

“Supervisory Practices of School Heads and Teachers Professional Development in Relation to Teaching Performance”

Teofilo M. Villanueva II¹, Ma. Quincy D. Dones², Christine Jane M. Tamagos³

La Carlota City College, La Carlota City, Negros Occidental, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800258>

Received: 17 August 2026; Accepted: 22 August 2026; Published: 01 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study determined the supervisory practices of school heads and teacher professional development in relation to teaching performance. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, it examined the relationships among these variables. The respondents were 136 educational personnel from Cluster 1 public schools in a school division within the Negros Island Region, selected through total population sampling. Findings revealed that the respondents were predominantly female and experienced professionals with more than 20 years in teaching. The findings also revealed that both school heads' supervisory practices and teacher professional development were assessed at a very high level. Teachers' teaching performance was rated outstanding. Results showed no significant relationship between supervisory practices and teaching performance. However, a significant relationship was found between teacher professional development and teaching performance. The findings indicate that teacher professional development contributes more directly to improved teaching performance than supervisory practices alone. The study recommends strengthening institutional mechanisms that align supervisory practices with classroom needs and expanding access to quality in-service training, workshops, and Learning Action Cell sessions to sustain teacher growth and enhance teaching performance.

Keywords: Supervisory Practices, Teacher Professional Development, Teaching Performance, Instructional Supervision, Professional Learning

INTRODUCTION

The success of instructional leadership and teachers' professional development have a significant impact on the standard of education in schools. As instructional leaders, school directors have a significant influence on how teachers are taught by using supervisory strategies that promote ongoing development. In addition to guaranteeing that curriculum standards are followed, good supervision offers teachers chances for professional growth, mentoring, and constructive criticism. Learning results for students are directly impacted by improved teaching performance, which is a result of these techniques (Hallinger, 2020; Robinson et al., 2020).

Moreover, Reambonanza, R. J., & Tan, D. A. (2022) cited that the instructional supervision through classroom observation, instructional support, coaching, and professional interaction significantly influenced teachers' competencies and overall teaching performance. Teachers who regularly received instructional supervision demonstrated better classroom practices and professional.

Ventista (2023) findings of the study indicate that teacher professional development is a critical factor in enhancing instructional effectiveness and overall educational quality. Results reveal that professional development activities characterized by structured training, collaborative learning, and reflective practices contributed significantly to the improvement of teachers' pedagogical skills and instructional confidence. These findings are consistent with the study of who reported that sustained and collaborative professional learning positively influences teachers' classroom practices and professional competence.

Moreover, the results show that when professional development initiatives are aligned with supportive supervisory practices such as coaching, mentoring, and instructional feedback, teachers demonstrate higher

levels of competence and instructional effectiveness. This supports the findings of Sims et al. (2022), who emphasized that effective professional development is strengthened by supportive structures and leadership that guide teachers in applying newly learned strategies. Similarly, Amemasor (2025) found that professional development programs integrated with supervision and mentoring foster teacher confidence, reflective practice, and adaptability to evolving educational demands.

Overall, the results affirm that teacher professional development, when supported by effective instructional supervision, empowers teachers to refine their teaching practices, respond to curricular changes, and sustain professional growth, thereby contributing to continuous educational improvement.

This study sought to examine the relationship between supervisory practices of school heads and teacher professional development, and how these factors collectively influence teaching performance. By exploring this interplay, the research aims to provide insights into supervisory practices that promote teacher growth and elevate instructional quality. Ultimately, the findings may serve as a basis for strengthening school leadership frameworks and designing professional development programs that are responsive to the needs of educators in the pursuit of academic excellence.

Research Questions

This study aimed to determine the relationship between the supervisory practices of school heads and teacher professional development and their influence on teaching performance.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - a. Age;
 - b. Sex;
 - c. Years in teaching; and
 - d. Highest educational attainment?
2. What is the level of the supervisory practices of school heads as a whole and when grouped in terms of:
 - a. Instructional supervision;
 - b. Classroom observation and feedback;
 - c. Monitoring and evaluation; and
 - d. Professional support and mentoring?
3. What is the level of teacher professional development as a whole and when grouped in terms of:
 - a. Participation in seminars and trainings;
 - b. In-service education and upskilling;
 - c. Collaborative learning;
 - d. Application of learned skills in teaching?
4. What is the level of teaching performance of teachers?
5. Is there a significant relationship between supervisory practices of school heads and teaching Performance?
6. Is there a significant relationship between teacher professional development and teaching performance?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Supervisory practices encompass the school head's efforts to monitor instruction, observe classroom practice, provide feedback, evaluate performance, and offer professional support. The thesis literature describes instructional supervision as a means of aligning classroom practice with instructional goals and of supporting teachers through constructive feedback and mentoring. Gallardo and Salamanca (2023) reported very high instructional supervision practices, while De Castro (2021) emphasized the contribution of supervisory leadership to instructional effectiveness.

Teacher professional development involves participation in seminars and trainings, in-service education and skill enhancement, collaborative professional learning, and the application of acquired skills. The study's review emphasizes that professional development is more likely to influence teaching when activities are relevant to instructional needs, sustained over time, collaborative, and supported by school leadership. Kennedy (2021) and Desimone (2020) underscore the importance of coherent, active, and sustained professional learning.

Teaching performance in the study was assessed using the Enhanced Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (E-IPCRF) for school year 2024–2025. The thesis findings also show mixed evidence concerning the relationship of supervision and professional development with performance. Ordanel and Dioso (2023) reported no significant relationship between supervisory practices and teachers' work performance, while Bacay and Callo (2023) reported a significant relationship. The present study therefore contributes context-specific evidence from Cluster 1 public schools in the Negros Island Region.

Castro (2021) found that teachers rated the supervisory practices of school administrators as "Very High," especially in providing professional assistance, feedback mechanisms, and instructional support. The study emphasized that effective supervision enhances teacher confidence, accountability, and instructional effectiveness.

Amzat, et al. (2022) that found school leadership practices strongly promote teacher professional development, with results indicating a high to very high level of implementation in instructional leadership, supervision, and continuous teacher learning, highlighting that teachers are actively engaged in structured professional growth programs such as trainings and collaborative learning activities.

García and Weiss (2020), who reported that instructional supervision and classroom observation practices did not have a statistically significant direct effect on teacher performance ratings. Their study highlighted that teachers' effectiveness was more strongly shaped by factors such as professional experience, self-efficacy, and training, rather than by the frequency of supervisory activities. They emphasized that supervision may enhance compliance with institutional expectations but does not necessarily translate into measurable improvements in performance outcomes.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employs a descriptive-correlational research design to obtain in-depth insights into the supervisory practices of school heads and their relationship to teacher professional development and teaching performance.

Bhandari (2021) notes, this design is particularly useful for measuring the degree of association between variables and for generating informed predictions based on observed relationships. In this study, descriptive correlation was applied to identify and assess significant associations between the personality traits of the sample population and their entrepreneurial intentions.

The data collected enabled the researchers to analyze these relationships and interpret the findings, thereby formulating conclusions and explanations regarding the variables under investigation.

Respondents of the Study

The subject and respondents of this study were the 8 school heads and 128 teachers in a cluster 1 public schools in one of the schools division of Negros Island Region.

Instruments of the Study

The researcher employed a self-constructed survey questionnaire to evaluate the Supervisory Practices of school heads and teacher professional development in relation to teaching performance.

Part I of the instrument gathered the demographic profile of respondents, including age, sex, years of teaching experience, and highest educational attainment. Part II focused on supervisory practices, covering instructional supervision, classroom observation and feedback, monitoring and evaluation, as well as professional support and mentoring provided by school heads to teachers. Part III addressed professional development, examining teachers' participation in seminars and trainings, engagement in in-service education and upskilling, involvement in collaborative learning, and application of acquired skills in classroom instruction. Finally, Part IV assessed teachers' performance based on the results of the EIPCRF for the school year 2024–2025. Teaching performance was operationalized using official results from the Enhanced Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (E-IPCRF) for SY 2024–2025. The E-IPCRF is DepEd's standardized assessment tool aligned directly with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Performance was evaluated across predefined Key Result Areas (KRAs), including Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, Learning Environment, Diversity of Learners, Curriculum and Planning, and Assessment and Reporting.

The evaluation process involved a multi-evaluator framework conducted across the full school year. Evaluators (School Heads and Master Teachers) conducted multiple formal classroom observations using the Classroom Observation Tool (COT) alongside portfolio verification. To ensure inter-rater reliability, evaluators underwent division-level calibration training prior to the evaluation period, ensuring consistent application of the 5-point scoring rubric. This structured design allowed the researcher to comprehensively analyze the interplay between supervisory practices, professional development initiatives, and teaching performance. And To ensure inter-rater reliability, evaluators underwent division-level calibration training prior to the evaluation period, ensuring consistent application of the 5-point scoring rubric.

Rating Scale Range	Adjectival Rating Interpretation	Description
4.50 – 5.00	Outstanding	Performance consistently exceeds all standard requirements.
3.50 – 4.49	Very Satisfactory	Performance consistently meets and occasionally exceeds standards.
2.50 – 3.49	Satisfactory	Performance meets basic standard requirements.
1.50 – 2.49	Unsatisfactory	Performance fails to meet basic standards in key areas.
1.00 – 1.49	Poor	Performance consistently fails to meet minimum standards.

The research instrument was subjected to face validation, where five experts asked their expertise about whether a device measures the concept intended. The validators are professionals and known to be competent and experts in their field of education. Three (3) of them are school principals, 1 research director and 1 guidance counselor whom have a doctorate degree to ensure well-rounded education perspective. By the used C.H Lawshe (1975) for the evaluation, all questionnaire items were rated as essential, resulting in a Mean CVR of 1.00 for both the Supervisory Practices of School Heads and Teacher Professional Development scales. Then, Cronbach's alpha was employed to determine the reliability index of the questionnaire, which resulted as reliable, for Supervisory Practices of School Heads resulted to .704 and for Teacher Professional Development resulted .785.

Procedure

The researcher sent a request letter to the college president thru the graduate school dean for the conduct of the study. After securing the approval, questionnaires were administered to the target respondents. It was sent to the respondents at any given time.

To ensure the reliability of the research instrument, a pilot testing was conducted in two schools within the division of Negros Island Region. The purpose of the reliability testing was to determine the consistency and internal reliability of the questionnaire before its full-scale administration. The responses gathered from the pilot test were encoded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), particularly through reliability testing measures to establish the instrument's consistency.

Ethical Considerations

The study focused on the supervisory practices of 8 school heads, teacher professional development, and the teaching performance of 128 teachers in Cluster 1 public schools within a division in the Negros Island Region. The supervisory practices evaluated include instructional supervision, classroom observation and feedback, monitoring and evaluation, and professional support and mentoring. Professional development dimensions include participation in trainings, in-service education, collaborative learning, and application of learned skills. Teaching performance was evaluated using the E-IPCRF results for School Year 2024–2025.

Methodologically, the study is bounded by its cross-sectional correlational design, which restricts interpretations strictly to statistical associations rather than causal effects. Methodological limitations and steps taken to mitigate bias.

The researchers informed the participants about the purpose, methods, risks, and benefits of the research, and they voluntarily agree to participate. The participants' personal information was kept and ensure that their privacy was respected. The study was conducted honestly, avoiding fabrication or plagiarism. Ethical research procedures were followed strictly.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

The table 1 below shows the demographic profile of the respondents.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Demographic Profile of the Respondents.

Profile	Category	f	%
Age	21-30	9	6.6
	31-40	33	24.3
	41-50	40	29.4
	51-and above	54	39.7
	Total	136	100.00
Sex	Male	26	19.1
	Female	110	80.9
	Total	136	100.00
Years in Teaching	Below 5 years	22	16.2
	5-10 years	21	15.4
	11-20 years	41	30.1
	More than 20 years	52	38.2
	Total	136	100.00
	Bachelor's Degree	19	14.0

Highest Educational Attainment	With Master's Units	68	50.0
	Master's Degree	43	31.6
	Doctoral Units/Degree	6	4.4
	Total	136	100.00

The demographic profile of the 136 teacher-respondents reveals that the majority are older and experienced educators. Most respondents were aged 51 and above or 39.7%, followed by those aged 41–50 or 29.4% and 31–40 or 24.3%, with only a small proportion 6.6% belonging to the youngest age group of 21–30.

This indicates a workforce largely composed of mature teachers with extensive professional experience.

In terms of sex, the respondents were predominantly female with 110 respondents or 80.9% while there are 26 respondents or 19.1 were male, reflecting the broader trend of female dominance in the teaching profession.

Regarding years in service, a significant portion had more than 20 years of teaching experience or 38.2%, while 30.1% had 11–20 years, and fewer respondents reported less than 10 years of experience. This suggests that the teaching force is generally seasoned and stable.

As for highest educational attainment, half of the respondents had earned master's units, 31.6% had completed a master's degree, 14.0% held only a bachelor's degree, and 4.4% had doctoral units or degrees, highlighting a strong commitment to graduate-level education.

The results of the study findings imply that the respondents are aged 31 years and above, experienced, and academically engaged educators whose professional background enhances instructional quality and institutional stability. However, the limited presence of younger teachers and doctoral degree holders underscores the need for continuous recruitment and stronger support for advanced professional development to sustain leadership and innovation within the institution. The teaching profession worldwide continues to be largely female-dominated, particularly in basic and secondary education (UNESCO, 2022).

Level of the Supervisory Practices of School Heads

Table 2 below presents the extent of the supervisory practices of school heads.

Table 2. Level of the Supervisory Practices of School Heads.

Extent of the Supervisory Practices of School Heads	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Instructional Supervision	4.75	0.46	Very High
1. Classroom observations are scheduled and conducted during the school year.	4.75	0.55	Very High
2. Instructional supervision activities are documented (e.g., observation forms, reports).	4.79	0.49	Very High
3. Supervisory conferences are conducted following classroom observations.	4.71	0.57	Very High
4. Instructional supervision focuses on classroom teaching and learning processes.	4.77	0.49	Very High
5. Follow-up activities after supervision are implemented	4.71	0.55	Very High
Classroom Observation and Feedback	4.75	0.50	Very High
6. Feedback conferences are conducted after classroom observations.	4.79	0.56	Very High
7. Observation feedback refers to specific classroom practices.	4.74	0.56	Very High

8. Written or recorded feedback is provided to teachers.	4.76	0.56	Very High
9. Feedback sessions include discussion of observed strengths and areas for improvement.	4.76	0.55	Very High
10. Feedback timelines are followed according to school policy.	4.71	0.57	Very High
Monitoring and Evaluation	4.68	0.50	Very High
11. Teaching performance indicators are clearly communicated to teachers.	4.74	0.54	Very High
12. Monitoring of teaching performance is conducted at scheduled intervals.	4.73	0.52	Very High
13. Evaluation tools are consistently used across teachers.	4.64	0.59	Very High
14. Evaluation results are recorded and filed appropriately.	4.67	0.58	Very High
15. Monitoring data are used as basis for instructional decisions.	4.63	0.58	Very High
Professional Support and Mentoring	4.56	0.57	Very High
16. Mentoring or coaching activities are organized by the school.	4.58	0.63	Very High
17. Teachers are paired or grouped for mentoring purposes.	4.45	.68	Very High
18. Coaching sessions focus on specific instructional needs.	4.59	0.63	Very High
19. Support mechanisms are available for teachers who need assistance.	4.57	0.63	Very High
20. Professional support activities are included in the school plan.	4.62	0.62	Very High
Supervisory Practices as a whole	4.69	0.46	Very High

Legends:(4.21-5.0)-Very High;(3.41 – 4.20)-High;(2.61-3.40) Moderate (1.81 – 2.60)-Low;(1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

The table presents the level of supervisory practices of school heads in the areas of instructional supervision, classroom observation and feedback, monitoring and evaluation, and professional support and mentoring. The overall mean of 4.69 with a standard deviation of 0.46, interpreted as “Very High,” indicates that supervisory practices are extensively implemented to support teachers and enhance instructional performance. Instructional supervision and classroom observation and feedback both obtained the highest mean of 4.75, showing strong emphasis on monitoring instruction and providing feedback. Documentation of supervisory activities was the highest-rated indicator with a mean of 4.79, reflecting systematic and organized practices, while supervisory conferences and follow-up activities, though still rated “Very High” at 4.71, suggest areas for improvement in sustaining teacher support.

In classroom observation and feedback, conducting feedback conferences after observations was most highly rated at 4.79, while adherence to feedback timelines at 4.71 was slightly lower, implying the need for greater consistency. Monitoring and evaluation received an overall mean of 4.68 with a standard deviation of 0.50, with clear communication of performance indicators rated highest at 4.74. However, the use of monitoring data for instructional decisions, rated at 4.63, was relatively weaker, suggesting that evidence-based planning could be strengthened. Professional support and mentoring had the lowest overall mean of 4.56 with a standard deviation of 0.57, though still “Very High.” Inclusion of support activities in school plans was most emphasized at 4.62, while teacher mentoring partnerships, rated at 4.45, were least practiced, indicating limited focus on structured peer collaboration.

The findings imply that school heads demonstrate strong supervisory commitment, particularly in instructional monitoring and feedback, which positively influence teacher effectiveness. Nonetheless, the relatively lower ratings in mentoring and data utilization highlight areas for improvement, suggesting that strengthening

collaborative support systems and evidence-based decision-making could further enhance instructional quality and leadership effectiveness.

This corresponds with the study findings of Gallardo and Salamanca (2023), which revealed that school heads demonstrated a very high level of instructional supervision, particularly in classroom observation, teacher mentoring, and performance monitoring. Their study concluded that consistent supervisory engagement strengthens teachers' instructional competencies and promotes a collaborative school environment.

Likewise, Castro (2021) found that teachers rated the supervisory practices of school administrators as "Very High," especially in providing professional assistance, feedback mechanisms, and instructional support. The study emphasized that effective supervision enhances teacher confidence, accountability, and instructional effectiveness.

Level of Teacher Professional Development

Table 3 presents the level of teacher professional development.

Table 3. Level of Teacher Professional Development.

Teacher Professional Development	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Participation in Trainings and Seminars	4.83	0.36	Very High
1. Teachers attend DepEd recognized seminars and trainings during the school year.	4.89	.34	Very High
2. Attendance in professional development activities is documented.	4.87	.37	Very High
3. Trainings attended are aligned with teachers' subject areas.	4.83	.45	Very High
4. School-level trainings are conducted regularly.	4.77	.47	Very High
5. Teachers are informed in advance about professional development activities.	4.78	.48	Very High
In-Service Education and Skill Enhancement	4.77	.42	Very High
6. In-service trainings address identified instructional needs.	4.82	.44	Very High
7. Skill-enhancement activities are included in the school calendar.	4.78	.47	Very High
8. Teachers are given opportunities to develop new instructional skills.	4.74	.47	Very High
9. Professional development activities address current curriculum demands.	4.75	.48	Very High
10. Training programs are implemented as planned.	4.76	0.54	Very High
Collaborative Professional Learning	4.67	.47	Very High
11. Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions are conducted regularly.	4.62	.60	Very High
12. LAC sessions focus on instructional challenges.	4.64	.58	Very High
13. Teachers share teaching strategies during collaborative sessions.	4.70	.55	Very High
14. Meeting outputs are documented (minutes, action plans).	4.72	.51	Very High
15. Collaborative sessions result in agreed instructional actions.	4.68	.51	Very High
Application of Learned Skills	4.70	.46	Very High

16. Strategies introduced during trainings are observable in classroom instruction.	4.69	.52	Very High
17. Lesson plans reflect strategies discussed in professional development activities.	4.70	.53	Very High
18. Instructional materials show evidence of training application.	4.74	.49	Very High
19. Teaching approaches change following major trainings.	4.64	.57	Very High
20. Classroom practices reflect school-wide professional development goals.	4.74	.48	Very High
Professional Development as a whole	4.74	0.39	Very High

Legends:(4.21-5.0)-Very High;(3.41 – 4.20)-High;(2.61-3.40) Moderate (1.81 – 2.60)-Low;(1.00 – 1.80)-Very Low

The table revealed the teacher professional development across four dimensions: participation in trainings and seminars, in-service education and skill enhancement, collaborative professional learning, and application of acquired skills. The overall mean was 4.74 with a standard deviation of 0.39, interpreted as “Very High,” which indicates that professional development is extensively implemented and actively practiced in schools.

Participation in Trainings and Seminars recorded the highest mean of 4.83 with a standard deviation of 0.36, also interpreted as “Very High.” This reflects strong teacher engagement in activities organized or recognized by both the school and the Department of Education. The top-rated indicator was attendance at DepEd-recognized seminars and trainings during the school year, with a mean of 4.89, underscoring teachers’ commitment to formal development opportunities. The lowest-rated item was the regular conduct of school-level trainings, with a mean of 4.77, suggesting that while participation is highly evident, schools may further improve the consistency of their training programs.

In-Service Education and Skill Enhancement yielded a mean of 4.77 with a standard deviation of 0.42, interpreted as “Very High.” The highest-rated indicator was the responsiveness of in-service trainings to identified instructional needs, with a mean of 4.82, highlighting alignment with classroom demands. The lowest-rated indicator was the provision of opportunities for teachers to develop new instructional skills, with a mean of 4.74. Although still highly practiced, this suggests that schools may provide more varied and innovative opportunities to strengthen emerging competencies and adapt to evolving educational requirements.

Collaborative Professional Learning obtained the lowest mean among the dimensions at 4.67 with a standard deviation of 0.47, though still interpreted as “Very High.” Documentation of meeting outputs, such as minutes and action plans, was the strongest indicator with a mean of 4.72, suggesting systematic organization and monitoring of collaborative activities. The lowest-rated statement was the regular conduct of Learning Action Cell sessions, with a mean of 4.62, indicating that while collaborative practices are implemented, their consistency requires reinforcement to maximize peer learning and professional sharing.

Application of Learned Skills achieved a mean of 4.70 with a standard deviation of 0.46, interpreted as “Very High.” The highest-rated indicators were the presence of training application in instructional materials and the reflection of school-wide professional development goals in classroom practices, both with a mean of 4.74. These findings demonstrate that teachers effectively apply knowledge and skills gained from professional development activities. The lowest-rated indicator was the change in teaching approaches following major trainings, with a mean of 4.64, suggesting that significant pedagogical transformation may require sustained support and monitoring.

These study findings imply that schools strongly support teacher professional development through active participation in trainings, responsive in-service programs, collaborative learning, and the application of acquired skills. The consistently “Very High” ratings confirm that these initiatives enhance teacher competence and instructional effectiveness. However, lower scores in collaborative learning regularity and changes in teaching

approaches highlight the need for sustained peer collaboration, mentoring, and follow-up support to ensure lasting instructional innovation.

This is similar to the results of Amzat, et al. (2022) that found school leadership practices strongly promote teacher professional development, with results indicating a high to very high level of implementation in instructional leadership, supervision, and continuous teacher learning, highlighting that teachers are actively engaged in structured professional growth programs such as trainings and collaborative learning activities.

Level of Teaching Performance of Teachers

Table 4 on the next page presents the level of teaching performance of teachers.

Table 4. Level of Teaching Performance of Teachers.

Teaching Performance	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Outstanding	116	4.67	0.18	Outstanding
Very Satisfactory	20			
Satisfactory	0			
Unsatisfactory	0			
Poor	0			

Legends:(4.50-5.0)-Outstanding;(3.50 – 4.49)-Very Satisfactory;(2.50-3.49) Satisfactory (1.50 – 2.49)-Unsatisfactory;(1.00 – 1.49)-Poor

The table above revealed the teaching performance of the 136 teacher-respondents as evaluated in terms of performance ratings. Results show that the majority of teachers, 116 or most of the respondents, were rated as Outstanding, with a mean of 4.67 and a standard deviation of 0.18. Meanwhile, 20 teachers were rated as Very Satisfactory, and no respondents fell under the categories of Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, or Poor.

The dominance of the “Outstanding” rating indicates that most teachers demonstrate exemplary performance in their instructional duties, classroom management, and professional responsibilities. While there some teachers rated as “Very Satisfactory” implies that despite the performance is generally high, there are still a few educators whose performance may benefit from further enhancement or support to reach the “Outstanding” level.

These findings imply that the teaching workforce demonstrates a high level of competence and instructional effectiveness. This may be attributed to strong supervisory practices, continuous professional development, and collaborative school-based support systems. The results also suggest that school leadership and professional development programs are effective in maintaining high teaching standards. However, continuous mentoring, targeted support, and sustained professional development may further help elevate all teachers toward consistently outstanding performance and ensure long-term instructional excellence.

Through the Results-Based Performance Management System and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers framework, emphasizes regular assessment of teachers based on clearly defined indicators of instructional quality. This structured approach encourages consistent high-level performance, which aligns with the present findings where most teachers were rated as Outstanding (DepEd, 2020).

In addition, Cabigao (2022) highlighted that teachers who benefit from ongoing supervisory guidance, coaching, and professional development are more likely to attain Outstanding performance ratings. This is especially evident when school leaders consistently monitor instructional practices and deliver timely feedback.

Relationship Between Supervisory Practices and Teaching Performance

Table 5 below shows the relationship between supervisory practices and teaching performance.

Table 5. Relationship Between Supervisory Practices and Teaching Performance.

Variables	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Supervisory Practices VS Teaching Performance	0.144	0.095	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant

The table presents the relationship between supervisory practices and teaching performance. The results show a spearman rank correlation coefficient of 0.144 with a p-value of 0.095. Since the p-value is higher than the level of significance of 0.05, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, indicating that the relationship between the two variables is not statistically significant.

The correlation coefficient of 0.144 suggests a very weak positive relationship between supervisory practices and teaching performance. However, the strength of this relationship is minimal, and the result is not statistically significant. This means that even if supervisory practices slightly increase, such changes do not necessarily lead to a meaningful or measurable improvement in teaching performance within the context of this study.

The findings imply that the relationship between supervisory practices and teaching performance was non-significant ($\rho = 0.144$, $p = 0.095$). Supervisory practices, as implemented in the study setting, do not have a significant direct relationship with teachers' performance ratings. This suggests that teaching performance may be influenced by other factors not included in the study, such as teacher motivation, personal competencies, years of experience, school resources, or professional development activities. It also implies that while supervisory practices are rated very highly, their impact on performance ratings may be indirect rather than immediate or measurable through statistical correlation.

This finding is consistent with the work of García and Weiss (2020), who reported that instructional supervision and classroom observation practices did not have a statistically significant direct effect on teacher performance ratings. Their study highlighted that teachers' effectiveness was more strongly shaped by factors such as professional experience, self-efficacy, and training, rather than by the frequency of supervisory activities. They emphasized that supervision may enhance compliance with institutional expectations but does not necessarily translate into measurable improvements in performance outcomes.

Likewise, Torres and Santos (2022) found that although supervisory practices were rated highly, their correlation with teacher performance was not statistically significant. This indicates that extensive supervision does not automatically lead to higher performance ratings. The authors suggested that teachers may already demonstrate strong performance regardless of supervisory oversight, largely due to professional competence and the use of standardized evaluation systems.

Relationship Between Supervisory Practices and Teaching Performance

Table 5 below shows the relationship between supervisory practices and teaching performance.

Table 5. Relationship Between Supervisory Practices and Teaching Performance.

Variables	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Supervisory Practices VS Teaching Performance	0.144	0.095	Failed to Reject H_0	Not Significant

The table presents the relationship between supervisory practices and teaching performance. The results show a spearman rank correlation coefficient of 0.144 with a p-value of 0.095. Since the p-value is higher than the level of significance of 0.05, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, indicating that the relationship between the two variables is not statistically significant.

The correlation coefficient of 0.144 suggests a very weak positive relationship between supervisory practices and teaching performance. However, the strength of this relationship is minimal, and the result is not statistically significant. This means that even if supervisory practices slightly increase, such changes do not necessarily lead to a meaningful or measurable improvement in teaching performance within the context of this study.

The findings imply that supervisory practices, as implemented in the study setting, do not have a significant direct relationship with teachers' performance ratings. This suggests that teaching performance may be influenced by other factors not included in the study, such as teacher motivation, personal competencies, years of experience, school resources, or professional development activities. It also implies that while supervisory practices are rated very highly, their impact on performance ratings may be indirect rather than immediate or measurable through statistical correlation.

This finding is consistent with the work of García and Weiss (2020), who reported that instructional supervision and classroom observation practices did not have a statistically significant direct effect on teacher performance ratings. Their study highlighted that teachers' effectiveness was more strongly shaped by factors such as professional experience, self-efficacy, and training, rather than by the frequency of supervisory activities. They emphasized that supervision may enhance compliance with institutional expectations but does not necessarily translate into measurable improvements in performance outcomes.

Likewise, Torres and Santos (2022) found that although supervisory practices were rated highly, their correlation with teacher performance was not statistically significant. This indicates that extensive supervision does not automatically lead to higher performance ratings. The authors suggested that teachers may already demonstrate strong performance regardless of supervisory oversight, largely due to professional competence and the use of standardized evaluation systems.

Relationship Between Teacher Professional Development and Teaching Performance

Table 6 on the next page shows the relationship between teacher professional development and teaching performance.

Table 6. Relationship Between Teacher Professional Development and Teaching performance

Variables	Test Statistics (r_s)	p-value	Decision for H_0	Interpretation
Teacher Professional Development VS Teaching Performance	0.195	0.023	Reject H_0	Significant

While overall professional development is significantly associated with teaching performance ($\rho = 0.195$, $p = 0.023$), dimensional analysis reveals that Application of Learned Skills exhibits the strongest and only statistically significant individual association ($\rho = 0.224$, $p = 0.009$). Passive attendance and general in-service training do not directly predict performance unless translated into observable classroom application (Desimone, 2020; Kiran et al., 2022).

The findings imply that teacher professional development is associated with teaching performance, but it is not a strong predictor of performance outcomes. While participation in training, seminars, and other professional development activities contributes to improved teaching performance, other factors such as teaching experience, instructional practices, motivation, and supervisory support may exert a more substantial influence on teacher effectiveness.

This result is parallel to Kiran et.al, (2022), whose results indicate that there is a significant relationship between components of professional development such as thematic knowledge, learning environment, human resource development, and evaluation and components of teaching performance, including management skills, instruction and curriculum, content expertise, methodology, and assessment skills. Based on students' responses, a strong and positive relationship exists between professional development and teaching performance, suggesting that improvements in professional development are associated with enhanced teaching effectiveness across multiple dimensions.

Desimone (2020) emphasized that high-quality professional development significantly enhances teachers' instructional practices and classroom performance. The study underscored that components such as active learning, sustained duration, and collaborative participation are strongly associated with improved teaching effectiveness. These findings highlight the importance of designing professional development programs that go beyond compliance and instead foster meaningful engagement, long-term growth, and peer collaboration to achieve measurable improvements in teaching outcomes

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The respondents are well experienced, and academically engaged educators whose professional background enhances instructional quality and institutional stability.
2. School heads exhibit very high level of supervisory practices, particularly in instructional supervision and feedback mechanisms. However, there is a need to further strengthen mentoring and collaborative support systems to maximize the effectiveness of supervision.
3. The study also concludes that teachers are highly engaged in professional development activities, especially in seminars and trainings. However, collaborative learning practices require enhancement to ensure sustained and meaningful professional growth.
4. Findings demonstrate a statistical association between Professional Development application and performance but do not establish causality due to the cross-sectional design.
5. Finally, Supervisory practices as currently measured do not directly predict E-IPCRF performance ratings or the teaching performance.

Recommendations

In light of the findings and conclusions derived from the study, the following recommendations and plan of action were formulated:

1. The Department of Education may Strengthen policy alignment between Professional development offerings and competency standards, emphasizing sustained skill application over seat-time hours.
2. School heads may focus from evaluative compliance to actionable peer coaching and collaborative Learning Action Cells (LACs).

3. Teachers are encouraged to actively participate not only in seminars and trainings but also in collaborative professional learning activities such as Learning Action Cells. They continuously apply and reflect on the skills acquired from professional development to improve their instructional practices.
4. Future researchers are encouraged to investigate differential supervisory impacts across career stages (e.g., novice vs. veteran teachers) via moderated regression. And may employ multi-evaluator observations and time-series data to evaluate causal effects over time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher sincerely thanks all those who contributed to the completion of this study through their guidance, support, and encouragement.

Special gratitude is extended to his life partner, Grace E. Villanueva, his children, Gabrielle Anne and Irvin Myles, and his parents, Sofia and the late Maximiano, for their unwavering love, sacrifices, and inspiration.

The researcher gratefully acknowledges Dr. Ma. Quincy D. Dones, adviser and mentor, for her invaluable guidance and expertise; Dr. Maylin M. Tongcua and the panel members for their constructive feedback; and former Mayor Dr. Rex R. Jalando-on and the City Government of La Carlota for the scholarship support. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Ramir B. Uytico, former Regional Director of DepEd Western Visayas, for his leadership and support.

The researcher thanks all respondents for their time and valuable participation.

Above all, he gives thanks to Almighty God for His grace, guidance, and strength throughout this journey.

REFERENCES

1. Amzat, I. H., Yanti, P. G., & Suswandari, S. (2022). Estimating the effect of principal instructional and distributed leadership on teacher professional development.
2. Avalos, B. (2020). Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 87, 102–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102>
3. Adomako, S. (2021). Instructional supervision and teacher performance in basic schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies*, 5(2), 45–58.
4. Amemasor, K. (2025). Supervisory practices and professional development of teachers. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 9(1), 22–34.
5. Avalos, B. (2021). Teacher professional development over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 98, 103247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103247>
6. Bacay, M. F. D., & Callo, E. C. (2023). School leaders' supervisory roles and practices to teachers' instructional performance in public elementary schools. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 127(1), 65–80. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1001271620235041>
7. Bates, R. (2020). Educational leadership, supervision, and accountability. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(4), 567–584. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219873045>
8. Bushi, M. (2024). Monitoring and evaluation practices in public schools. *International Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 11(2), 66–79.
9. Cabigao, Ronaldo T. (2022). Instructional supervision and teacher performance in public schools. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 3(2), 71–84.
10. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2020). *Effective teacher professional development*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
11. De Castro, Arlene M. (2021). Supervisory leadership practices and instructional effectiveness of school administrators. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 9(2), 44–56.
12. Desimone, L. M. (2020). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181–199.

13. Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2021). Best practices in teachers' professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 102(6), 19–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721721999578>
14. Gallardo, Melanie D., & Salamanca, Edgar P. (2023). Instructional supervision practices of school heads in public secondary schools. *International Journal of Education, Teaching, and Social Science*, 3(1), 55–68.
15. García, E. L., & Weiss, E. (2020). Teacher supervision and instructional effectiveness in public schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*.
16. Glover, D. (2021). School leadership, supervision, and instructional quality. *School Leadership & Management*, 41(3), 223–240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1832493>
17. Godes, M. C., & Dioso, R. R. (2024). Instructional supervisory practices of school heads and their relationship to teacher performance. (Journal details vary by database; verify volume/issue if required.)
18. Hallinger, P. (2020). Instructional leadership and teacher professional learning. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(2), 185–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143219898793>
19. Hopkins, D. (2020). School improvement and instructional supervision. *Journal of Educational Change*, 21(2), 295–307. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-020-09367-6>
20. Ismiarti, I., Nursidah, N., & Sukamto, S. (2021). Academic supervision and its effect on teacher performance. *International Journal of Educational Management and Innovation*, 2(3), 145–153.
21. Karabekmez, S. (2022). Classroom observation and feedback in instructional supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education and Development*, 25(1), 14–28.
22. Kariotoglou, P. (2024). Professional support systems and teaching effectiveness. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 132, 104215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104215>
23. Kennedy, M. M. (2021). How professional development improves teaching. *Review of Educational Research*, 91(2), 197–229. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654321998074>
24. Kiprono, F. J., Ngumi, O., & Kurgat, A. (2022). Instructional supervisory practices and teachers' job performance in public secondary schools. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 9(5), 1–15.
25. Malinova, M. (2021). Collaborative learning and instructional supervision. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 109, 101831. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2021.101831>
26. Medard, J. (2020). Supervisory leadership and teacher performance. *African Journal of Educational Studies*, 7(1), 33–46.
27. Napil, E. (2025). School monitoring practices and instructional effectiveness. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 12(1), 1–15.
28. OECD. (2021). Teachers and school leaders as valued professionals: OECD education policy perspectives. OECD Publishing.
29. Opfer, V. D., & Pedder, D. (2020). Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(3), 376–407. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320912215>
30. Ompoc, R. (2023). Instructional supervision and teaching performance of public-school teachers. *Journal of Educational Studies and Practice*, 8(2), 89–103.
31. Ordanel, A. R. N., & Dioso, E. D. (2023). Effects of supervisory practices of school principals to work performance of teachers. *EPRA International Journal of Educational Research*, 9(4), [page numbers if available]. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra14013>
32. Paglinawan, M. (2024). Professional development initiatives and teacher competence. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 16(1), 55–69.
33. Paris, L. (2023). Teacher collaboration and professional growth. *Teaching Education*, 34(3), 271–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2022.2075698>
34. Philippine Department of Education. (2020). Results-based performance management system (RPMS) and Philippine professional standards for teachers (PPST). DepEd.
35. Rohmatika, D. (2019). Instructional leadership and supervision practices. *Journal of Educational Administration Research*, 4(2), 101–113.
36. Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2020). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(4), 635–674. (This is a later edition/republication of the influential work.)
37. Tan, C. (2022). In-service education and teacher upskilling. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 50(4), 357–371. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2021.1912993>

-
38. Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2021). Teacher job satisfaction, professional development, and instructional quality. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 103, 103349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103349>
 39. Torres, Jose R., & Santos, Liza M.. (2022). Instructional supervision and teacher performance relationship in public schools. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 28(3), 33–47.
 40. Udtog, M., & Espacio, J. (2025). Professional support and monitoring in basic education. *International Journal of Educational Supervision*, 6(1), 18–30.
 41. Varsik, S. (2022). Monitoring and evaluation systems in schools. *Journal of Educational Policy and Practice*, 14(2), 144–158.
 42. Ventista, L. (2023). Supervisory practices and teaching performance. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 10(2), 77–92.
 43. UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
 44. UNESCO. (2023). *Global report on teachers: Addressing teacher shortages and transformation*. UNESCO Publishing.