

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION COMPLIANCE OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL HEADS: INFLUENCE OF PROFESSIONAL PROFILE AND PERFORMANCE RATINGS

Carmelito D. Sojor IV

Negros Oriental State University, Negros Oriental, Philippines

Email: carmelito.sojor@norsu.edu.ph

ABSTRACT: *This study determined the compliance level of public elementary school heads supervising kindergarten teachers with the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision 2022 and examined its relationship with selected profile variables. Specifically, it described the school heads' highest educational background, years of service, school size category, school location type, and Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) rating; assessed their compliance across the start-up, actual instructional support, and closure phases; and determined the relationship between profile variables and instructional supervision compliance. A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design was employed involving 81 randomly selected public elementary school heads from the Schools Division of Negros Oriental. Data were gathered using an adapted questionnaire based on the RO7 Manual of Instructional Supervision and analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, and Spearman's rank-order correlation. The findings revealed that school heads were fully compliant with instructional supervision in the start-up ($M = 2.75$), actual instructional support ($M = 2.70$), and closure ($M = 2.67$) phases. Years of service showed a significant positive relationship with instructional supervision compliance, while OPCRf rating exhibited a significant negative relationship. Highest educational background, school size category, and school location type were not significantly related to compliance. The study concludes that professional experience contributes more to instructional supervision compliance than educational attainment or school context.*

Keywords: instructional supervision, school heads, instructional leadership, educational leadership.

1. INTRODUCTION

Instructional supervision remains one of the most essential functions of school leadership, serving as a mechanism for ensuring quality instruction, promoting teachers' professional growth, and improving learner outcomes. As instructional leaders, school heads are expected to provide systematic guidance, monitoring, coaching, and feedback that support teachers in enhancing classroom practices and achieving curriculum standards. Effective instructional supervision extends beyond compliance with administrative requirements; it fosters collaborative professional learning, strengthens instructional decision-making, and cultivates a culture of continuous school improvement. Consequently, the competence and commitment of school heads in carrying out instructional supervision have become central indicators of educational leadership effectiveness across educational systems.

Globally, instructional supervision has consistently been recognized as a critical determinant of school effectiveness. Studies have shown that structured supervision enhances teachers' instructional competence, instructional planning, classroom management, and assessment practices, ultimately contributing to improved learner achievement [1]. Contemporary perspectives likewise emphasize instructional supervision as a developmental process rather than merely an evaluative function, encouraging reflective practice, mentoring, and continuous professional development among teachers. As educational reforms continue to reshape school leadership responsibilities, ensuring that school heads faithfully implement established supervision frameworks has become increasingly important.

In the Philippine educational system, instructional supervision is anchored on the Department of Education's commitment to improving teaching quality and learner performance through effective school leadership. Various

policies and frameworks have institutionalized the supervisory responsibilities of school heads, recognizing instructional leadership as a fundamental component of school governance. In DepEd Region VII, this commitment was further strengthened through the implementation of the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision (RO7 MIS) [2], which provides standardized procedures for conducting instructional supervision across three major phases: start-up, actual instructional support, and closure. The manual serves as a comprehensive guide to ensure consistency, accountability, and quality in the supervision process while promoting continuous instructional improvement in schools.

Despite the institutionalization of the RO7 MIS [2], the extent to which school heads comply with its prescribed instructional supervision processes remains inadequately documented. Existing studies have largely focused on the effectiveness or perceptions of instructional supervision, teacher performance, or instructional leadership, with limited empirical evidence examining school heads' actual compliance with the prescribed supervision phases. Furthermore, little is known about whether school heads' professional characteristics, including educational attainment, years of experience as school heads, school size category, school location type, and Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) ratings, are associated with differences in their compliance with instructional supervision. Understanding these relationships is essential because school leaders operate under varying professional and organizational contexts that may influence how instructional supervision is implemented.

Within the Schools Division of Negros Oriental, where the RO7 MIS [2] has been operationalized, there remains a need to generate empirical evidence regarding the compliance of school heads with the instructional supervision framework.

Assessing their level of compliance across the start-up, actual instructional support, and closure phases, while examining its association with selected professional and organizational profile variables, will provide valuable information on the current implementation of instructional supervision within the division. Such evidence can assist educational leaders in identifying strengths and areas requiring further capacity-building interventions, thereby promoting greater consistency in instructional leadership practices.

Therefore, this study sought to determine the compliance level of school heads with instructional supervision based on the RO7 Manual of Instructional Supervision [2]. Specifically, it examined their compliance across the three instructional supervision phases and investigated whether significant differences existed according to highest educational background, years of service as a school head, school size category, school location type, and Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) rating. The findings are expected to contribute to the growing body of knowledge on instructional leadership and provide an empirical basis for strengthening instructional supervision policies, leadership development programs, and quality assurance initiatives within the Department of Education.

Specifically, this study will seek to answer the following:

1. What is the profile of the school heads in terms of:
 - 1.1 highest educational background;
 - 1.2 years of service as a school head;
 - 1.3 school size category;
 - 1.4 school location type?
 - 1.5 Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) rating?
2. What is the school heads' compliance level in instructional supervision in terms of the following instructional supervision phases:
 - 2.1 start-up;
 - 2.2 actual instructional support; and
 - 2.3 closure?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the school heads and their compliance level in instructional supervision?

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The educational background of school heads has long been recognized as one of the essential determinants of effective instructional leadership. Educational attainment provides school leaders with advanced theoretical knowledge, research competencies, pedagogical understanding, and managerial skills necessary for implementing instructional supervision. As educational reforms continue to demand higher standards of school leadership, graduate education has become increasingly important in equipping school heads with the competencies required to supervise instruction, facilitate teacher development, and promote continuous school improvement. Consequently, numerous international and local studies have examined the extent to which educational qualifications influence the instructional supervision practices of school leaders.

From an international perspective, educational attainment has consistently been associated with stronger instructional leadership behaviors. Sharif [3] reported that school heads possessing advanced academic qualifications demonstrated

higher levels of instructional leadership than those with lower educational attainment. Their study revealed that graduate education enhances school leaders' capacity to supervise instruction through improved decision-making, instructional planning, and collaborative leadership. School heads with master's and doctoral degrees were found to create professional learning environments that encouraged teacher participation, collective responsibility, and continuous instructional improvement. These findings suggest that advanced education provides school leaders with broader perspectives that enable them to perform supervisory responsibilities more effectively.

Similarly, Nguyen et al. [4] found that higher educational attainment significantly influenced the instructional supervision practices of school heads. Their study indicated that school leaders with doctoral degrees were more likely to implement innovative supervisory approaches, utilize evidence-based instructional strategies, and encourage reflective teaching practices among teachers. The researchers attributed these findings to the advanced research training and leadership preparation acquired through graduate education, which strengthened school heads' instructional decision-making and problem-solving capabilities. Rather than relying solely on traditional classroom observations, academically prepared school leaders demonstrated greater competence in using supervision as a developmental process that promotes teacher growth.

The importance of continuing academic preparation was likewise emphasized by Martinez et al. [5], who examined the relationship between educational attainment and professional engagement among school leaders. The study found that school heads with stronger academic backgrounds participated more actively in professional development activities related to instructional leadership and supervision. Continuous engagement in professional learning enabled these school leaders to remain informed about emerging instructional practices, educational innovations, and contemporary supervisory approaches. Consequently, they demonstrated greater confidence and competence in conducting instructional supervision and providing meaningful instructional support to teachers.

Beyond instructional knowledge, educational preparation also contributes to school leaders' ability to respond to increasingly diverse educational contexts. Kim et al. [6] reported that school heads whose graduate preparation included culturally responsive leadership and inclusive educational practices demonstrated greater effectiveness in supervising instruction within diverse learning environments. Their findings indicate that advanced educational preparation enables school leaders to adopt supervision practices that are responsive to learners' diverse needs while supporting teachers in implementing inclusive instructional strategies. Such competencies have become increasingly relevant as schools continue to serve learners from varied social, cultural, and educational backgrounds.

Within the Philippine context, similar findings have been reported regarding the influence of educational attainment on instructional supervision. De Guzman et al. [7] found that school heads who completed graduate studies, particularly in educational management and educational leadership,

exhibited stronger instructional leadership practices than those with lower academic qualifications. Graduate education was found to enhance school leaders' understanding of curriculum implementation, teacher supervision, instructional assessment, and organizational leadership, thereby strengthening their capacity to facilitate instructional improvement within their respective schools.

Likewise, Lopez *et al.* [8] observed that educational qualifications significantly influenced the confidence and competence of school heads in implementing instructional supervision. School leaders with limited academic preparation were found to experience greater difficulty in providing instructional guidance, conducting classroom observations, and mentoring teachers on pedagogical concerns. Nevertheless, the study emphasized that formal educational qualifications should not be viewed as the sole determinant of effective supervision. Instead, continuous professional development, leadership training, and mentoring opportunities remain essential in strengthening instructional supervision regardless of a school head's initial educational attainment.

Although previous studies generally demonstrate a positive relationship between educational attainment and instructional supervision, scholars likewise acknowledge that educational qualifications alone do not guarantee effective supervisory practice. Catapang [9] argued that highly educated school heads continue to encounter organizational constraints, administrative workload, and resource limitations that restrict their capacity to conduct comprehensive instructional supervision. Similarly, Villanueva [10], through a meta-analysis of instructional leadership studies, concluded that while graduate education provides important theoretical and technical competencies, effective instructional supervision ultimately depends on the school leader's ability to translate professional knowledge into meaningful instructional support, collaborative leadership, and continuous teacher development. These findings underscore the importance of combining formal academic preparation with practical leadership experience and sustained professional learning.

The reviewed literature collectively suggests that educational attainment contributes substantially to school heads' instructional supervision practices by strengthening leadership competence, instructional decision-making, supervisory skills, and commitment to continuous professional development. However, educational qualifications operate alongside organizational and contextual factors that may either facilitate or constrain effective instructional supervision. Consequently, while graduate education enhances school leaders' preparedness to perform instructional leadership functions, its effectiveness ultimately depends on the extent to which school heads are able to apply their professional knowledge within the realities of school administration. These findings provide a strong theoretical basis for examining whether school heads' highest educational background is associated with their level of compliance with instructional supervision as prescribed in the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision [2].

3. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the continuous improvement of instructional supervision practices in the Department of Education by providing empirical evidence on the compliance level of school heads with the prescribed instructional supervision processes under the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision [2]. Specifically, the study may benefit the following:

Department of Education Officials. The findings may serve as a basis for evaluating the implementation of the RO7 Manual of Instructional Supervision [2] across schools. The results may guide the development of policies, monitoring mechanisms, and leadership development initiatives that strengthen instructional supervision and improve the quality of basic education.

Schools Division Office. The Schools Division Office may utilize the results to identify strengths and areas requiring improvement in the instructional supervision practices of school heads. The findings may also inform the planning of technical assistance, mentoring programs, capability-building activities, and monitoring strategies to ensure consistent implementation of instructional supervision.

School Heads. The results may provide school heads with valuable feedback regarding their level of compliance with the prescribed instructional supervision phases, namely the start-up, actual instructional support, and closure phases. The study may encourage reflective leadership practices, promote professional growth, and strengthen their role as instructional leaders committed to improving teaching and learning.

Kindergarten Teachers. Although the study focuses on school heads, kindergarten teachers may indirectly benefit from strengthened instructional supervision practices. Effective supervision provides teachers with constructive feedback, professional support, mentoring, and opportunities for continuous improvement, thereby fostering instructional excellence and professional development.

Learners. Improved instructional supervision may ultimately contribute to enhanced classroom instruction and more effective teaching practices. As instructional quality improves, learners are expected to experience richer learning opportunities that support their academic achievement and holistic development.

Future Researchers. The study may serve as a useful reference for future investigations related to instructional supervision, educational leadership, school effectiveness, and policy implementation. It may also provide baseline information for comparative studies conducted in other divisions, regions, or educational settings and encourage further research exploring additional factors influencing instructional supervision compliance.

4. METHODOLOGY

The research methodology employed in this study was carefully designed to systematically investigate the research problems. This chapter presents the research design, research respondents, research environment, research instrument, data gathering procedure, ethical considerations, and statistical treatment of data. These methodological components were selected to ensure that the study was conducted

systematically and that the data collected were valid, reliable, and appropriate for determining the compliance level of school heads in instructional supervision and examining whether differences exist according to their profile characteristics.

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-comparative research design. The descriptive component was utilized to determine the profile of the school heads in terms of highest educational background, years of service as a school head, school size category, school location type, and Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) (OPCRF) rating. Likewise, it was used to determine the level of compliance of school heads with instructional supervision in terms of the start-up, actual instructional support, and closure phases based on the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision [2].

The comparative component of the study was employed to determine whether significant differences exist in the school heads' instructional supervision compliance when grouped according to their highest educational background, years of service as a school head, school size category, school location type, and OPCRf rating. Since the study sought to describe existing conditions and compare naturally occurring groups without manipulating any variable, the descriptive-comparative research design was considered the most appropriate approach.

Research Respondents

The respondents of the study consisted of the public elementary school heads in the Schools Division of Negros Oriental. These school heads were responsible for implementing instructional supervision on kindergarten teachers in accordance with the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision [2]. Only school heads who were actively performing instructional supervision during the conduct of the study were included as respondents.

To ensure adequate representation of the respondents across the Schools Division, the selection of school heads employed the fishbowl sampling technique. Guided by the "50% plus one" rule recommended by the researcher's statistician, fifty percent of the school heads from every district plus one additional respondent were selected through random sampling. The names of all qualified school heads within each district were written on identical slips of paper, placed in a container, thoroughly mixed, and randomly drawn until the required number of respondents for each district was obtained. This procedure ensured that every qualified school head had an equal opportunity to participate in the study while maintaining proportional representation from all participating districts.

Research Environment

The study was conducted in the public elementary schools within the Schools Division of Negros Oriental, Department of Education, Region VII, Philippines. The Schools Division comprises three congressional districts with schools situated in both urban and rural communities. These schools differ in terms of enrollment, teacher population, geographical location, and organizational structure, making them appropriate settings for examining school heads' compliance with instructional supervision.

The Schools Division of Negros Oriental implements the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision [2] as the standard framework for instructional supervision. Consequently, the division provides an appropriate research environment for determining the extent to which school heads comply with the prescribed instructional supervision processes across the start-up, actual instructional support, and closure phases.

Research Instrument

The primary instrument used in this study was a structured survey questionnaire consisting of two parts.

Part I elicited information regarding the respondents' profile, specifically their highest educational background, years of service as a school head, school size category, school location type, and Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) rating.

Part II measured the school heads' compliance with instructional supervision based on the Monitoring and Evaluation Tool (MIS Form 4) for Instructional Supervision Providers contained in the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision [2]. The instrument assessed compliance across the three phases of instructional supervision, namely: (1) Start-up, (2) Actual Instructional Support, and (3) Closure.

The indicators contained in the instrument were adopted from the RO7 Manual of Instructional Supervision [2], thereby ensuring that the measurement of instructional supervision compliance was aligned with the official standards and guidelines prescribed by the Department of Education Regional Office VII.

Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to the conduct of the study, permission was secured from the Dean of the Graduate School and the Schools Division Superintendent of the Schools Division of Negros Oriental. Upon approval, communication letters were sent to the selected school heads requesting their participation in the study.

After obtaining the necessary permissions, the researcher personally administered the survey questionnaires or distributed them through appropriate channels. Before answering the questionnaire, each respondent was informed of the objectives of the study and was requested to sign the informed consent form indicating voluntary participation.

The accomplished questionnaires were subsequently retrieved, checked for completeness, encoded, organized, and prepared for statistical analysis. Data processing was performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) with the assistance of a statistician to ensure accuracy in data analysis and interpretation.

Ethical Considerations

The study strictly adhered to the ethical principles governing educational research and complied with the provisions of the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Prior to data collection, informed consent was obtained from all respondents after they had been fully informed of the objectives of the study, the procedures involved, the voluntary nature of their participation, and their right to withdraw from the study at any time without any adverse consequences.

The confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents were maintained throughout the conduct of the research. No

identifying information was disclosed in any report or publication resulting from the study. All data collected were used solely for academic purposes and were securely stored to prevent unauthorized access.

Ethical approval for the conduct of the study was secured from the appropriate authorities of Negros Oriental State University in accordance with the institutional research policies. The researcher likewise ensured honesty, transparency, objectivity, and academic integrity throughout the entire research process.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The data collected were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical tools.

Frequency count and percentage were employed to describe the profile of the school heads in terms of highest educational background, years of service as a school head, school size category, school location type, and Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) rating.

Weighted mean and standard deviation were utilized to determine the level of compliance of school heads with instructional supervision in terms of the start-up phase, actual instructional support phase, closure phase, and overall instructional supervision compliance.

To determine whether significant differences existed in the school heads' instructional supervision compliance when grouped according to their profile variables, appropriate inferential statistical tests were employed. One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used for variables consisting of three or more categories, while the independent samples t-test was employed for variables consisting of only two categories. All hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1.1 School Heads Educational Background

Educational Attainment highest degree	Frequency	Percentage
Baccalaureate Degree in Agricultural Education	4	4.94
Units in Master's Degree in Educational Management	27	33.33
Units in Master's Degree in Education Major in Administration and Supervision	16	19.75
Master's Degree in Education Major in Administration and Supervision-CAR	3	3.70
Master's Degree in Education Major in Administration and Supervision	11	13.58
Master's Degree in Education Management	1	1.23
Units in Doctor of Education in Educational Management	3	3.70
Units in Doctor of Education in Management and Supervision	3	3.70
Units in Doctor of Philosophy in Management and Supervision	3	3.70
Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Management	1	1.23

Doctor of Education in Educational Management	6	7.41
Doctor of Education in English	3	3.70

Total 81 100

Table 1.1 presents the profile of the 81 school heads, detailing their highest educational background. majority of the school heads (95.06%, comprising of 77 school heads) have graduate-level educational background, comprising of 46 school heads' with units and complete academic requirements (CAR) in master's degrees (56.79%); 12 school head's with master's degrees (14.81%); 9 school heads with units in doctoral degrees (11.11%); and 10 school heads with doctoral degrees (12.34%). Notably, most of these school heads are specializing in educational management/administration and supervision/management and supervision. This is a major finding, as it indicates a strong emphasis on leadership, management, and supervision formal training of the school heads where instructional supervision is covered in these specializations. Notably, a total of 10 (12.34%) school heads have completed doctoral degrees in which majority of them (7 school heads) hold the Degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Management (7.41%). This suggests a commitment to advanced knowledge and expertise in educational leadership. A small percentage (4.94%, comprising of 4 school heads) of school heads holds a Baccalaureate Degree in Agricultural Education. This is a notable outlier, potentially indicating a unique context or factor within the school system

With the majority of school heads having graduate-level education, they are likely equipped with advanced knowledge of school administration, curriculum planning, and instructional leadership as Sharif [3] reported that school heads with more advanced degrees demonstrate a greater capacity for effective instructional leadership, fostering a collaborative environment that enhances teaching and learning outcomes. This educational background enables them to provide well-informed guidance and supervision to teachers. Those pursuing Master's and Doctoral degrees are likely exposed to research-based educational management principles. This can improve their ability to make data-driven decisions in instructional supervision. Some school heads specialize in Management, Supervision, and English Education, which suggests varied instructional leadership approaches. This diversity can impact how they mentor teachers, develop curricula, and implement best teaching practices in schools. The 4 school heads (5%) with only a Baccalaureate degree may have limited training in instructional supervision, which could affect their ability to evaluate and mentor teachers effectively. School heads without a completed master's degree (those taking units) may still be in the process of developing their leadership competencies. This could be a concern in the field of instructional supervision as Lopez et al. [8] identified that school heads with the limited educational background were less likely to conduct effective instructional supervision with the lack of confidence in the use of pedagogical strategies.

The high number of school heads with advanced degrees suggests strong educational leadership in schools. This background positively impacts instructional supervision, as

these leaders can guide teachers using research-based strategies. However, continuous professional development (CPD) programs should be encouraged, especially for those still pursuing their degrees. Training in instructional leadership and curriculum implementation should be prioritized to ensure all school heads, regardless of their level of education, are equipped to mentor and evaluate teachers effectively.

Table 1.2 School Heads Years of Service as a School Head

Number of Years in Service as School Head	Frequency	Percentage
5 years and below	19	23.46
6-10 years	2	2.47
11-15 years	26	32.10
16-20 years	23	28.40
21 years and above	11	13.58
Total	81	100

Table 1.2 shows the profile of school heads in terms of years of service as a school head. Majority of the school heads (32.10%, comprising of 26 school heads) have been serving for 11-15 years. This indicates a significant pool of experienced leaders who have likely developed a strong understanding of school operations and instructional supervision. A substantial portion (23.46%) or 19 of the school heads have 5 years or less of experience. This suggests a relatively recent influx of new leaders into the system. The group with 16-20 years of service (28.40%, comprising of 12 school heads) represents a considerable portion of experienced leaders approaching the later stages of their careers. There are 11 school heads with 21 years and above group (13.58%) signifying a smaller but highly experienced segment. Notably, the 6-10 years group has the smallest representation (2.47%, comprising of only 2 school heads).

These findings on the distribution of experience levels are important when considering the research on how years of service influence instructional supervision. Sun et al. [11] found a positive correlation between principals' years of experience and their engagement in instructional leadership, including supervision. Their study suggested that more experienced leaders tend to provide clearer instructional guidance, monitor teacher performance more effectively, and promote professional development. In this context, the notable portion of school heads with 11-20+ years of experience in Table 1.2 may indicate a potential strength in terms of instructional leadership capacity. However, the research also cautions against a simplistic interpretation of experience. Dacumos et al. [12], while acknowledging that experienced school heads often demonstrate high levels of instructional leadership, also pointed out that they may face constraints in actually engaging in supervision due to competing priorities and workload. This highlights the importance of considering factors beyond years of service that can influence a school head's ability to effectively perform instructional supervision.

Furthermore, the 19 school heads with experience for 5 years and below may indicate that a few number of the school heads may be at the early phase of their service which is subjective to role adjustment and service orientation which

could also be linked to their compliance level on instructional supervision. The distribution of experience among school heads has a crucial implication on instructional supervision. While experienced heads bring valuable experience, they must also be afforded mentorship focused on current trends in pedagogies, emerging instruction strategies, and changing technological advances in learning. The school heads with lesser years of experience require targeted support and professional development. They should be trained on instructional leadership, efficient ways of evaluation, data-driven decision-making, and implementing a positive school climate. Ensuring adequate support is the key to keeping them in the position. There is a small number of school heads in the 6-10 year range. This raises concerns over succession planning. School districts must identify and nurture potential leaders early on to ensure a smooth transition when experienced heads retire. This includes opportunities for professional growth and leadership experiences. The wide range of experience levels necessitates differentiated supervisory approaches. Feedback, support, and evaluation approaches need to be shaped according to the needs and experience of every school head under the supervision of school heads. The experienced head can bring stability, but on the other hand, may resist innovation. A newly appointed head might be open to innovation, but lacks the experience to manage difficult situations effectively. It is very essential to consider these factors for instructional supervision compliance level and create an environment that nurtures both experience and innovation through continuing professional development. This was perceived by Caballero et al. [13] in which continuing professional growth is significant for school heads. It also builds their capacities for conducting relevant instructional supervision through access to relevant training programs regardless of years of service.

Table 1.3 School Heads School Size Category

School Size Category	Frequency	Percentage
Small School (9 teachers and below; less than 440 learners)	42	51.85
Medium School (10-29 teachers; 441-840 learners)	31	38.27
Large School (30-50 teachers; 841-1,840 learners)	5	6.17
Very Large School (51 teachers and above; 1,241 learners and above)	3	3.70
Total	81	100

Table 1.3 classifies the school heads based on the size of the schools they manage, using both teacher count and learner count as indicators. The data reveals that majority of the school heads (51.85%, comprising of 42 school heads) are managing small schools, characterized by 9 or fewer teachers and less than 440 learners. A substantial portion (38.27%, comprising of 31 school heads) manage medium-sized schools with 10-29 teachers and 441-840 learners. In contrast, only a small percentage of the school heads handle large schools with 30-50 teachers and 841-1,840 learners (6.17%, comprising of 5 school heads) and very large schools with 51

teachers and above and 1,241 learners and above (3.70%, comprising of 3 school heads).

This distribution of school sizes has essential implications for instructional supervision. Research suggests that school size can influence the nature and effectiveness of supervisory practices. Caballero *et al.* [13], in their study on instructional supervision and teacher job satisfaction, noted that in small schools, school heads tend to have more frequent and direct interactions with teachers. This closer working relationship can foster a more supportive environment for supervision and potentially enhance its effectiveness. The high percentage of school heads managing small schools in Table 1.3 suggests that many of these leaders may benefit from this advantage of closer teacher-head interactions. However, the predominance of small schools also raises potential challenges. As indicated in the original analysis, small schools may face resource allocation issues, multi-grade teaching situations, and a higher workload for the school head, who may need to take on multiple roles. These factors can influence the time and resources available for instructional supervision, even with closer teacher interactions.

Conversely, large and very large schools present different sets of challenges. Robinson [14], in a meta-analysis, found that principals in larger schools often devote less time to instructional leadership activities, including supervision, due to increased administrative demands and a greater number of teachers to support. Sun *et al.* [11] also suggested that in larger schools, it can be difficult for school heads to establish close relationships with all teachers and provide personalized feedback. The limited number of school heads managing large and very large schools in Table 1.3 suggests that these leaders may face these complexities in their supervisory roles.

Dacumos *et al.* [12] further emphasized that in larger schools, school heads are expected to practice distributed leadership to effectively manage instructional supervision. This involves sharing supervisory responsibilities among other school personnel. The findings in Table 1.3 highlight the need to consider the varying demands placed on school heads depending on the size of their schools and the importance of appropriate support and strategies to address these demands.

Although corresponding challenges may be encountered by the school heads, it is very essential and possible that the school heads should maximize instructional supervision and create school culture that allows for collaboration and support in which teachers can comfortably seek guidance and feedback from the school heads, regardless of the school size [13].

Table 1.4 School Heads School Location Type

School Location Type	Frequency	Percentage
Rural	72	88.9
Urban	9	11.11
Total	81	100

Table 1.4 classifies school heads by location type of school they managed. Majority of the school heads (88.9%, comprising of 72 school heads) are assigned to rural schools. This may indicate a largely dispersed population, where small community schools fulfill localized needs. It may also

indicate difficulties in attracting and retaining school heads in rural areas, which could have led to the concentration of assignments in these areas. Only 9 school heads (11.11%) were assigned to the urban schools likely to be denser in population.

In implication, different challenges may be faced by the school heads which can affect their compliance to instructional supervision. Challenges may be slightly different between urban and rural schools, which will affect the school heads' commitment to instructional supervision. Azano *et al.* [15] cited geographical isolation, difficulties in reaching out to other forms of professional development services, and lack of resources as being highly prevalent in rural areas and result in hindering the heads of schools from providing extended services on instructional supervision. At this level, instructional supervision may be further complicated by the difficulty in attracting and retaining qualified teachers, as pointed out by Ingersoll [16]. Rural schools usually experience more resource constraints, such as funding, materials, and technology. This affects the quality of instruction and the school head's ability to give teachers the necessary resources for improvement. Teachers in rural schools face professional isolation because of distance and limited access to professional development opportunities. This means that the school head has to take on a greater responsibility to provide instructional leadership and support. Rural schools tend to have multigrade classes, and therefore, the school head must be aware of the teaching strategies appropriate for different age groups and levels of learning within a single classroom. In rural areas, school heads have to be creative and resourceful in their supervisory practices. They may be more dependent on technology for communication and support, make use of peer observation and mentoring among teachers, and avail themselves of community resources to complement meager school funding. Because of the isolated geography, scarcity of training opportunities, and other resource reasons, rural school heads barely undertake frequent and intensive instructional supervision. The multi-grade teaching system, while common in most rural schools, only complicates matters even further [12].

In contrast to urban schools, they differ in the fact that school heads handling urban schools usually have more diverse pupil populations with different socioeconomic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. As stated by Caballero *et al.* [13] that the larger size of schools and the numbers of pupils in urban settings can pose logistical challenges to the school principals in providing individualized responses and support to teachers. School heads should be prepared to meet such diverse needs through differentiated instruction and culturally responsive teaching practices. Urban settings tend to demand rapid outcomes, placing pressure on school heads. The resultant effect could be an over-emphasis on measurable outcomes and standardized testing. In urban settings, the role of the school head should also encompass expertise in data analysis and utilizing results of assessment for the betterment of instruction. They also need to be able to manage a different team of teachers and staff effectively and ensure coordination among different stakeholders. Large sizes and pupil diversity

make it difficult for urban school heads to develop close relations with all teachers and offer personalized support. School heads in urban schools are often burdened with myriad intractable social and economic problems such as poverty, crime, and language barriers, which become a distraction from instructional supervision [11].

The data highlights the need for differentiated support and professional development for school heads based on their school location. Interventions should be focused on the challenges each type of school faces. For example, the head of a rural school may benefit from training involving resource mobilization, multigrade teaching, and use of technology for communication and supervision. Urban school heads may need assistance in data analysis, cultural responsiveness, and people management. Irrespective of location, there is a need to focus on how to improve instructional supervisions and ensure that all the teachers are supported appropriately. The strategy of effective support for school heads in handling schools requires knowledge of current conditions of school locations and their specific challenges for effective development.

Table 1.5 School Heads Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) Rating

Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) Rating for the Last School Year 2023-2024	Frequency	Percentage
4.50 – 5.00 (Outstanding)	26	32.10
3.50 – 4.499 (Very Satisfactory)	55	67.90
Total	81	100

Table 1.5 shows the OPCRf rating of school heads in terms of their distribution based on the school head's ratings for the last school year 2023-2024. Majority of the school heads (67.90%, comprising of 55 school heads) have "Very Satisfactory" rating (3.50 – 4.499) and 26 (32.10%) school heads attained the "Outstanding" rating (4.50 – 5.00) during the school year 2023-2024. The fact that school heads received both "Outstanding" and "Very Satisfactory" marks on their respective OPCRf can be interpreted on the basis that, in principle, all criteria used for an OPCRf represent a generally acceptable level of achievement. It would also mean school heads are being honest in claiming good performance because the support as well as monitoring and evaluation processes are working accordingly.

While the data indicates positive performance overall, it is important to consider its implications for instructional supervision and compliance. This might correspond to a greater proportion of the school heads ranked with "Outstanding". Generally, these school heads may have managed their instructional work well. Some school heads seek professional development about their role so that they have innovative ways or strategies and teach others the practice of headship. Probably most compliant school heads on guidelines pertaining to instructional supervision, who surpass minimum expectations. They might be effectively delegating tasks and empowering teachers, hence positively impacting teacher performance and pupil outcomes. As they are performing at a high level, it is important to continue

giving them opportunities for growth and leadership development. Regarding the school heads rated "Very Satisfactory," these school heads are meeting expectations in the performance of their roles. They are always improving even though they are doing well. Thus, they may require professional development towards the instructional supervision skills. Probably, they comply with the instructional supervision guidelines, and they require more support to adhere to best practices each time. They can be placed under the mentorship of "Outstanding" school heads to acquire new strategies to improve their performance.

The high OPCRf ratings of school heads suggest a positive impact on teachers and pupils. Instructional leadership effectively fosters a conducive atmosphere for the growth of teachers' professionalism. In the "Outstanding" and "Very Satisfactory" ratings, there might be differences regarding the efficiency of instructional supervision. Some school heads may have been rated "Outstanding" for areas that are comparatively weak. Whichever the OPCRf, there will always be the need to continually improve upon instructional supervision practices. Teachers need to have continuous feedback, support, and professional development for improvement of skills. The effectiveness of the pupils depends on proper teaching techniques and a friendly learning atmosphere. As such, ratings by the OPCRf on the school heads do not show what particular areas need to be worked on and in what aspects these individual school heads have instructional supervisory strengths or weaknesses but the high OPCRf rating of the school heads constitutes the basis that the school heads are meeting the expectations in doing their duties and responsibilities which positively implies good compliance to instructional supervision.

Table 2.1 School Heads' Compliance Level in Instructional Supervision in Terms of Start-Up Phase

Start-Up Phase Instructional Supervision Indicators	Frequency		Mean SD	Interpolation
	Fully Compliant	Partially Compliant		
1. Oriented teachers on the indicators for class observation thru a school memorandum with MOVs (school memorandum, conference notes)	56	25	2.69 0.46	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
2. Assessed teachers' supervisory needs with MOVs (utilizing SAT, Assessment Results, RPMS, Observation Forms, etc.)	70	11	2.86 0.34	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
3. Established the purpose of the classroom visit with	65	16	2.80 0.40	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the

MOVs (school memorandum, conference notes)				expected MOVs
4. Identified the supervisory approach and the type of visit to employ with MOVs (schedule and supervisory approach matrix)	63	18	2.78 0.42	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
5. Determined the conduct of supervisory activity (online or onsite) with MOVs (supervisory matrix, conference notes)	51	30	2.63 0.48	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
Overall			2.75 0.42	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs

Legend:

Range of Mean	Verbal Rating	Verbal Description
2.34-3.00	Fully Compliant	Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
1.67-2.33	Partially Compliant	Accomplished at least 50% of the expected MOVs but less than 100%
1.00-1.66	Non-Compliant	No MOVs Accomplished

Table 2.1 presents the school heads' compliance level in instructional supervision in terms of start-up phase, as provided on the four indicators. Majority of the school heads (70 out of 81) is fully compliant in the start-up phase in terms of indicator 2 "Assessed teachers' supervisory needs (utilizing SAT, Assessment Results, etc.)," and indicator 4 "Determined the conduct of supervisory activity (online or onsite)" has the lowest number of fully compliant school heads (51 out of 81). The high frequency and mean for indicator 2 suggest that most school heads emphasize needs assessment for teachers at the start-up phase. This is critical in providing tailored instructional supervision and support for the individual requirements of teachers. The low standard deviation indicates that school heads generally follow a similar approach in their needs assessment. However, the smaller frequency and mean for indicator 4 suggest that calculating the mode of supervisory activity (online or onsite) would be problematic for some school heads when starting up. It may be due to a host of reasons, including changing school policies, scheduling logistical challenges in organizing visits either online or onsite, or even lack of guidelines regarding the application of each mode.

The full compliance in assessing teachers' supervisory needs aligns with findings from DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020, which emphasizes that school heads, as instructional leaders, must create an enabling and supportive environment for teachers to enhance instructional delivery. This process includes evaluating teachers' competencies to provide the

necessary technical assistance. The challenge in determining the mode of supervision (online or onsite) can be contextualized through the findings of Dacumos et al. [12], which suggested that school heads' effectiveness in instructional supervision is influenced by external factors such as school policies, technological access, and logistical constraints. Similarly, Villanueva [10] emphasized that while school heads may possess the theoretical knowledge for effective supervision, practical application is often hindered by administrative workload and shifting educational policies. The table shows an overall mean of 2.75 (SD = 0.42), which is interpreted as "Fully Compliant." This suggests that, in general, school heads demonstrate full compliance with the instructional supervision activities and have accomplished 100% of the expected means of verifications (MOVs) during the start-up phase, as prescribed in RO7 MIS [2].

However, it is important to note that even within a "Fully Compliant" rating; there are variations in compliance levels across different activities. The standard deviations for all four indicators are relatively low (0.46, 0.34, 0.40, and 0.48). This is a very important observation. These low values indicate that the school heads, as a group, show a high degree of consistency in their compliance with each of the start-up phase indicators. In simpler terms, most school heads are performing these start-up activities in a similar manner. Indicator 2 ("Assessed teachers' supervisory needs") has the lowest standard deviation (0.34), indicating the highest consistency in compliance among school heads for this particular activity. This might suggest that assessing teacher needs is a well-established and uniformly practiced aspect of instructional supervision. Indicator 4 ("Determined the conduct of supervisory activity") has the highest standard deviation (0.48) among the four, although it is still relatively low. This might suggest slightly more variability in how school heads determine whether to conduct supervision online or onsite. Factors such as school resources, teacher preferences, or specific supervisory needs might contribute to this variation.

The overall standard deviation of 0.42 for the "Start-Up Phase" further reinforces the conclusion that there is a strong tendency for school heads to adhere to the expected practices in this phase of instructional supervision. The discussion of the DepEd Manual of Instructional Supervision [2] highlights the importance of providing school heads with a structured approach to supervision. Low standard deviations, as seen in Table 2.1, suggest that school heads are indeed adhering to a structured approach, which aligns with the intent of the manual.

Sun *et al.* [11] emphasized that instructional supervision is most effective when school heads engage in adaptive leadership practices, considering both teacher needs and evolving educational contexts. The start-up phase is essential in setting the tone for instructional supervision throughout the year. The data shows that most school heads pay attention to knowing the needs of teachers early on, which is a good start. Lower compliance with "determining the mode of supervisory activity" needs attention. School leaders heads should be guided on making decisions effectively. The promising feature of "Assessing Teacher's Supervisory

Needs" lies in its high compliance with low variability. This will, in all probability, indicate a common sense of the importance of this activity. Although the overall compliance is "Fully Compliant," continuous improvement is necessary. School heads are to be motivated to contemplate about their practices, take feedback from the teachers, and fine-tune their strategies for instructional supervision.

The findings support the idea that instructional supervision, beginning with the start-up phase, plays a vital role in enhancing teacher development and improving instructional effectiveness. Studies by Sharif [3] and De Guzman et al. [7] stress that effective instructional supervision correlates with higher teacher motivation and professional growth. Consequently, school heads should continuously refine their supervision strategies by leveraging teacher feedback and evidence-based best practices to sustain a high level of instructional leadership. Effective instructional supervision, starting from the start-up phase, can positively impact teachers' professional growth and instructional effectiveness. Such, in turn, benefits the pupil through better learning outcomes. An effective school head would assess teacher needs so as to give better targeted support and professional development for increased teacher satisfaction and motivation. The more specific definition of the mode of supervisory activity prepares and engages the teacher to take a better and active part in the process for better supervision.

Table 2.2 School Heads' Compliance Level in Instructional Supervision in Terms of Actual Instructional Support Phase

Actual Support Phase Instructional Supervision Indicators	Frequency		Mean SD	Interpolation
	Fully Compliant	Partially Compliant		
Pre-Observation				
1. Provided the teacher with the pre-observation tool to accomplish with MOVs (accomplished pre-observation form)	55	26	2.68 0.47	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
2. Guided/ collaborated with the teacher in planning the lesson (materials, strategies, questions) with MOVs (CBOW, learners' profile, conference notes)	52	29	2.64 0.48	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
3. Discussed/ planned with the teacher on activities and procedures with MOVs (CBOW, learners' profile, conference notes)	58	23	2.72 0.45	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
4. Pointed out expectation from learners based on target learning outcomes with MOVs (CBOW,	46	35	2.57 0.50	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs

learners' profile, conference notes)

Actual Observation				
5. Observed the classroom instruction with MOVs (utilizing the pre-observation tool, class observation checklist, and lesson plan, COT)	68	13	2.84 0.37	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
6. Documented instructional engagement highlighting desired behaviour expected from the teacher and learners with MOVs (actual observation notes)	57	24	2.70 0.46	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
7. Documented instructional engagement highlighting developmental points and actions with MOVs (actual observation notes)	61	20	2.65 0.43	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
8. Documented instructional engagement highlighting strategies used with MOVs (actual observation notes)	53	28	2.65 0.48	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
9. Documented instructional engagement highlighting decisions made, what went well, and what could be done differently with MOVs (actual observation notes)	58	23	2.72 0.45	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
10. Documented instructional engagement highlighting learners' achievement and others with MOVs (actual observation notes)	48	33	2.59 0.49	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
Post-Observation				
11. Congratulated the teacher for a successful instructional delivery with	74	7	2.91 0.28	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs

MOVs (post-observation conference notes)				
12. Allowed the teacher to share his/her feelings/thoughts on the delivery of the lesson (post-observation conference notes)	73	8	2.90 0.30	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
13. Summarized impressions and assessments of the less (post-observation conference notes)	62	19	2.77 0.42	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
14. Compared the plan with the actual implementation of the lesson (post-observation conference notes)	52	29	2.64 0.48	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
15. Analyzed why the desired outcomes were not achieved (post-observation conference notes)	52	29	2.64 0.48	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
16. Deduced connection between the pupil achievement and teacher performance (post-observation conference notes)	45	36	2.56 0.50	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
Overall			2.70 0.44	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs

Table 2.2 presents the school heads' compliance level in instructional supervision concerning the "Actual Instructional Support Phase." The table is divided into Pre-Observation, Actual Observation, and Post-Observation activities, providing the frequency of compliance (Fully Compliant, Partially Compliant, Non-Compliant), the mean score for each indicator, and the standard deviation.

Indicator 11 elicited the highest recorded compliance in instructional supervision which is when a school head "Congratulated the teacher after a successful delivery of instructions" (Mean = 2.91; SD = 0.28). It would indicate that nearly all school heads provided very regular recognition of teacher efforts at the end of lesson deliveries with positive reinforcement as a practice in instructional supervision. Similarly, indicator 12 "Allowed the teacher to share his/her feelings/thoughts on the delivery of the lesson" also came with a mean of 2.90 and a standard deviation of 0.30, pointing out a strong emphasis on supportive post-observation feedback mechanisms. This aligns with the DepEd Manual of Instructional Supervision [2], which emphasizes the role of school heads in providing continuous guidance and support to teachers, ultimately creating a nurturing environment that enhances instructional delivery.

In contrast, the lowest compliance in the scale was seen in indicator 16 "Deduced connection between the pupil achievement and teacher performance" with a mean of 2.56 and a standard deviation of 0.50. This means that school heads were less involved in the deeper analysis of pupil performance in relation to teaching effectiveness. Studies by Dacumos et al. [12] and Villanueva [10] indicate that many instructional leaders struggle with leveraging assessment data to refine instructional practices, often due to inadequate training in educational data analysis. Without a structured approach to linking teacher performance with pupil achievement, instructional supervision may not fully contribute to improved learning outcomes. Another relatively low-scoring area is indicator 4 "Pointed out expectations from learners based on target learning outcomes" (mean 2.57, standard deviation 0.50), which suggests that some instructional leaders might not be adequately emphasizing pupil outcome expectations during pre-observation. DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017, which introduced the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), also stresses that instructional leaders must guide teachers in articulating clear learning objectives to enhance classroom effectiveness.

The full compliance in post-observation reinforcement activities indicates that school heads are serious about creating a positive environment for teachers. By congratulating teachers and allowing them to reflect on their instructional practices, school heads create a growth-oriented supervision culture. However, the relatively low compliance in analyzing pupil achievement in relation to teacher performance suggests a gap in utilizing instructional supervision to drive pupil learning improvements. Without school heads fully evaluating and interpreting the relationship between strategies used by the teachers and their pupils' achievements, opportunities to target instructional improvement may be overlooked.

Overall, with a mean of 2.70 and a standard deviation of 0.44, school heads have been reported to be "Fully Compliant" in the instructional supervision practices in this phase, indicating that expected means of verifications (MOVs) were fully accomplished at 100%. Such implies that there was a planned and systematic procedure to instructional supervision such that there is always room for guidance and feedback to the teachers. The findings support DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020, which mandates school heads to be instructional leaders who engage in reflective supervision practices that enhance teaching effectiveness.

Considering the consistency of the school head's compliance level in this phase, similar to Table 2.1, the standard deviations in Table 2.2 are generally low, ranging from 0.28 to 0.50 with an overall SD of 0.44. This indicates a relatively high degree of consistency in how school heads implement the activities within the Actual Instructional Support Phase. In pre-observation, indicators 1 to 4 show standard deviations ranging from 0.47 to 0.50. This suggests moderate consistency in how school heads prepare for classroom observations. The DepEd MIS [2] emphasizes the importance of pre-observation activities to ensure a focused and productive observation. The MIS outlines specific steps, such as providing the teacher with a pre-observation tool and

collaborating on lesson planning. The standard deviations suggest that while most school heads are compliant, there's still some variability in how these pre-observation activities are conducted. This could be due to differences in school resources, time constraints, or the specific needs of teachers. In the actual observation, indicators 5 to 10 have standard deviations ranging from 0.37 to 0.49. Indicator 5 ("Observed the classroom instruction...") has a relatively low standard deviation (0.37), indicating strong consistency in the core activity of classroom observation. The MIS [2] provides guidelines on what to observe and how to document instructional engagement. The standard deviations suggest that school heads generally adhere to these guidelines, but there might be some variation in the level of detail or focus in their documentation. In the post-observation, indicators 11 to 16 show standard deviations ranging from 0.28 to 0.50. Indicators 11 and 12 ("Congratulated the teacher..." and "Allowed the teacher to share...") have the lowest standard deviations (0.28 and 0.30), indicating very high consistency in these supportive post-observation practices. The MIS [2] highlights the importance of providing constructive feedback and support to teachers after the observation. The standard deviations suggest that school heads are generally consistent in providing encouragement and allowing teachers to reflect on their practice. However, there's slightly more variability in how they analyze the lesson, compare it to the plan, and deduce connections between pupil achievement and teacher performance. This might reflect differences in school heads' analytical skills or the time they have available for in-depth post-observation discussions. The MIS [2] provides a structured framework for instructional supervision, aiming to ensure consistency and quality in the process. The relatively low standard deviations in Table 2.2 suggest that school heads are generally following this framework.

However, variation in compliance across these specific activities did highlight some critical areas for improvement. The lower engagement in linking pupil achievement with instructional strategies suggests that professional development for school heads is required on data-driven decision-making in instructional supervision. This strengthening can enhance the teaching habits more based on evidence, thus having them directly benefit both teachers and learners. The data also implies that even though school heads are generally fulfilling the requirements on instructional supervision, some critical areas such as intensive analysis of the pupil achievement, need more thrust. This, in turn will strengthen the service of instructional supervision so that besides supporting teachers directly, it adds value to their pupils' improved learning outcomes. Strengthening professional development programs for school heads in data-driven decision-making and instructional leadership is necessary. As emphasized in the RO7 Manual of Instructional Supervision [2], integrating assessment data into supervision practices can provide teachers with more targeted instructional support. This will ensure that instructional supervision not only supports teacher growth but also translates into measurable pupil achievement gains. By addressing these gaps, school heads can further refine their supervisory practices, ultimately enhancing both teacher effectiveness and pupil learning outcomes.

Table 2.3 School Heads' Compliance Level in Instructional Supervision in Terms of Closure Phase

Closure Phase Instructional Supervision Indicator	Frequency		Mean SD	Interpolation
	Fully Compliant	Partially Compliant		
1. Re-evaluated the teacher based on his/her performance on a particular support intervention with MOVs (conference notes)	52	29	2.64 0.48	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
2. Conducted an exit conference to commend the teacher, discuss on possible learning and development interventions, and agree on what, when and how to actualize plans as part of the provision of a technical assistance with MOVs (conference notes)	58	23	2.72 0.45	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
3. Celebrated the teacher's effort through simple rewards and recognition with MOVs (conference notes, certificate of recognition, etc.)	59	22	2.73 0.44	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
4. Sent off teachers as a transition activity to the various activities for continuous improvement to better performance with MOVs (conference notes)	49	32	2.60 0.49	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs
Overall			2.67 0.45	Fully Compliant: Accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs

Table 2.3 presents the school heads' compliance level in instructional supervision in terms of closure phase. The highest compliance indicator is "Celebrated the teacher's effort through simple rewards and recognition", which has the highest mean of 2.73 and the lowest standard deviation of 0.44. This suggests that school heads were most consistent in recognizing and celebrating teachers' efforts, which aligns with studies highlighting the positive impact of motivation

and reinforcement on teacher performance and engagement [3]. The DepEd RO7 Manual of Instructional Supervision [2] emphasizes that instructional supervision should foster a supportive and nurturing environment, reinforcing teachers' confidence and commitment to professional growth. Recognition and motivation are the keys to a positive work environment, and the high compliance level in this activity shows that school heads value appreciation as a reinforcement strategy. Since recognition contributes to teacher morale and engagement, this high level of compliance could lead to improved teacher performance and a more motivated workforce. Similarly, conducting an exit conference also received high compliance (Mean = 2.72; SD = 0.45), indicating that school heads actively engage in providing feedback, discussing possible learning and development interventions, and planning the next steps. This practice aligns with DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020, which highlights that school heads, as instructional leaders, should provide continuous guidance to help teachers enhance their instructional delivery. Villanueva [10] found that school heads who conduct structured exit conferences tend to have teachers who are more reflective and proactive in implementing recommended teaching strategies.

On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest compliance is "Sent off teachers as a transition activity to the various activities for continuous improvement to better performance", which has the lowest mean of 2.60 and the highest standard deviation of 0.49. The higher variability suggests that school heads implement this practice inconsistently, potentially due to a lack of structured transition protocols. Dacumos et al. [12] emphasized that effective transition activities allow teachers to integrate supervision feedback into their teaching practices systematically, ultimately improving instructional quality and pupil learning outcomes. The lower level of compliance could indicate a weakness in ensuring the structured transition for teachers after the instructional supervision process. Without the proper sendoff or transition, teachers may not fully integrate and apply the recommendations or interventions offered, which would weaken the continuity of professional growth.

Considering specifically the school heads' compliance level in the closure phase, the standard deviations in Table 2.3 are relatively low, ranging from 0.44 to 0.49. This suggests that, similar to the previous phases, there is a general consistency in how school heads implement the activities within the Closure Phase. Indicators 1, 2, and 4 have standard deviations of 0.48, 0.45, and 0.49, respectively. These values indicate a moderate level of consistency among school heads in their practices related to re-evaluating teachers, conducting exit conferences, and sending off teachers for continuous improvement. Indicator 3 ("Celebrated the teacher's effort...") has the lowest standard deviation (0.44). This suggests the highest consistency in compliance among school heads for this specific activity. It implies that school heads are generally consistent in recognizing and celebrating teacher efforts, which is a positive aspect of fostering a supportive supervisory environment. The DepEd MIS [2] emphasizes the importance of the Closure Phase as a crucial step in the instructional supervision process. It highlights the need for

school heads to provide feedback, plan for future development, and acknowledge teachers' efforts. The overall consistency in compliance (SD = 0.45), as reflected by the low standard deviations, is a positive finding. It suggests that school heads are generally implementing the Closure Phase activities in a standardized manner, which can contribute to a more equitable and effective supervisory process.

Such suggests a general score mean of 2.67 and a SD of 0.45: In general, most school heads, therefore are fully compliant in supporting closure in instruction by the closing phases of instruction supervisions conducted for them, an indication, this is somewhat well-structured, systematic means, but just minor variability means it is far from being one size fits all activities. There seems to be high compliance in recognition of teachers; this indicates that school heads know the importance of motivation. On the other hand, lower compliance in transitioning teachers into continuous improvement activities may point to a training need or further guidelines on the smooth transition from supervision to implementation. The differences in compliance may indicate gaps in implementation across different schools or districts. Strengthening instructional supervision frameworks may standardize practices. Structured closure activities benefit teachers by clarifying expectations, next steps, and areas for growth. High compliance in recognizing teachers can enhance motivation, job satisfaction, and retention. The lower compliance in transition activities could lead to challenges in sustaining teacher development, which may indirectly affect instructional quality and pupil learning outcomes.

Overall, the school heads are "Fully Compliant" (mean = 2.67; SD = 0.45) in instructional supervision in terms of closure phase, indicating that the school heads have accomplished 100% of the expected MOVs in this phase as prescribed in the RO7 MIS [2]. However, variations in compliance levels suggest gaps in implementation. Strengthening instructional supervision frameworks, as outlined in the RO7 Manual of Instructional Supervision [2], can help standardize practices and ensure seamless transitions for teacher development. Additionally, De Guzman et al. [7] found that when school heads actively guide teachers through transition activities, it fosters long-term professional growth and sustained instructional improvement. It is very essential for school heads develop structured transition programs to ensure that teachers effectively integrate instructional feedback into their future teaching practices as emphasized in DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017, ongoing supervision and mentorship should be embedded in the school's professional development programs to sustain teacher growth. Addressing inconsistencies in transition activities will enhance the overall efficacy of instructional supervision, ultimately leading to improved teacher performance and better pupil learning outcomes.

Table 5. Relationship between the School Heads' Profile and Their Compliance Level in Instructional Supervision

Profile Variable	Spearman rho (ρ)	p-value	Degree of Relationship	Decision
Highest Educational Background	0.01	0.38	Negligible Positive Correlation	Not Significant Fail to Reject H_0

Profile Variable	Spearman rho (ρ)	p-value	Degree of Relationship	Decision
Years of Service as School Head	0.37	<0.001	Weak Positive Correlation	Significant Reject H_0
School Size Category	0.14	0.22	Weak Positive Correlation	Not Significant Fail to Reject H_0
School Location Type	0.07	0.54	Negligible Positive Correlation	Not Significant Fail to Reject H_0
OPCRF Rating	-0.34	0.002	Weak Negative Correlation	Significant Reject H_0

The results indicate that among the five profile variables examined, only years of service as a school head and Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) rating demonstrated statistically significant relationships with school heads' compliance level in instructional supervision. Specifically, years of service exhibited a weak positive correlation ($\rho = 0.37$, $p < 0.001$), suggesting that school heads with longer administrative experience generally demonstrate higher compliance with the prescribed instructional supervision processes. This finding implies that accumulated professional experience enables school heads to become more familiar with instructional supervision procedures, strengthens their supervisory competencies, and enhances their confidence in implementing the provisions of the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision [2]. The result corroborates the findings of Caballero *et al.* [13], who reported that experienced school heads tend to exhibit more effective instructional supervision practices, and Dacumos *et al.* [12], who likewise emphasized that experienced school leaders possess greater confidence in carrying out supervisory responsibilities.

Conversely, the OPCRf rating demonstrated a weak but statistically significant negative correlation with instructional supervision compliance ($\rho = -0.34$, $p = 0.002$). This finding suggests that school heads who obtained higher OPCRf ratings tended to exhibit relatively lower compliance with instructional supervision. Although this result appears contrary to the assumption that highly performing school heads also demonstrate greater supervisory compliance, it may indicate that school heads with higher performance ratings devote substantial attention to broader administrative and managerial responsibilities that compete with the time and effort required for instructional supervision. Dacumos *et al.* [12] similarly argued that administrative workload and competing leadership responsibilities may reduce school heads' direct engagement in instructional supervision despite satisfactory overall performance. The finding also suggests that OPCRf ratings may capture a wider range of leadership functions beyond instructional supervision alone.

On the other hand, highest educational background, school size category, and school location type were not significantly associated with instructional supervision compliance. Although educational attainment is often considered an important indicator of leadership competence, the negligible positive correlation ($\rho = 0.01$, $p = 0.38$) indicates that advanced academic qualifications alone do not necessarily translate into greater compliance with instructional

supervision. This finding supports the observations of Lopez *et al.* [8], Villanueva [10], and Catapang [9], who emphasized that instructional supervision is influenced not only by educational qualifications but also by practical leadership competencies, organizational context, motivation, and professional experience. Similarly, neither school size category ($\rho = 0.14$, $p = 0.22$) nor school location type ($\rho = 0.07$, $p = 0.54$) significantly influenced school heads' compliance. These findings suggest that school heads are generally able to implement instructional supervision regardless of whether they manage small or large schools or are assigned to urban or rural settings. Rather than structural characteristics of schools, effective instructional supervision appears to depend more on the leadership capabilities and professional practices of school heads.

The findings may also be interpreted through the lens of Transformational Leadership Theory proposed by Burns [17], which emphasizes that leadership effectiveness depends primarily on leaders' ability to inspire, motivate, and develop their followers rather than on their personal credentials or organizational circumstances. The absence of significant relationships between educational background, school size, and school location with instructional supervision compliance suggests that transformational leadership behaviors are cultivated through leadership practice and professional experience rather than through formal qualifications or contextual conditions alone. Likewise, the positive influence of years of service indicates that transformational leadership competencies are strengthened through continued leadership experience.

Similarly, Distributed Leadership Theory advanced by Spillane [18] provides further explanation for the findings. The theory argues that leadership functions are distributed among various members of the school organization rather than residing solely in the school head. Consequently, compliance with instructional supervision may depend less on individual demographic or organizational characteristics and more on collaborative leadership practices involving master teachers, department heads, and other instructional leaders. This perspective helps explain why educational background, school size, and school location were not significant determinants of compliance while professional experience remained influential.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that school heads' compliance with instructional supervision is influenced more by professional experience than by educational attainment or school context. While years of service contributes positively to compliance, the negative association with OPCRf ratings suggests that broader administrative responsibilities may sometimes compete with instructional leadership functions. These results underscore the need for continuous leadership development programs that strengthen instructional supervision competencies while ensuring that performance evaluation systems adequately recognize instructional leadership as a core responsibility of school heads.

6. CONCLUSION

This study examined the profile of school heads and their level of compliance with instructional supervision in accordance with the Regional Office VII Manual of

Instructional Supervision. The findings revealed that the majority of the school heads possessed graduate-level educational qualifications, had considerable experience in school leadership, managed predominantly small and rural schools, and obtained Very Satisfactory to Outstanding Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) ratings. These characteristics indicate that the respondents generally possess the professional preparation and administrative experience expected of instructional leaders in public elementary schools.

The study further established that school heads were fully compliant with the instructional supervision requirements across the three phases of instructional supervision—start-up, actual instructional support, and closure. This demonstrates that school heads consistently implemented the prescribed supervisory processes and accomplished the required means of verification, reflecting adherence to the standards set forth in the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision. Although variations were observed across specific supervisory indicators, these differences did not diminish the overall high level of compliance exhibited by the respondents.

With respect to the relationship between school heads' profile and instructional supervision compliance, the findings showed that years of service as a school head and OPCRf rating were the only profile variables significantly associated with compliance. School heads with longer administrative experience tended to demonstrate higher compliance with instructional supervision, highlighting the contribution of accumulated leadership experience to the effective implementation of supervisory responsibilities. Conversely, the significant negative relationship between OPCRf rating and instructional supervision compliance suggests that higher overall performance ratings do not necessarily correspond to greater compliance with instructional supervision, implying that broader administrative responsibilities and performance expectations may influence the amount of attention devoted to instructional leadership functions.

In contrast, highest educational background, school size category, and school location type were not significantly related to instructional supervision compliance. These findings suggest that compliance with instructional supervision is not primarily determined by formal academic qualifications or the organizational characteristics of the school. Rather, effective instructional supervision appears to depend more on the school head's professional experience, leadership practices, and ability to implement the prescribed supervisory processes consistently across varying school contexts.

Overall, the study concludes that public elementary school heads in the Schools Division of Negros Oriental generally demonstrate a high level of compliance with instructional supervision as prescribed by the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision. While instructional supervision is consistently practiced regardless of educational attainment, school size, or school location, professional experience remains an important factor in strengthening supervisory compliance. The findings likewise underscore that existing performance evaluation systems may not fully reflect school

heads' instructional supervision practices, emphasizing the distinct and essential role of instructional leadership in promoting continuous teacher development and improving the quality of basic education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are offered:

The Department of Education Regional Office VII may continuously strengthen the implementation of the Regional Office VII Manual of Instructional Supervision by providing regular monitoring, technical assistance, and capability-building activities that reinforce the consistent implementation of instructional supervision across all schools. Particular emphasis may be given to enhancing school heads' competencies in data-informed instructional supervision, particularly in linking classroom observation findings with learner performance and teacher professional development.

The Schools Division Office of Negros Oriental may design differentiated professional development programs for school heads that recognize varying levels of administrative experience. Since years of service was found to be significantly associated with instructional supervision compliance, structured mentoring programs may be established wherein experienced school heads mentor newly appointed administrators in implementing effective instructional supervision practices aligned with the DepEd instructional supervision framework.

School heads may sustain their high level of compliance with instructional supervision by continuously strengthening reflective supervisory practices throughout the start-up, actual instructional support, and closure phases. Greater emphasis may be placed on using classroom observation data, learner performance evidence, and teacher reflection to guide instructional improvement and professional growth.

The Department of Education, through its performance management system, may review the alignment between the Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF) and instructional supervision functions. Since OPCRf ratings were found to have a significant negative relationship with instructional supervision compliance, there is a need to examine whether current performance indicators adequately capture school heads' instructional leadership responsibilities and whether instructional supervision should receive greater emphasis in performance evaluation.

School heads, regardless of educational attainment, school size category, or school location type, may continue participating in continuing professional development programs focused on instructional leadership, coaching, mentoring, and evidence-based instructional supervision. The findings indicate that compliance with instructional supervision is attainable across different educational and organizational contexts when supported by continuous professional learning and effective leadership practice.

Future researchers may replicate the present study in other Schools Division Offices or regions using larger and more diverse samples to enhance the generalizability of the findings. They may also investigate additional variables such as instructional leadership competencies, organizational

climate, teacher engagement, workload, availability of instructional resources, and leadership self-efficacy that may influence school heads' compliance with instructional supervision. Employing mixed-methods or qualitative research designs may likewise provide deeper insights into the contextual factors that shape effective instructional supervision practices.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] Ali, F., Hussain, S. T., Zhang, F., Rizwan, M., & Wei, W. (2023). Distributed leadership and organizational innovation: The mediating role of knowledge sharing and the moderating role of organizational culture. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 2607.
- [2] RO7 Manual of Instructional Supervision (MIS, 2022). DepEd Region VII, Central Visayas
- [3] Sharif, U. M. (2020). The role of the principal in developing an instructional leadership team in school. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 15(11), 662–667. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2020.4057>
- [4] Nguyen, T., et al. (2021). Educational attainment and its influence on instructional supervision practices of school leaders. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 29(2), 123–140.
- [5] Martinez, P., et al. (2021). Barriers to effective instructional supervision in early childhood education. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 49(4), 567–580.
- [6] Bhowmik, M. K., Walker, A., & Bryant, D. (2023). Reconceptualizing inclusive leadership to address diversity in schools. *Multicultural Education Review*, 15(2), 139–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2023.2250713>
- [7] De Guzman, R. F., et al. (2020). The Impact of Educational Qualifications on Instructional
- [8] Lopez, A., et al. (2021). Analyzing the Relationship Between Educational Attainment and Leadership Style Among School Heads. *Journal of Educational Studies and Research*, 12(2), 75–91.
- [9] Catapang, M. (2023). Challenges in Instructional Leadership: Insights from Philippine School Heads. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 10(1), 43–58.
- [10] Villanueva, J. (2021). Beyond Qualifications: The Role of Interpersonal Skills in Instructional Leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 24(4), 483–498.
- [11] Sun, J., et al. (2020). The effects of principal leadership on teacher collaboration and student achievement: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 58(3), 261–283.
- [12] Dacumos, L. G., et al. (2022). The impact of school heads' instructional leadership on kindergarten pupils' school readiness in selected public schools in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 101(2), 123–138.
- [13] Caballero, H. C., et al. (2021). Instructional supervision practices of school heads and teachers' job satisfaction in selected public elementary schools in the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 8(1), 1–10.
- [14] Robinson, V. M. J., et al. (2020). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(1), 5–32.
- [15] Azano, A. P., et al. (2020). Rural principal leadership: A systematic literature review. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(1), 124–160.
- [16] Ingersoll, R. (2020). Teacher shortages and teacher turnover: The revolving door of the teaching profession. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 28, 1–38.
- [17] Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- [18] Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23–28.