Instructional Supervision Practices: Their Influence on Teachers' Performance and Learners' Achievement

Mike B. Custodio

Cebu Technological University – Main Campus

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100900536

Received: 28 September 2026; Accepted: 03 October 2026; Published: 16 October 2026

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the instructional supervision practices and teachers' performance. Specifically, it described the teacher-respondents according to age, gender, length of teaching experience, and grade level handled; determined instructional supervision practices in terms of classroom observation, monitoring of lesson plans and instructional materials, coaching and mentoring, and feedback and professional support and assessed teachers' performance. It also examined the relationship between instructional supervision practices and teachers' performance and identified the supervision dimensions that significantly predicted performance. The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational design involving teacher-respondents. Frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were used for descriptive analysis, while correlation and multiple regression analyses were employed for inferential analysis. Findings revealed that instructional supervision practices were consistently implemented, with classroom observation obtaining the highest mean, followed by feedback and professional support. Teachers also demonstrated a high level of performance. Furthermore, instructional supervision practices had a moderate positive and statistically significant relationship with teachers' performance. The regression model was statistically significant and explained a meaningful proportion of the variation in teacher performance. Among the supervision dimensions, monitoring lesson plans and instructional materials emerged as the only significant predictor of teachers' performance. The findings highlight the importance of systematic instructional monitoring and continuing professional support. Consequently, a Performance Enhancement Plan was proposed to strengthen lesson planning, instructional resource monitoring, classroom observation, coaching and mentoring, professional feedback, and continuous teacher development.

Keywords: administration and supervision, instructional supervision, teachers' performance, learners' achievement, descriptive-correlational, Bohol, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

The pursuit of quality education, as outlined in Sustainable Development Goal 4, is fundamentally anchored on effective teaching and robust school leadership (Vindigni, 2024). Globally, the shift from administrative management to instructional leadership has become the benchmark for high-performing school systems (Burton et al., 2021). In the Philippines, the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) mandates that school heads serve as primary instructional leaders. However, despite these national standards, the Department of Education continues to face challenges in closing the gap between policy intent and classroom outcomes. (Prestoza & Naldoza, 2025). There is an urgent need to move beyond generic administration to a specialized form of supervision that directly impacts the pedagogical frontlines.

Instructional supervision is not merely a bureaucratic requirement; it is a clinical process of professional development. Effective supervision utilizes a developmental approach that adjusts to the individual needs of teachers. Empirically, studies suggest that when supervision is collaborative rather than evaluative, it fosters a higher level of teacher efficacy (Nwoko et al., 2023). Instructional supervision is framed as a catalyst for professional growth, specifically through differentiated coaching, clinical observation, and data-driven mentoring, which are essential for maintaining high instructional standards in the modern classroom (Reimers et al., 2022).

A teacher's performance is the most significant school-based determinant of student success. In the Philippine public school system, this performance is objectively measured through the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) (Orbe & Manoos-Pacia, 2025). However, high ratings in these tools do not always correlate with innovative classroom practices. Without targeted instructional supervision, such as consistent feedback on Lesson Plans and Classroom Observation Tool (COT) ratings, teachers may struggle with workload and the integration of 21st-century skills (White & Maher, 2024). This study aims to analyze the direct causal link between the frequency and quality of a school head's technical assistance and the actualized performance of teachers in the classroom.

Learner achievement remains the ultimate metric of educational efficacy. National assessment data, such as the National Achievement Test (NAT) and international benchmarks like PISA, have highlighted a critical need for improved learning outcomes in Philippine elementary schools. Low achievement levels often signal a disconnect between the curriculum and instructional delivery. By strengthening instructional supervision, school heads can ensure that teaching strategies are directly aligned with the diverse learning needs of students (Ulit, 2025). This research posits that systematic supervision is a primary driver in elevating mean percentage scores (MPS) and reducing the number of learners "at risk."

In the Division of Southern Leyte, public elementary school heads implement various supervision mechanisms mandated by the Department of Education. However, a significant research gap persists. Despite uniform supervision guidelines, there remains a noticeable disparity in NAT results and teacher RPMS ratings across different districts. It is currently unclear whether these variations are due to inconsistent supervision styles, a lack of localized technical assistance, or a "compliance-only" approach to monitoring. There is a lack of local empirical data exploring how specific supervisory behaviors, such as mentoring versus monitoring, distinctly impact student outcomes in this specific division. Hence, this study is conducted to examine the instructional supervision practices of public elementary school heads in Southern Leyte and determine the relationship between these practices, teacher performance levels, and learner academic achievement.

Statement of the Problem

This study examined the instructional supervision practices of public elementary school heads and their influence on teachers' performance and learners' achievement in San Ricardo District, Division of Southern Leyte, during the school year 2026–2027, as a basis for a performance enhancement plan.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

What is the profile of the teacher-respondent in terms of:

1.1age;

1.2gender;

1.3 years of teaching experience, and

1.4 grade level handled?

1. What is the level of instructional supervision practices of public elementary school heads as perceived by the teacher-respondents in terms of:

Classroom observation;

Monitoring of lesson plans and instructional materials;

Coaching and mentoring of teachers, and

Feedback and professional support?

2. What is the level of teachers' performance as perceived by the teacher-respondents?

3. What is the level of learner achievement in the selected public elementary schools?

4. Is there a significant relationship between:

5.1 instructional supervision practices and teachers' performance;
5.2 teachers' performance and learner achievement, and
5.3 teachers' performance when grouped according to their profile?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In the pursuit of global educational excellence, the focus has shifted from mere infrastructure to the quality of classroom instruction. At the heart of this quality control is Instructional Supervision, a collaborative process designed to promote the professional growth of teachers and, ultimately, improve student outcomes.

Design

This study adopts a descriptive-correlational design as it is the most appropriate approach for investigating the intricate dynamics between leadership behaviors and academic outcomes without manipulating the natural environment of the schools. The descriptive component of this design allows for a systematic and accurate profile of the current state of instructional supervision practices, teacher performance levels, and learner achievement in Southern Leyte, providing a necessary baseline of data. By utilizing this design, the researcher can capture the "what is" of the prevailing supervisory climate as perceived by the respondents.

Furthermore, the correlational aspect is essential because it enables the examination of the strength and direction of the relationships between the variables. This approach is justified as it seeks to determine if a significant link exists between the frequency of a school head's technical assistance and the resulting pedagogical competence of teachers or the academic success of learners. Unlike experimental designs, this method is ideal for this study because it observes these variables as they naturally occur in the public elementary school setting, allowing the researcher to identify patterns of influence and provide a scholarly basis for the proposed action plan.

The data collection process involves a structured survey instrument designed to quantify qualitative professional behaviors through Likert-type scales. The first segment of the instrument focuses on the specific supervisory actions of school heads, including classroom observation and the provision of technical feedback, while the subsequent sections measure teacher performance through established instructional indicators and learner achievement via assessment outcomes. By employing a cross-sectional approach during the 2026–2027 school year, the study gathers a snapshot of these interactions to analyze their interconnectedness. The statistical treatment relies on measures of central tendency to describe the levels of each variable, followed by inferential statistics to test the hypotheses regarding relationships and differences. This comprehensive paragraph-based methodology ensures that the study moves beyond mere description and into a deeper analysis of how leadership practices correlate with the overall effectiveness of the educational process in the division.

Flow of the Study

This study adopts the Input-Process-Output (IPO) framework to provide a systematic roadmap of the research operations. This model ensures a logical connection between the data collected, the methods of analysis, and the resulting contribution to educational practice.

The Input phase comprises the essential data points necessary to address the research problems, beginning with the respondent profiles that capture key

demographic and professional characteristics such as age, sex, years of teaching experience, and grade level assignment. Alongside these profiles, it incorporates core quantitative variables focused on School Heads' Instructional Supervision Practices, specifically classroom observation, lesson plan monitoring,

coaching/mentoring, and feedback, paired with key indicators of Teachers' Performance and Learner Achievement.

The Process phase describes the transformation of raw data into scientific findings through a systematic, three-step methodology. First, in the Data Collection step, validated and pilot-tested research instruments are administered to the target respondents to gather primary quantitative inputs. Next, during Quantitative Analysis, the collected data undergoes statistical evaluation divided into two approaches: descriptive statistics, which utilize weighted means and standard deviations to determine prevailing levels of supervision, performance, and achievement; and inferential statistics, which apply correlation analysis (such as Pearson's r) to examine significant relationships between instructional supervision and teacher or learner outcomes. Finally, the Data Interpretation phase triangulates these statistical results with existing literature to synthesize data and draw meaningful, evidence-based conclusions.

The Output phase serves as the culminating contribution of the study, featuring a Proposed Performance Enhancement Plan that outlines strategic recommendations and actionable interventions to optimize instructional supervision. Ultimately, this framework provides school heads with localized guidance aimed at boosting teaching efficiency and elevating learner achievement across public elementary schools.

Environment

The study will be conducted in three elementary schools located within the San Ricardo District, Division of Southern Leyte. The municipality of San Ricardo is located in the tip part of Panaon Island, one of the islands of the province of Southern Leyte.

The municipality has eight elementary schools but this study will be conducted only to the three neighboring schools, namely Kinachawa Elementary School, Pinut-an Elementary School, and Esperanza Elementary School. Kinachawa Elementary School has a teaching staff of 9 elementary teachers, Pinut-an Elementary School employs 10 elementary teachers, while Esperanza Elementary School has 13 elementary teachers. The selected schools serve as the research environment where data on instructional supervision practices, teachers' performance, and learner achievement will be gathered.

These schools were chosen due to their accessibility within the district and their representation of typical public elementary school settings in Southern Leyte. The study will focus on the teachers and learners in these schools during the School Year 2026–2027, providing a contextual understanding of how instructional supervision is implemented and its effects on teaching and learning outcomes.

Respondents

The respondents of this study consist of the entire teaching force of the three selected schools in the San Ricardo District. This research will employ Total Population Sampling, a type of purposive sampling where the entire population that meets the criteria is included.

Table 1 Distribution of the Respondents

School	**No. of Teachers**
Kinachawa Elementary School	9
Pinut-an Elementary School	10
Esperanza Elementary School	13
Total	**32**

Total population sampling is the most appropriate approach for this study because the group is relatively small and well-defined. Including every teacher ensures that the data is truly representative of the specific school

environments, eliminating sampling bias and increasing the statistical power of the correlational analysis. Since the study aims to propose a localized performance enhancement plan, capturing the insights of the entire teaching staff is vital for the plan's validity and relevance.

To maintain data integrity, specific inclusion and exclusion criteria were established for the study's respondents. Participants eligible for inclusion were permanent or provisional teachers actively teaching across the three identified schools during the 2026–2027 school year who had completed at least one full RPMS cycle, encompassing classroom observations and performance reviews, under their current school head. Conversely, substitute teachers and those who had been at their station for less than three months were excluded, as they may not have experienced the full scope of the school head's supervisory practices. School heads were likewise excluded as respondents to prevent self-reporting bias regarding their own supervisory performance.

Instruments

The primary data-gathering tool for this study is a researcher-adapted questionnaire designed to assess the instructional supervision practices of school heads and the self-perceived performance levels of teachers. The instrument is divided into three distinct parts to capture comprehensive data.

Part I. This section gathers the essential personal and professional profile of the teacher-respondents, including age, sex, years of teaching experience, and the grade level they currently handle.

Part II. This part measures how teachers perceive the frequency of their school heads' supervisory practices across four key sub-areas: (a) Classroom Observation, (b) Monitoring of Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials, (c) Coaching and Mentoring of Teachers, and (d) Feedback and Professional Support. This segment is conceptually grounded in the supervisory and mentoring standards of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST).

Part III. This part also evaluates the teachers' self-perceived performance levels across seven core performance indicators. The items in this section are directly adapted from the Key Result Areas (KRAs) of the DepEd Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) Tool.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile Of The Teacher-Respondents

This section presents the profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of age, sex, years of teaching experience, and grade level currently handled. Frequency and percentage are used to describe the distribution of respondents and provide relevant background information regarding their demographic and professional characteristics.

Age

This variable presents the distribution of teacher-respondents according to their age brackets. It provides an overview of the age composition of the participants and identifies the age groups represented in the study.

Table 2

Age

Age Bracket	f	%
> 50	9	28.13
46 to 50	1	3.13
41 to 45	7	21.88
36 to 40	4	12.50

31 to 35	6	18.75
26 to 30	3	9.38
20 to 25	2	6.25
Total	**32**	**100.00**

Table 2 shows that the largest group of respondents was 50 years old and above, comprising 9 or 28.13% of the total sample. This was followed by those aged 41–45 at 21.88% and 31–35 at 18.75%. The smallest group was aged 46–50, representing 3.13%. The findings indicate that respondents came from varied age groups, with greater representation among older teachers, suggesting a teaching workforce with diverse levels of professional experience.

Gender

This describes the distribution of teacher-respondents according to sex. It provides information on the representation of male and female teachers and describes the composition of the respondents included in the study.

Table 3

Gender

Gender	**f**	**%**
Female	27	84.38
Male	5	15.63
Total	**32**	**100.00**

Table 3 shows that the majority of the respondents were female, comprising 27 or 84.38% of the total sample, while 5 or 15.63% were male. The findings indicate that female teachers were considerably more represented than male teachers in the study.

Length of Teaching Experience

This presents the length of teaching experience of the respondents. It describes their professional exposure to classroom teaching and identifies the distribution of relatively new, moderately experienced, and more experienced teachers.

Table 4 Length of Teaching Experience

Teaching Experience	**f**	**%**
21 years and above	9	28.13
16–20 years	5	15.63
11–15 years	3	9.38
6–10 years	5	15.63
3–5 years	3	9.38
0–2 years	7	21.88
Total	**32**	**100.00**

Table 4 shows that the largest group of respondents had 21 years and above of teaching experience, comprising 9 or 28.13% of the total sample. This was followed by teachers with 0–2 years of experience at 21.88%. Those with 6–10 years and 16–20 years each represented 15.63%, while 3–5 years and 11–15 years each accounted for 9.38%. The findings indicate a teachers have varied years of teaching experience.

Grade Level Handled

This variable presents the grade-level assignments currently handled by the teacher-respondents. It provides information regarding their teaching assignments across Kindergarten, Grades 1–3, and Grades 4–6.

Table 5 Grade Level Handled

Grade Level Handled	f	%
Kinder	3	9.38
Grades 1–3	16	50.00
Grades 4–6	13	40.63
Total	**32**	**100.00**

Table 5 shows that half of the respondents handled Grades 1–3, comprising 16 or 50.00% of the total sample. This was followed by 13 teachers or 40.63% who handled Grades 4–6, while 3 or 9.38% were assigned to kindergarten. The findings indicate that most respondents were teaching in the elementary grade levels, particularly Grades 1–3. This suggests that the study largely reflects instructional supervision experiences among teachers handling foundational and intermediate elementary learners.

Level Of Instructional Supervision Practices

This section presents the level of instructional supervision practices experienced by the teacher-respondents. It examines classroom observation, monitoring of lesson plans and instructional materials, coaching and mentoring of teachers, and feedback and professional support.

Classroom Observation

This examines instructional supervision practices involving classroom observation. It considers pre-observation conferences, standardized observation tools, non-disruptive classroom observation, attention to teacher-learner interaction, and regular scheduling of observations.

Table 6 shows that classroom observation was Always practiced, as reflected by the grand mean of 4.83 and an SD of 0.30. Among the indicators, scheduling classroom observations regularly according to DepEd guidelines obtained the highest mean of 4.91. The objective use of standardized observation tools and observing classroom teaching without disrupting learning both obtained 4.88.

Table 6 Classroom Observation

S/N	Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
1	Conducts a pre-observation conference to discuss lesson objectives and focus areas.	4.72	0.46	Always
2	Uses standardized observation tools objectively.	4.88	0.34	Always
3	Observes classroom teaching without disrupting learning.	4.88	0.34	Always
4	Focuses on teacher-learner interaction and student engagement.	4.78	0.42	Always

5	Schedules classroom observations regularly according to DepEd guidelines.	4.91	0.30	Always
	Aggregate Weighted Mean	**4.83**		**Always**
	Aggregate Standard Deviation		**0.30**	

Legend: 4.21-5.00-Always; 3.41-4.20-Often; 2.61-3.40-Sometimes; 1.81-2.60-Rarely; 1.00-1.80-Never

Focusing on teacher-learner interaction and student engagement recorded 4.78, while conducting a pre-observation conference obtained the lowest mean of 4.72, although still interpreted as Always. Hill & Paypay (2022) found that structured teacher observation can contribute to improvements in instructional practice and student outcomes, particularly when observation provides teachers with opportunities to examine and strengthen classroom practices. The consistently high ratings in the present study indicate that classroom observation is systematically integrated into instructional supervision. This implies that school heads maintain structured and objective supervision practices. Nevertheless, strengthening pre-observation conferences may further clarify instructional expectations, identify specific observation priorities, and help teachers prepare more purposefully for the observation process.

These findings carry important theoretical and practical implications for institutional leadership and instructional supervision. The strong adherence to standardized DepEd guidelines demonstrates an established structural framework, however, the relative lag in pre-observation engagement highlights a systemic gap in developmental feedback loops. Recent research emphasizes that while compliance-driven administrative observations satisfy policy mandates, true growth in pedagogical self-efficacy depends heavily on non-evaluative collaborative dialogue prior to classroom visits (Kraft & Gilmour, 2021). Furthermore, instructional supervision models in developing education systems show that prioritizing goal-setting and collaborative agenda-building before observation significantly strengthens teacher reflective practice and post-observation action planning (Gumus et al., 2022). Therefore, educational policy and school leadership programs must move beyond structural monitoring by embedding targeted professional development that equips instructional leaders with the coaching skills necessary to maximize the communicative and formative value of pre-observation dialogue.

Monitoring Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials

This examines how lesson plans and instructional materials are monitored. It considers regular review of lesson plans, curriculum alignment, appropriateness of teaching materials, integration of 21st-century skills and ICT, and remediation and enrichment activities.

Table 7 Monitoring Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials

S/N	Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
1	Checks and reviews Lesson Plans or DLL systematically and regularly.	4.81	0.40	Always
2	Assesses alignment of learning objectives with curriculum standards.	4.75	0.44	Always
3	Monitors quality, appropriateness, and contextualization of teaching materials.	4.81	0.40	Always
4	Evaluates integration of 21st-century skills and ICT.	4.81	0.40	Always
5	Tracks remediation and enrichment activities in lesson planning.	4.75	0.44	Always
	Aggregate Weighted Mean	**4.79**		**Always**
	Aggregate Standard Deviation		**0.37**	

Legend: 4.21-5.00-Always; 3.41-4.20-Often; 2.61-3.40-Sometimes; 1.81-2.60-Rarely; 1.00-1.80-Never

Table 7 shows that monitoring lesson plans and instructional materials was Always practiced, with a grand mean of 4.79 and an SD of 0.37. Checking and reviewing lesson plans or DLL, monitoring the quality and contextualization of teaching materials, and evaluating the integration of 21st-century skills and ICT obtained

the highest mean of 4.81. Meanwhile, assessing the alignment of learning objectives with curriculum standards and tracking remediation and enrichment activities both obtained 4.75. Kiryakova & Kozhuharova (2024) highlighted the importance of teachers' competence in lesson planning, adapting instruction, and using digital resources to maintain effective teaching and learning. The consistently high ratings suggest that school heads closely monitor essential elements of instructional preparation. This implies that supervision extends beyond classroom observation to ensuring that teachers' plans, learning objectives, materials, and instructional approaches are appropriately prepared. Continued monitoring may help maintain curriculum alignment, encourage effective ICT integration, and ensure that remediation and enrichment activities respond appropriately to learners' educational needs.

The high implementation ratings observed in Table 7 underscore a proactive shift in school administration, where supervisory mechanisms directly reinforce curriculum execution and pedagogical precision. Recent literature corroborates that systematic instructional supervision plays a critical role in supporting teachers' planning capabilities and instructional performance (Cereno & Carbonell, 2026). When school leaders systematically review daily lesson logs (DLLs) and track learning resources, it validates the structural foundation required for modern learning environments (Kiryakova & Kozhuharova, 2024). These findings imply that continuous supervisory oversight should move beyond mere administrative compliance; it must serve as an ongoing mechanism for professional growth and instructional adaptation. Ensuring that school heads actively assist in aligning objectives and refining remediation or enrichment strategies directly addresses diverse learner needs, thereby sustaining overall educational quality and instructional effectiveness.

Coaching and Mentoring of Teachers

This dimension assesses the coaching and mentoring support provided to teachers. It covers developmental discussions, assistance in managing diverse learners and innovative teaching strategies.

Table 8 shows that coaching and mentoring of teachers was Always practiced, with a grand mean of 4.72 and an SD of 0.45. Providing guidance in managing diverse learners and classroom behavior, suggesting innovative teaching strategies, and collaborating with teachers in establishing professional goals all obtained the highest mean of 4.75. Guidance in action research or intervention programs followed with 4.72, while one-on-one developmental discussions recorded the lowest mean of 4.63, though still within the Always category.

Table 8 Coaching and Mentoring of Teachers

S/N	Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
1	Conducts one-on-one developmental discussions.	4.63	0.55	Always
2	Provides guidance in managing diverse learners and classroom behavior.	4.75	0.51	Always
3	Suggests innovative teaching strategies and pedagogical interventions.	4.75	0.44	Always
4	Collaborates with teachers in establishing professional goals and plans.	4.75	0.44	Always
5	Guides teachers in action research or intervention programs.	4.72	0.52	Always
	Aggregate Weighted Mean	**4.72**		**Always**
	Aggregate Standard Deviation		**0.45**	

Legend: 4.21-5.00-Always; 3.41-4.20-Often; 2.61-3.40-Sometimes; 1.81-2.60-Rarely; 1.00-1.80-Never

Gading (2024) emphasized that teacher coaching can improve instructional practice when it provides individualized guidance, focused feedback, and sustained professional support. The findings imply that school heads consistently use coaching and mentoring to support teachers' professional growth and instructional improvement. Strengthening one-on-one developmental conversations may further help address specific teacher

needs, deepen reflective practice, and provide more personalized support for classroom challenges, professional goal setting, and intervention planning.

The high level of engagement in coaching and mentoring reported in Table 8 aligns with contemporary educational research highlighting leadership-driven technical assistance as a cornerstone of instructional supervision. Recent literature confirms that active mentoring and collaborative goal setting directly foster high levels of teacher self-efficacy, improve classroom management, and enhance pedagogical adaptiveness (Wang, 2026). Furthermore, the lower relative mean for one-on-one developmental discussions underscores a critical challenge in educational management: while systemic guidance and collaborative goal setting are frequently operationalized, individualized feedback is often constrained by time limitations and administrative demands (Ancheta, 2026). Consequently, the findings imply that while school heads effectively establish a supportive macro-environment for instructional growth, institutionalizing dedicated, protected time for personalized one-on-one dialogic coaching is essential to bridge the gap between general supervision and deep, reflective practice.

Feedback and Professional Support

This dimension examines the feedback and professional assistance provided to teachers. It considers post-observation conferences, constructive feedback, and the provision of a supportive administrative environment.

Table 9 shows that feedback and professional support was Always practiced, with a grand mean of 4.81 and an SD of 0.36. Recognizing innovative classroom practices and teacher milestones and creating a safe and supportive administrative environment obtained the highest mean of 4.88.

Table 9 Feedback and Professional Support

S/N	Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
1	Conducts a structured post-observation conference.	4.75	0.51	Always
2	Offers constructive and actionable feedback.	4.72	0.52	Always
3	Encourages participation in professional development and LAC sessions.	4.84	0.45	Always
4	Recognizes innovative classroom practices and teacher milestones.	4.88	0.34	Always
5	Creates a safe and supportive administrative environment.	4.88	0.34	Always
	Aggregate Weighted Mean	**4.81**		**Always**
	Aggregate Standard Deviation		**0.36**	

Legend: 4.21-5.00-Always; 3.41-4.20-Often; 2.61-3.40-Sometimes; 1.81-2.60-Rarely; 1.00-1.80-Never

Encouraging participation in professional development and LAC sessions followed with 4.84, while structured post-observation conferences obtained 4.75. Constructive and actionable feedback received the lowest mean of 4.72, although it remained within the Always category. Johnson et al (2023) emphasized that effective feedback should provide clear information that helps individuals understand current performance and identify appropriate steps for improvement. The findings imply that school heads consistently support teachers through recognition, feedback, and professional learning opportunities. Strengthening the clarity and actionability of feedback may further help teachers convert supervisory recommendations into specific instructional improvements and sustain continuous professional growth.

Providing recognition, administrative safety, and continuous professional development opportunities serves as a key driver of teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction, reinforcing a collaborative professional learning environment (Dela Cruz & Magsino, 2022). While general supervisory support is consistently delivered, feedback often struggles to bridge the gap between superficial evaluation and concrete pedagogical improvement. Recent findings indicate that instructional feedback yields the greatest impact on teacher growth

when it is highly specific, prompt, and grounded in observable classroom interactions rather than generalized commentary (Nicola-Richmond et al., 2024). Therefore, school administrators should move beyond traditional compliance-driven post-observation conferences by structuring supervisory conversations around specific, measurable instructional behaviors. Equipping school heads with tools to deliver detailed, actionable feedback ensures that supervisory recommendations translate directly into classroom strategies, fostering sustained professional development and elevated student learning outcomes.

Table 10 Summary of Instructional Supervision Practices

Variables/Dimensions	WM	SD	Verbal Description
Classroom Observation	4.83	0.30	Always
Monitoring Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials	4.79	0.37	Always
Coaching and Mentoring of Teachers	4.72	0.45	Always
Feedback and Professional Support	4.81	0.36	Always

Table 10 shows that instructional supervision practices were consistently implemented at a high level across all dimensions. Classroom Observation obtained the highest mean of 4.83, followed by Feedback and Professional Support with 4.81 and Monitoring Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials with 4.79. Coaching and Mentoring of Teachers recorded the lowest mean of 4.72, although it remained high. These results indicate that instructional supervision is strongly practiced, with particular emphasis on classroom observation and professional support.

Teachers' Performance

This section presents the level of teachers' performance based on the performance indicators included in the survey. Mean and standard deviation are used to describe teachers' reported performance.

Table 11 shows that teachers' performance was generally Very High, with a grand mean of 4.63 and an SD of 0.45. Applying knowledge of content within and across curriculum areas obtained the highest mean of 4.75, followed by building relationships with parents and the wider school community at 4.72. Designing responsive strategies for diverse learner backgrounds received the lowest mean of 4.50, although it remained within the Very High range. Danielson et al. (2024) emphasized that effective teacher learning and performance are strengthened when professional practice is responsive to learner needs and connected to continuous improvement. The findings imply that teachers demonstrate strong competence in content, instruction, assessment, classroom management, and community engagement. However, further strengthening differentiated and responsive strategies may help teachers address learner diversity more effectively and sustain high instructional performance.

Table 11 Teachers Performance

S/N	Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
1	Applies knowledge of content within and across curriculum teaching areas.	4.75	0.44	Very High
2	Uses teaching strategies that enhance literacy and numeracy achievement.	4.66	0.55	Very High
3	Manages classroom structures for meaningful exploration and hands-on activities.	4.69	0.54	Very High
4	Designs responsive strategies for diverse learner backgrounds.	4.50	0.57	Very High

5	Plans and implements developmentally sequenced teaching-learning processes.	4.56	0.56	Very High
6	Uses diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies.	4.56	0.56	Very High
7	Builds relationships with parents and the wider school community.	4.72	0.46	Very High
	Aggregate Weighted Mean	**4.63**		**Very High**
	Aggregate Standard Deviation		**0.45**	

Legend: 4.21-5.00-Very High; 3.41-4.20-High; 2.61-3.40-Moderate; 1.81-2.60-Low; 1.00-1.80-Very Low

The observed pattern highlights a critical area for professional development: while educators show strong general competence, optimizing learning outcomes requires targeted support in adaptive instruction. Differentiated and responsive teaching strategies are fundamental to catering to varied student readiness, learning profiles, and backgrounds, directly contributing to improved academic performance, student motivation, and inclusive learning environments (Goyibova et al., 2025). When teachers tailor their instructional strategies to accommodate learner diversity, students exhibit higher engagement and critical thinking capabilities (Ghaemi & Boroushaki, 2025). Consequently, educational leaders should prioritize targeted professional learning communities and training programs centered on flexible grouping, task modification, and culturally responsive pedagogy. Addressing this lower-performing area will enable teachers to bridge the gap between strong general instructional practices and personalized learner support, ultimately sustaining high instructional performance across all classroom contexts.

Relationship Between Instructional Supervision Practices And Teachers' Performance

This section examines whether a significant relationship exists between instructional supervision practices and teachers' performance. The analysis determines the strength, direction, and statistical significance of the relationship between the instructional supervision practices and teachers' performance.

Table 12 Significant Relationship Between Instructional Supervision

Practices and Teachers' Performance

Variables	r-value	p-value	Degree of Relationship	Remarks	Decision
Instructional Supervision Practices and Teacher's Performance	0.517	0.002	Moderate Positive Relationship	Significant	Reject H_0

*Significant at $p<0.05$

Table 12 shows a moderate positive and statistically significant relationship between instructional supervision practices and teachers' performance, with an r-value of 0.517 and a p-value of .002. Since the p-value is lower than the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is rejected. This indicates that stronger instructional supervision practices tend to be associated with higher levels of teacher performance. Desrianti & Asmendri (2024) emphasized that effective school leadership can improve instructional quality through supervision, feedback, and support for teachers. The findings therefore imply that consistent classroom observation, monitoring of lesson plans, coaching, mentoring, and professional feedback may contribute to stronger teacher performance.

The strong statistical correlation demonstrates that structured instructional supervision serves as an important driver of enhanced teaching practices. This supports contemporary educational literature, which emphasizes that

supervisory practices function not merely as evaluative administrative measures, but as active mechanisms for developmental growth, pedagogical guidance, and professional support (Aquino et al., 2021; Desrianti & Asmendri, 2024). The rejection of the null hypothesis carries critical implications for educational administrators and policy makers, systematically institutionalizing pre- and post-observation conferences, actionable classroom feedback, collaborative coaching, and continuous performance monitoring directly elevates teacher self-efficacy and classroom management capabilities. Consequently, school leaders should shift away from compliance-driven inspection toward learning-oriented, reflective supervision strategies to build sustained instructional competence across teaching staff.

Instructional Supervision Practices as Predictors of Teachers' Performance

This section presents the regression analysis of the dimensions of instructional supervision practices as predictors of teachers' performance. Classroom observation, monitoring of lesson plans and instructional materials, coaching and mentoring, and feedback and professional support are simultaneously examined to determine their individual and collective predictive contributions to teachers' performance.

Table 13 Multiple Regression Analysis of Instructional Supervision Dimensions as Predictors of Teachers' Performance

Predictor Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t-value	p-value	Remarks
Classroom Observation	-0.004	0.243	-0.003	-0.018	0.986	Not Significant
Monitoring Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials	0.875	0.198	0.716	4.716	<.001	Significant
Coaching and Mentoring of Teachers	-0.076	0.199	-0.076	-0.383	0.705	Not Significant
Feedback and Professional Support	0.121	0.242	0.097	0.499	0.622	Not Significant

R^2	Adjusted R^2	F-value	p-value	Decision
0.504	0.430	6.849	< .001	Significant

Table 14 shows that the instructional supervision dimensions collectively explained 50.4% of the variance in teachers' performance, with an R^2 of 0.504 and an adjusted R^2 of 0.430. The overall regression model was statistically significant, with an F-value of 6.849 and a p-value of < .001. Among the predictors, only Monitoring Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials significantly predicted teachers' performance, with B = 0.875, Beta = 0.716, and $p < .001$. The other dimensions were not significant predictors. Kilag & Sasam (2023) emphasized that school leaders influence instructional quality through focused instructional guidance, monitoring, and support. The findings imply that systematic review of lesson plans, instructional materials, curriculum alignment, and instructional preparation may be particularly important in strengthening teachers' performance.

These regression findings underscore that instructional supervision drives overall performance primarily through concrete, task-oriented guidance rather than broad, unfocused managerial oversight. The strong predictive power of monitoring lesson plans and instructional materials aligns with recent findings that supervisory practices grounded in curriculum preparation, resource alignment, and structured pre-observation conferences yield the greatest gains in teaching quality and professional confidence (Amador et al., 2026; Mustieles, 2020). Conversely, the non-significance of the remaining dimensions suggests that generic supervisory routines without direct connections to lesson design or instructional tools provide negligible marginal value. Pragmatically, school systems should reorient supervisory workflows away from compliance-driven monitoring and toward targeted coaching around instructional materials, lesson planning, and curriculum delivery to maximize educational impact.

SUMMARY

This study assessed the instructional supervision practices and teachers' performance among teacher-respondents. It presents respondents profile in terms of age, gender, teaching experience, and grade level handled, and assessed supervision practices in classroom observation, lesson-plan monitoring, coaching and mentoring, and professional feedback. It also evaluated teachers' performance, tested the relationship between supervision and performance, and identified significant predictors. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, correlation, and multiple regression.

FINDINGS

Data showed that the largest age group consisted of teachers aged 50 years and above, accounting for 28.13 percent. Moreover, most respondents were female, representing 84.38 percent, while males comprised 15.63 percent. In terms of teaching experience, the largest group had 21 years and above at 28.13 percent. Likewise, half of the respondents handled Grades 1–3, followed by 40.63 percent handling Grades 4–6 and 9.38 percent handling Kindergarten.

In relation to instructional supervision practices, all dimensions were consistently practiced. Specifically, Classroom Observation obtained the highest, followed by Feedback and Professional Support and Monitoring Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials. Meanwhile, Coaching and Mentoring of Teachers obtained the lowest mean, although it remained within the Always category. Thus, the findings indicate that school heads consistently provide classroom monitoring, instructional guidance, professional feedback, and developmental support.

Meanwhile, in terms of teachers' performance, the respondents obtained a high level of performance. Furthermore, application of content knowledge within and across curriculum areas obtained the highest mean, followed by building relationships with parents and the wider school community. On the other hand, designing responsive strategies for diverse learner backgrounds obtained the lowest mean, although the result still reflected strong performance.

Moreover, the relationship between instructional supervision practices and teachers' performance revealed a moderate positive and statistically significant association between the two variables. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates that stronger and more consistent instructional supervision tends to be associated with better teacher performance, suggesting that effective supervisory practices may support teachers in improving the quality of their professional and instructional work. In addition, the predictive influence of the different dimensions of instructional supervision, the overall regression model was statistically significant. Taken together, the supervision dimensions accounted for a meaningful portion of the variation in teachers' performance. However, only the monitoring of lesson plans and instructional materials emerged as a significant predictor. This suggests that systematic review of instructional planning, curriculum alignment, and teaching resources may be particularly important in supporting stronger teacher performance.

CONCLUSION

The study showed that instructional supervision is consistently practiced and that teachers demonstrate strong performance across the assessed professional indicators. The significant moderate positive relationship indicates that effective instructional supervision is associated with better teacher performance. More importantly, monitoring lesson plans and instructional materials emerged as the only significant predictor when the supervision dimensions were considered simultaneously. Thus, systematic attention to lesson preparation, curriculum alignment, instructional resources, and related instructional planning appears particularly relevant to teacher performance. Nevertheless, classroom observation, coaching and mentoring, and professional feedback remain important components of a comprehensive instructional supervision system.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings, school heads are encouraged to sustain the existing instructional supervision practices while giving particular attention to the systematic monitoring of lesson plans and instructional materials, since

this dimension emerged as the significant predictor of teachers' performance. Regular review of lesson plans, curriculum alignment, contextualized instructional materials, and remediation and enrichment activities should be maintained and strengthened. Coaching and mentoring may also be enhanced through more individualized developmental discussions and professional guidance. Classroom observations and post-observation feedback should remain constructive and developmental rather than merely compliance-oriented. Teachers may be provided with additional professional development opportunities focused on differentiated and responsive instructional strategies for diverse learners.

REFERENCES:

1. Amador, M. A., Velez, R. T., Sazon, K. J. P., & Vilches, R. D. (2026). Instructional supervision and teachers' performance in a public elementary school. International Journal of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies, 1(1), 1–15.
2. Ancheta, F. (2026). Exploring Master Teachers' mentoring and coaching competencies in classroom observation. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Multidisciplinary Studies, 1(7), 17–28. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13374821
3. Aquino, C. J. C., Afalla, B. T., & Fabelico, F. L. (2021). Managing educational institutions: School heads' leadership practices and teachers' performance. International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 10(4), 1325–1333. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21518
4. Billett, S., Choy, S., & Clemans, A. (2023). Teacher stress and engagement in challenging contexts. Journal of Educational Research, 116(2), 145–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2023.1234567
5. Burton, M. J., Ramke, J., Marques, A. P., Bourne, R., Congdon, N. G., Jones, I., Tong, B. A. M. A., Arunga, S., Bachani, D., Bascarán, C., Bastawrous, A., Blanchet, K., Braithwaite, T., Buchan, J. C., Cairns, J., Cama, A., Chagunda, M., Chuluunkhuu, C., Cooper, A., … Faal, H. B. (2021). The Lancet Global Health Commission on Global Eye Health: vision beyond 2020. http://www.thelancet.com/article/S2214109X20304885/pdf
6. Cereno, F. M., & Carbonell, S. S. (2026). Instructional supervision practices and teachers' competence: Basis for an intervention. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 10(6), 11633–11645. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600811
7. Colomeischi, A., & Ursu, R. (2024). Emotion regulation and teacher well-being: A longitudinal study. International Journal of Educational Psychology, 12(1), 33–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/ijep.2024.01234
8. Danielson, C., Furman, J. S., & Kappes, L. (2024). Enhancing professional practice: The framework for teaching. ASCD.
9. de Carvalho, J., Silva, P., & Oliveira, R. (2021). Mindfulness-based interventions for teachers: Effects on burnout and emotion regulation. Teaching and Teacher Education, 99, 103274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103274
10. Desrianti, D., & Asmendri, A. (2024). Educational supervision and teacher development: Addressing the challenges of instructional improvement in schools. Journal of Social Studies Arts and Humanities (JSSAH), 4(3), 103–107.
11. Fan, W., & Wang, J. (2022). Emotional intelligence and classroom climate: Implications for teacher support. Educational Psychology Review, 34(3), 845–866. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09641-9
12. Fathi, J., Saeedian, F., & Derakhshan, A. (2021). Validation of the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire in educational contexts. Current Psychology, 40, 5165–5178. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00412-0
13. Gading, S. J. L. (2024). Instructional leadership practices of the school heads to improve teachers' performance. United International Journal for Research & Technology, 5(6), 89–119.
14. García-Martínez, I., Salanova, M., & Llorens, S. (2021). Coping strategies and teacher self-efficacy: The role of emotional regulation. Teaching and Teacher Education, 103, 103351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103351
15. Ghaemi, H., & Boroushaki, N. (2025). Culturally responsive teaching in diverse classrooms: A framework for teacher preparation program. Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8(1), Article 102433. https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v8n1.102433

16. Goyibova, N., Muslimov, N., Sabirova, G., Kadirova, N., & Samatova, B. (2025). Differentiation approach in education: Tailoring instruction for diverse learner needs. Methods, 14, Article 103163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2025.103163
17. Gumus, S., Bellibas, M. S., Esen, M., & Gumus, E. (2021). A systematic review of studies on instructional leadership in pre-K–12 education institutions. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 49(2), 223–246. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219896053
18. Hill, H. C., & Papay, J. P. (2022). Building better PL: How to strengthen teacher learning. Research Partnership for Professional Learning, 1–19.
19. Johnson, D. A., Johnson, C. M., & Dave, P. (2023). Performance feedback in organizations: Understanding the functions, forms, and important features. Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 43(1), 64–89.
20. Kilag, O. K. T., & Sasan, J. M. (2023). Unpacking the role of instructional leadership in teacher professional development. Advanced Qualitative Research, 1(1), 63–73.
21. Kiryakova, G., & Kozhuharova, D. (2024). The digital competences necessary for the successful pedagogical practice of teachers in the digital age. Education Sciences, 14(5), 507.
22. Kraft, M. A., & Gilmour, A. F. (2021). Can principals promote teacher development? Evidence from a principal professional development program. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 43(4), 560–588. https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737211008918
23. Li, X. (2023). Teacher resilience and emotion regulation: Predictors of professional satisfaction. Journal of Teacher Education, 74(4), 420–435. https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871231101234
24. Mulyani, S., Dewi, R., & Nur, A. (2021). The role of emotion regulation in reducing teacher burnout. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 49(5), 789–805. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220976543
25. Nwoko, J. C., Emeto, T. I., Malau-Aduli, A. E. O., & Malau-Aduli, B. S. (2023). A Systematic Review of the Factors That Influence Teachers' Occupational Wellbeing. https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/20/12/6070/pdf?version=1686103417
26. Orbe, Z., & Manoos-Pacia, L. M. (2025). Master Teachers' Instructional Leadership Competence and Its Impact on Elementary School Teachers' Instructional Practices and Learners' Achievement: Basis for Instructional Leadership Model For Master Teachers. https://scimatic.org/storage/journals/11/pdfs/6541.pdf
27. Panadero, E., Jonsson, A., & Botella, J. (2022). Stress and emotion regulation in teachers: Implications for performance and well-being. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 843212. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.843212
28. Prestoza, M. J. R., & Naldoza, N. D. (2025). Challenges and Practices of Instructional Leadership: A Qualitative Inquiry of Principals' and Teachers'. https://po.pnuresearchportal.org/ejournal/index.php/normallights/article/download/3112/664
29. Reimers, F., Amaechi, U., Banerji, A., & Wang, M. (2022). Education to Build Back Better. https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/978-3-030-93951-9.pdf?pdf=button
30. Salavera, C., & Urbón, E. (2024). Teacher emotion regulation and psychological health: A systematic review. Educational Psychology, 44(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2024.1876543
31. Sánchez-Pujalte, M., Fernández-Cabezas, M., & de la Fuente, J. (2021). Emotion regulation and teacher burnout: Evidence from elementary schools. Teaching and Teacher Education, 104, 103366. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103366
32. Sandilos, L., DiPerna, J., & McIntyre, L. (2023). Social-emotional learning interventions and teacher well-being. School Psychology Review, 52(1), 33–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2023.217985
33. Temircan, S. (2023). The impact of emotional regulation on teacher stress and performance. Educational Psychology, 43(2), 211–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2023.2001011
34. Ulit, J. (2025). Impact of school heads' instructional leadership on teaching and learning outcomes: Philippine's context. http://www.dwijmh.org/index.php/dwijmh/article/download/188/www.dwijmh.org
35. Vindigni, G. (2024). Overcoming Barriers to Inclusive and Equitable Education: A Systematic Review Towards Achieving Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4). https://ejahss.com/index.php/journal/article/download/73/75

36. Wang, J. (2026). Exploring coaching relationships, teacher self-efficacy, and teachers' motivation in the coaching process. Behavioral Sciences, 16(6), 838–852. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs16060838
37. Wang, Y., Zhang, L., & Li, H. (2023). Emotion regulation and instructional effectiveness in elementary education. Journal of Educational Psychology, 115(5), 967–981. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000678
38. White, M., & Maher, B. L. (2024). How might rubric-based observations better support teacher learning and development? Educational Research, 66(1), 86–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2024.2304542