Between the School Heads' Level of Instructional Management Competence and Awards Received

Variables	Computed χ^2 values	p-values on Ho	Decision	Verbal Interpretation
-----------	--------------------------	----------------	----------	-----------------------

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



School-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning standards	1.87	.393	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Teaching standards and pedagogies	3.10	.212	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Teacher performance feedback	3.70	.157	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learner achievement	4.40	.111	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning assessment	3.10	.212	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Learning environment	2.59	.274	Failed to Reject	Not Significant
Overall Competence	2.59	2.74	Failed to Reject	Not Significant

5. Initiatives of the School Heads to Strengthen their Instructional Management Competencies

Determining the initiative programs, projects, and activities relative to instruction is an essential way to provide a mirror on what relevant activities done in the school to strengthen the school heads' instructional management competencies.

Table 22 presents the thematic matrix on the initiatives done by the school heads to strengthen their instructional management competencies in teaching and learning along school-based curriculum review, contextualization and implementation of learning

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



standards, teaching standards and pedagogies, teachers' performance feedback, learner achievement, learning assessment and learning environment.

The table reveals that one of the initiatives done by the school head is Guro-Akayin ko Project (GAP). This is a clear manifestation that the school head is leading by example in developing high quality teachers. In an interview, one school head cited that this activity includes review of curriculum materials and development of school-based standardized test across learning areas. These activities support the roles and duties of the school heads in managing school-based curriculum review, contextualization, and implementation of learning standards. This initiative supports the idea of Hakielimu (2011) that leading by example, supporting teachers, and collaborating with teachers in contextualizing and localizing curriculum to make it appropriate and relevant for learners are some duties and responsibilities of instructional leaders.

Another initiative that reflected on the table is the implementation of School Learning Action Cell (SLAC), Modifying and Revising Curriculum (MRC) Project, Teachers' Enhancement Training Program (TETPRO) for enhancement of curriculum. This indicates that school head is concerned in the professional development of the teachers. It also indicated that the school heads lead on the conduct of SLAC, revising and modifying curriculum that is suited and relevant for diverse learners.

Table 22

Initiative of School Heads to Strengthen their Instructional Management Competencies

Main Theme	Sub-theme as to Instructional Management	Respondents' response/s	Currently Implemented Programs, Projects and Activities (PPA's)
-------------------	---	--------------------------------	--

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue I

August 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Results-Oriented Initiative School-based Curriculum Review, Contextualization and Implementation of Learning Standards	“As a school head I ensure that the teachers reflect on their duties and responsibilities as stated in the RPMS-PPST-IPCRF in delivering quality basic education “I lead and work with teams on revising and modifying curriculum that is suited and relative to learners”. “As a school head I ensure that everyone is given equal importance and provided supplementary learning materials.” “I encouraged teachers to attend different trainings and seminars that will help them grow professionally and to be more efficient by uplifting their teaching skills.” “I explained Collaborative, Integrative, Reflective and Inquiry Based Learning (2C-2I-1R) during SLAC”. “I Introduced new and effective modes for instruction that focuses on the current trends”. “I encouraged teachers to use technology in teaching and learning process.	Guro-Akayin ko Project (GAP) Project (MRC)-Modifying and Revising Curriculum Project (TETPRO)-Teachers’ Enhancement Training Program Project (SIS) which focused on Strengthening Instructional Supervision Project CMMT-Coaching and Mentoring with Master Teachers ,
--	--	--

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume VI, Issue I

August 2024

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



	I applied coaching and mentoring with master teachers to give TA to their co-teachers.	
Teacher Performance Feedback	" I always commend and praise teachers best works and give them constructive criticisms for the negative feedbacks from learners and parents. Thus, corrective action for improvement is applied".	Project (BFF) - Box ForFeedback
Learner Achievement	" I ensure teachers' performance is monitored and given corresponding praises, awards and recognition". "I recognized high performing learners and give moral support to struggling learners".	Recognition
Learning Assessment	" I lead in SLAC on the development and utilization of interventions to improve learning outcomes". " I Utilized learning outcomes in developing data-based interventions". Since learners have difficulties in learning situations, different strategies were implemented : First, I assessed the level of learners' ability thru the result of diagnostic test and interview with the teachers Second, I supported Literacy and Numeracy Program/ELLN	Analyzing QMEA Tool-Quarterly Monitoring, Evaluation and Adjustment of Learner s' Performance

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza



Third, I encouraged teachers to use Implementation technology as learning assessment of Memorizing Multiplication tools to measure the level of learners' Table (IMMT) and Reading Comprehension, (REACOM)

Learning Environment " I stablished good partnership with teachers, parents and other stakeholders to create safe and conducive environment".

"I presented all school accomplishment through State Of the School Addressed (SOSA)

"I ensure that the learning space is conducive to learning.

"I used FB Page, messenger and school website to disseminate school PPA's ".

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban, Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto, Jerico N. Mendoza
