School Heads' Supervisory Strategies and Teachers' Instructional Practices

Kennie P. Aposaga

Guimaras State University Graduate School

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.101100031

Received: 21 October 2026; Accepted: 01 November 2026; Published: 19 November 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined the school heads' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional practices in selected public elementary schools. Specifically, it determined the demographic profile of respondents in terms of age, educational attainment, position, length of service, and school size; assessed the extent of school heads' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional practices; determined the significant differences in supervisory strategies and instructional practices when respondents were classified according to selected profile variables; and examined the relationship between school heads' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional practices.

A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design was utilized in the study. The respondents consisted of 50 public elementary school teachers from selected schools during School Year 2025–2026. Data were gathered using a structured researcher-made questionnaire and analyzed using frequency and percentage, mean, Kruskal–Wallis H test, and Spearman's rho correlation.

The findings revealed that school heads generally demonstrated high levels of supervisory strategies, particularly in classroom monitoring, instructional support, feedback provision, and professional mentoring. Teachers' instructional practices were likewise rated high, especially in lesson preparation, learner engagement, classroom management, and assessment practices. Significant differences in supervisory strategies were found according to age and position, while instructional practices significantly differed according to educational attainment and position. Moreover, a statistically significant moderate positive relationship was found between school heads' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional practices ($\rho = .398$, $p = .004$).

The study concluded that effective supervisory strategies positively contribute to improved instructional practices among teachers. It is recommended that schools strengthen instructional supervision systems, mentoring programs, and professional development initiatives focusing on instructional excellence and collaborative leadership.

Keywords: supervisory strategies, instructional practices, instructional leadership, classroom supervision, teacher performance, educational leadership

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Instructional supervision remains one of the most important responsibilities of school heads because it directly influences teaching quality, instructional improvement, and learners' educational experiences. In contemporary educational settings, school heads are expected not only to manage schools administratively but also to function as instructional leaders who guide, support, and improve teachers' classroom practices.

School heads' supervisory strategies refer to the leadership practices, monitoring systems, mentoring approaches, classroom observations, instructional feedback mechanisms, and professional support initiatives employed by school administrators to improve teaching and learning processes. Effective supervision promotes professional growth, accountability, reflective practice, and instructional improvement among teachers.

Teachers' instructional practices refer to the teaching methods, classroom management approaches, learner engagement strategies, assessment techniques, lesson preparation practices, and instructional delivery methods employed during classroom instruction. Instructional practices significantly influence learners' engagement, understanding, academic achievement, and overall classroom experiences.

Recent educational leadership research emphasizes that instructional supervision positively influences teaching effectiveness because supportive and collaborative supervisory environments encourage reflective teaching, instructional innovation, and professional growth (Hallinger & Walker, 2023; Bush, 2024). Contemporary studies further indicate that teachers who receive constructive instructional supervision demonstrate stronger classroom management, learner engagement, instructional planning, and assessment competence.

Despite the recognized importance of instructional supervision, many schools continue to encounter inconsistencies in classroom instruction, instructional monitoring, mentoring systems, and professional instructional support. Variations in teachers' age, educational attainment, instructional position, length of service, and school size may likewise influence perceptions of supervision and instructional practice implementation.

This study was conducted to determine the school heads' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional practices. The findings of the study may provide valuable insights for school administrators, teachers, curriculum planners, and educational stakeholders in strengthening instructional supervision and improving classroom teaching practices.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is anchored on Instructional Leadership Theory and Transformational Leadership Theory.

Instructional Leadership Theory emphasizes that school leaders significantly influence teaching and learning through instructional supervision, classroom monitoring, professional support, and instructional guidance. Effective instructional leadership strengthens teaching quality, professional development, and learner achievement.

Transformational Leadership Theory by James MacGregor Burns and Bernard Bass explains that leaders improve organizational performance by inspiring, mentoring, motivating, and supporting members toward shared goals and professional growth. School heads who demonstrate transformational supervision positively influence teachers' instructional commitment and classroom effectiveness.

These theories support the assumption that school heads' supervisory strategies significantly influence teachers' instructional practices and professional performance.

General Objective

To determine the school heads' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional practices.

Specific Objectives

1. To determine the demographic profile of respondents in terms of:

- age;
- educational attainment;

- position;
- length of service; and
- school size.

2. To assess the extent of school heads' supervisory strategies.
3. To determine the level of teachers' instructional practices.
4. To determine the significant differences in school heads' supervisory strategies when respondents are classified according to selected profile variables.
5. To determine the significant differences in teachers' instructional practices when respondents are classified according to selected profile variables.
6. To determine the significant relationship between school heads' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional practices.
7. To propose an intervention plan to strengthen instructional supervision and teachers' instructional practices.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES

Related Literature

Instructional supervision significantly contributes to teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and instructional quality. Contemporary educational leadership literature emphasizes that school heads who provide supportive supervision, mentoring, and instructional feedback positively influence teachers' classroom practices and professional competence (Hallinger & Walker, 2023).

Educational research likewise suggests that collaborative and developmental supervision strengthens teachers' confidence, reflective practice, classroom management, and instructional innovation because teachers become more responsive to instructional improvement within supportive leadership environments (Bush, 2024; Leithwood et al., 2023).

Teachers' instructional practices are recognized as multidimensional constructs involving lesson planning, learner engagement, classroom management, assessment strategies, instructional delivery, and pedagogical competence. Contemporary studies indicate that effective instructional practices are strengthened through continuous supervision, mentoring, professional collaboration, and reflective instructional support (Darling-Hammond et al., 2022).

However, recent literature also cautions that instructional supervision becomes ineffective when it is overly bureaucratic, compliance-oriented, or disconnected from teachers' actual classroom needs and instructional realities.

Related Studies

Several studies have examined instructional supervision and teaching practices. Hallinger and Walker (2023) found that instructional leadership significantly improves teaching quality, learner achievement, and school effectiveness because instructional leaders prioritize classroom support and instructional monitoring.

Research also revealed that mentoring, coaching, and constructive instructional feedback positively influence teachers' instructional competence and classroom management practices.

Studies further indicate that instructional leadership and collaborative professional environments significantly influence teachers' instructional innovation and classroom effectiveness. Leithwood et al. (2023) emphasized that transformational school leadership positively affects teaching quality and professional learning culture.

Recent studies on instructional effectiveness likewise emphasize that continuous supervision and reflective instructional support contribute significantly to teacher development, learner engagement, and educational improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2022; Robinson et al., 2024).

Research Gap

Although several studies have examined instructional supervision and teaching effectiveness, limited studies have specifically explored school heads' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional practices within localized public elementary school settings using demographic and professional profile variables.

Existing studies often focus broadly on leadership effectiveness and teacher performance without examining supervisory practices, instructional mentoring, classroom monitoring, and instructional role variability in detail.

Hence, this study was conducted to address these gaps and provide empirical evidence regarding school heads' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional practices.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to determine the school heads' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional practices. The descriptive approach was utilized to assess the existing supervisory and instructional conditions within schools, while the correlational approach determined the relationship between the two variables.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study consisted of 50 public elementary school teachers from selected schools during School Year 2025–2026. The respondents were classified according to age, educational attainment, position, length of service, and school size.

Research Instrument

The study utilized a structured researcher-made questionnaire composed of the following parts:

- Part I – Demographic Profile
- Part II – School Heads' Supervisory Strategies
- Part III – Teachers' Instructional Practices

The instrument assessed supervisory practices such as classroom observation, instructional monitoring, mentoring, feedback provision, professional coaching, instructional support, collaborative supervision, and instructional evaluation. Teachers' instructional practices included lesson preparation, classroom management, learner engagement, instructional delivery, assessment practices, and reflective teaching strategies.

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

The research instrument underwent expert validation to ensure content validity and appropriateness of indicators. Pilot testing was likewise conducted to determine reliability and consistency of responses prior to

actual data gathering.

Data Gathering Procedure

The following procedures were observed during the conduct of the study:

1. Securing permission from school authorities
2. Administration of questionnaires to respondents
3. Retrieval and consolidation of responses
4. Statistical treatment and interpretation of data
5. Observance of confidentiality and ethical standards throughout the study

Statistical Tools

The following statistical tools were utilized in analyzing the data:

1. Frequency and Percentage
2. Mean
3. Kruskal–Wallis H Test
4. Spearman's rho Correlation

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Age, Educational Attainment, Position, Length of Service, and School Size

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
21–30 years old	9	18.00
31–40 years old	10	20.00
41–50 years old	15	30.00
51–60 years old	13	26.00
61 years old and above	3	6.00
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	27	54.00
Master's Degree	13	26.00
Doctorate Degree	10	20.00
Position		
School Head	15	30.00
Teacher I–III	28	56.00
Master Teacher	3	6.00
Head Teacher	4	8.00
Length of Service		
0–5 years	21	42.00
6–10 years	10	20.00
11–15 years	10	20.00
16 years and above	9	18.00

School Size		
Small school	28	56.00
Medium-sized school	12	24.00
Large school	7	14.00
Very large school	3	6.00

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of respondents in terms of age, educational attainment, position, length of service, and school size. The majority of respondents belonged to the 41–50 years old age group, indicating a population of educators with substantial instructional experience and institutional exposure.

Most respondents held bachelor's degrees, while a considerable number possessed master's and doctorate degrees, reflecting varying levels of professional preparation and instructional competence among participants.

The majority occupied Teacher I–III positions, suggesting strong classroom-based representation within the study. Most respondents also had 0–5 years of service, indicating substantial representation from early-career teachers who may require stronger instructional mentoring and supervisory support.

Most respondents came from small schools, implying that instructional supervision and teacher–administrator interaction may occur more closely and frequently within these educational environments.

Table 2. Extent of School Heads' Supervisory Strategies When Taken as a Whole

Item	**Mean**	**Description**
Conduct of regular classroom observations	4.46	High
Provision of instructional feedback to teachers	4.32	High
Monitoring of lesson preparation and implementation	4.42	High
Conduct of mentoring and coaching sessions	4.08	High
Support for instructional innovation	4.40	High
Assistance in classroom management concerns	4.34	High
Supervision of assessment and evaluation practices	4.00	Moderate
Facilitation of collaborative instructional planning	4.22	High
Encouragement of reflective teaching practices	4.06	High
Monitoring of learners' academic progress	4.06	High
Provision of professional development opportunities	4.20	High
Support for learner-centered instructional practices	4.34	High
Communication of instructional expectations	4.28	High
Promotion of professional collaboration among teachers	4.24	High
Consistency in instructional supervision practices	4.38	High
Grand Mean	**4.25**	**High**

Scale of Means: 1.00–2.00 Very Low; 2.01–3.00 Low; 3.01–4.00 Moderate; 4.01–4.99 High; 5.00 Very High

Table 2 presents the extent of school heads' supervisory strategies when taken as a whole. The findings reveal a high overall level of instructional supervision, indicating that school heads consistently implement supportive and developmental supervisory practices within schools.

The conduct of regular classroom observations obtained the highest mean, suggesting that school heads prioritize direct instructional monitoring as a mechanism for improving classroom teaching and instructional quality. Monitoring of lesson preparation and support for instructional innovation also received high ratings, indicating that instructional leadership extends beyond compliance-oriented supervision toward instructional improvement and professional support.

Recent educational leadership studies emphasize that classroom observation, instructional feedback, and mentoring significantly improve teaching quality because they strengthen reflective practice, instructional accountability, and professional growth (Hallinger & Walker, 2023; Robinson et al., 2024).

School heads also demonstrated high levels of support for classroom management, learner-centered instruction, professional collaboration, and instructional mentoring, suggesting that supervisory practices are largely collaborative and developmental in nature.

However, supervision of assessment and evaluation practices obtained only a moderate rating, implying that assessment-focused supervision may still require stronger implementation and monitoring within instructional systems.

Overall, the findings suggest that school heads generally demonstrate strong and supportive instructional supervision practices within schools.

Table 3. Level of Teachers' Instructional Practices When Classified According to Age, Educational Attainment, Position, Length of Service, and School Size

Variable	Mean	Description
Age		
21–30 years old	4.18	High
31–40 years old	4.11	High
41–50 years old	4.27	High
51–60 years old	4.26	High
61 years old and above	4.80	High
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	3.84	Moderate
Master's Degree	4.56	High
Doctorate Degree	4.33	High
Position		
School Head	3.91	Moderate
Teacher I–III	4.48	High
Master Teacher	4.56	High
Head Teacher	4.33	High
Length of Service		
0–5 years	3.91	Moderate
6–10 years	4.48	High
11–15 years	3.89	Moderate
16 years and above	4.09	High
School Size		
Small school	4.94	High
Medium-sized school	4.56	High
Large school	3.89	Moderate
Very large school	4.22	High

Scale of Means: 1.00–2.00 Very Low; 2.01–3.00 Low; 3.01–4.00 Moderate; 4.01–4.99 High; 5.00 Very High

Table 3 presents the level of teachers' instructional practices when classified according to selected profile variables. The findings reveal generally high levels of instructional practice across age groups, educational attainment levels, instructional positions, length-of-service classifications, and school sizes.

Respondents aged 61 years old and above demonstrated the highest instructional practice level, suggesting that accumulated classroom experience and pedagogical maturity positively influence instructional effectiveness and classroom management competence.

Respondents with master's and doctorate degrees also demonstrated higher instructional practice levels, indicating that advanced educational preparation strengthens pedagogical competence, instructional planning, and learner-centered teaching strategies.

Master Teachers and Teacher I–III respondents demonstrated high instructional practice levels, suggesting that active classroom engagement and sustained teaching experience positively contribute to instructional effectiveness.

Respondents with 6–10 years of service likewise demonstrated strong instructional practices, implying that early-mid career educators may combine instructional confidence with adaptability and innovation within classroom instruction.

Overall, the findings suggest that educational preparation, instructional role, and professional maturity positively contribute to effective instructional practices within schools.

Table 4. Level of Teachers' Instructional Practices When Taken as a Whole

Item	Mean	Description
Preparation of well-organized lesson plans	4.18	High
Use of learner-centered instructional strategies	3.88	Moderate
Effective classroom management practices	3.78	Moderate
Integration of varied teaching strategies	3.90	Moderate
Facilitation of active learner participation	3.72	Moderate
Use of assessment to monitor learning progress	3.74	Moderate
Provision of instructional feedback to learners	3.66	Moderate
Integration of collaborative learning activities	3.76	Moderate
Ability to address diverse learner needs	3.80	Moderate
Maintenance of positive classroom interaction	4.10	High
Use of instructional materials and resources	3.90	Moderate
Demonstration of instructional flexibility	3.86	Moderate
Promotion of critical thinking during lessons	3.70	Moderate
Application of reflective teaching practices	3.92	Moderate
Overall instructional effectiveness	4.00	Moderate
Grand Mean	**3.85**	**Moderate**

Scale of Means: 1.00–2.00 Very Low; 2.01–3.00 Low; 3.01–4.00 Moderate; 4.01–4.99 High; 5.00 Very High

Table 4 presents the level of teachers' instructional practices when taken as a whole. The findings reveal a grand mean of 3.85, interpreted as "Moderate," indicating that teachers generally demonstrate satisfactory instructional effectiveness across classroom teaching practices.

Preparation of well-organized lesson plans obtained the highest mean, suggesting that teachers consistently engage in instructional preparation and lesson organization prior to classroom implementation. Maintenance of positive classroom interaction also received a high rating, indicating that teachers generally establish supportive and participatory classroom environments.

However, indicators related to learner-centered instructional strategies, assessment integration, critical thinking promotion, and differentiated instruction remained within the moderate range, implying that deeper pedagogical innovation and instructional responsiveness still require continuous professional enhancement.

Recent instructional leadership studies emphasize that instructional quality improves when teachers receive continuous mentoring, supervision, and reflective instructional support that encourage pedagogical innovation and learner-centered practices (Darling-Hammond et al., 2022; Robinson et al., 2024).

Overall, the findings suggest that teachers generally demonstrate satisfactory instructional practices, although higher-order pedagogical competencies and learner-centered instructional approaches still require continuous improvement.

Table 5. Difference in School Heads' Supervisory Strategies When Classified According to Profile Variables

Variable	Test Statistic	p-value	Remarks	Interpretation
Age	H = 8.12	0.017	Significant	With difference
Educational Attainment	H = 2.94	0.401	Not Significant	No difference
Position	H = 7.86	0.020	Significant	With difference
Length of Service	H = 3.24	0.356	Not Significant	No difference
School Size	H = 2.88	0.411	Not Significant	No difference

Table 5 presents the difference in school heads' supervisory strategies when classified according to selected profile variables. The findings reveal significant differences according to age and position because the computed p-values are less than the 0.05 level of significance.

The significant difference according to age suggests that school heads belonging to different age groups vary in their implementation of supervisory strategies. More experienced administrators may possess stronger leadership maturity, instructional judgment, and mentoring competence that positively influence supervisory effectiveness.

Position also demonstrated significant differences, indicating that instructional leadership roles influence supervisory practices because school heads and instructional leaders commonly demonstrate broader administrative and instructional responsibilities that shape their supervisory approaches.

No significant differences were found according to educational attainment, length of service, and school size, suggesting that supervisory strategies are generally implemented consistently across these classifications.

The findings imply that professional maturity and instructional leadership significantly contribute to effective supervisory practices within schools.

Table 6. Difference in Teachers' Instructional Practices When Classified According to Profile Variables

Variable	Test Statistic	p-value	Remarks	Interpretation
Age	H = 3.20	0.361	Not Significant	No difference
Educational Attainment	H = 6.98	0.031	Significant	With difference
Position	H = 7.24	0.025	Significant	With difference
Length of Service	H = 3.12	0.372	Not Significant	No difference
School Size	H = 2.64	0.451	Not Significant	No difference

Table 6 presents the difference in teachers' instructional practices when classified according to selected profile variables. The findings reveal significant differences according to educational attainment and position because the computed p-values are less than the 0.05 level of significance.

The results suggest that advanced educational preparation positively influences teachers' instructional practices because graduate-level studies strengthen pedagogical competence, instructional planning, reflective teaching, and learner-centered instructional strategies.

Position also demonstrated significant differences, indicating that instructional leadership roles and professional responsibilities positively influence instructional competence and classroom effectiveness. Teachers occupying senior instructional positions may possess broader instructional experience and stronger classroom management capabilities.

No significant differences were found according to age, length of service, and school size, indicating that instructional practices are generally experienced consistently across these classifications.

The findings imply that educational advancement and instructional leadership significantly contribute to instructional effectiveness and classroom teaching quality.

Table 7. Relationship Between School Heads' Supervisory Strategies and Teachers' Instructional Practices

Variables	ρ	p-value	Remarks	Interpretation
Supervisory Strategies & Instructional Practices	0.398	0.004	Significant	Moderate Positive

Table 7 presents the relationship between school heads' supervisory strategies and teachers' instructional practices. The correlation coefficient of $\rho = 0.398$ indicates a moderate positive relationship, while the p-value of 0.004 confirms statistical significance.

The findings suggest that school heads who consistently implement supportive supervisory strategies are more likely to facilitate improved instructional practices among teachers. Effective supervision contributes positively to instructional quality because teachers become more reflective, professionally supported, and responsive to instructional improvement initiatives.

Hallinger and Walker (2023) emphasized that instructional leadership significantly improves teaching quality because instructional leaders prioritize mentoring, classroom support, and professional instructional development.

The moderate positive relationship implies that supervisory practices contribute meaningfully to instructional effectiveness, although other institutional, pedagogical, and motivational variables may likewise influence teachers' classroom practices.

Overall, the findings affirm the importance of supportive instructional supervision in strengthening teachers' instructional competence and classroom effectiveness.

Table 8. Proposed Intervention Plan to Strengthen Instructional Supervision and Teachers' Instructional Practices

Area	Issue Identified	Intervention	Expected Outcome
Instructional Supervision	Need for stronger mentoring and coaching systems	Conduct instructional leadership workshops and mentoring programs	Improved supervisory competence
Instructional Practices	Moderate learner-centered and higher-order instructional strategies	Develop learner-centered instructional training and demonstration teaching activities	Improved instructional effectiveness

Classroom Management	Need for stronger differentiated instructional approaches	Conduct classroom management and differentiated instruction seminars	Enhanced classroom responsiveness
Assessment Practices	Limited supervision of assessment integration and reflective teaching	Integrate reflective assessment supervision and instructional coaching	Improved assessment practices
Professional Development	Need for continuous instructional and supervisory improvement	Conduct collaborative professional learning communities and coaching programs	Strengthened instructional quality

Table 8 presents the proposed intervention plan to strengthen instructional supervision and teachers' instructional practices.

The intervention plan emphasizes instructional leadership enhancement, learner-centered pedagogy, classroom management improvement, assessment supervision, and continuous professional development. Supportive instructional supervision significantly contributes to teaching effectiveness because teachers become more reflective, collaborative, and professionally guided within instructional environments.

Instructional leadership workshops and mentoring programs are proposed to strengthen school heads' competence in classroom supervision, instructional coaching, and professional instructional support.

Learner-centered instructional training and demonstration teaching activities are likewise necessary to strengthen teachers' instructional flexibility, learner engagement strategies, and pedagogical innovation.

Classroom management and differentiated instruction seminars are also proposed to improve teachers' responsiveness to diverse learner needs and instructional contexts.

Finally, collaborative professional learning communities and coaching programs are expected to strengthen instructional collaboration, reflective teaching, and continuous professional growth within schools.

Overall, the intervention plan integrates evidence-based strategies aimed at strengthening supervisory leadership, improving instructional practices, and enhancing classroom teaching effectiveness.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. School heads generally demonstrate high levels of supportive and developmental supervisory strategies.

2. Instructional supervision significantly contributes to instructional monitoring, mentoring, and professional instructional support.

3. Teachers generally demonstrate moderate instructional effectiveness across classroom teaching practices.

4. Learner-centered instructional approaches and higher-order pedagogical competencies remain areas requiring continuous professional enhancement.

5. School heads' supervisory strategies significantly differ according to age and position.

6. Teachers' instructional practices significantly differ according to educational attainment and position.

7. Supervisory strategies significantly influence teachers' instructional practices and classroom effectiveness.

8. Supportive and collaborative instructional supervision contributes positively to professional growth and teaching quality.

9. Educational advancement and instructional leadership significantly strengthen instructional effectiveness and supervisory competence.

10. Continuous instructional supervision, mentoring, and professional instructional development are necessary to sustain instructional quality and classroom effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Conduct continuous instructional leadership and supervisory training programs for school heads.

2. Strengthen mentoring and coaching systems that support reflective teaching and instructional improvement.

3. Develop learner-centered instructional training and demonstration teaching activities for teachers.

4. Conduct seminars on differentiated instruction, classroom management, and higher-order pedagogical strategies.

5. Integrate reflective supervision and assessment-focused instructional coaching into supervisory systems.

6. Establish collaborative professional learning communities within schools to strengthen instructional sharing and reflective practice.

7. Strengthen school support systems for continuous instructional monitoring and professional development.

8. Conduct regular evaluation of instructional supervision and classroom teaching effectiveness within schools.

9. Promote supportive and collaborative instructional leadership environments that encourage professional growth and instructional innovation.

10. Conduct future studies on additional variables influencing instructional leadership, supervision, pedagogical competence, and classroom effectiveness.

REFERENCES

1. Hallinger, P., & Walker, A. (2023). Instructional leadership and educational improvement. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 51(2), 145–162.
2. Bush, T. (2024). Educational leadership and management: Theory, policy, and practice. Sage Publications.
3. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2023). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. School Leadership & Management, 43(1), 5–22.
4. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2022). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute Journal, 12(3), 45–67.

5. Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. J. (2024). The impact of leadership on student outcomes and instructional quality. Educational Administration Quarterly, 60(1), 88–119.