School Heads' Supervision Practices and Teachers' Instructional Performance: Basis for a Proposed Mentoring Program

Desiree Misllang-Sison[1], Armando D. Junio, Ed.D.[2]
Turac National High School, PSU- School of Advanced Studies
desiree.mislang@deped.gov.ph, armandodelosreyesjunio@yahoo.com

Abstract: *This study aimed to determine the relationship between school heads' supervision practices and teachers' instructional performance as basis for a proposed mentoring program.*

The findings of the study reveal that most of the teachers are 25 to 40 years old which has the most number of frequency and most are aged above 40 years.. In terms of sex, female teachers and school heads are more dominant than males .When it comes to civil status, most of the teachers and school heads are married. In terms of educational attainment,most of the teachers earned their units in Master's Degree while most of the school heads PhD/EdD holder. School heads and teachers are serving the public for less than 10 years and 10 to 30 years. In terms of specialization, most of the teachers are English majors while school heads are Mathematics majors. In terms of position, most of the principal are Principal I and teachers are Teacher III. Both teachers and school heads are members of professional organization ,do not have any other designations, attended series of seminars and with plus factors.

The level of teachers' instructional performance along content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment and diversity of learners, curriculum and planning and assessement and reporting is Very Satisfactory.

On the other hand, the level of school heads' supervision practices along instructional supervision, learning environment, human resource management and development and parents' involvement and community partnership and school leadership management and operations is outstanding. Supervision practices of school heads varies when they are grouped as to position, seminars attended and plus factor while nstructional performance of teachers varies when they are grouped according to educational attainment, length of service and position.

Moreover, instructional supervision established a positive correlation with content knowledge and pedagogy while learning environment, school leadership and management operations established a positive correlation with learning environment, diversity of learners and curriculum and planning.

Keywords: *Supervision Practices, Instructional Performance, Mentoring Program*

INTRODUCTION

The Constitution prescribes priority initiatives on education both on access and quality. It is in this reason that the Department of Education focuses in finding ways on how education will be part of everyone's life and how quality education be realized in every institution.

The success in the attainment of access in education has been realized as stated by Secretary Briones. She speaks before the DepEd regional and division officials, supervisors, principals, and teachers and highlights the victories of DepEd in terms of access to education which include increase of enrollment, decrease of dropout rates, and the rise of cohort survival rates during the Region VII Management Committee Meeting at South View Hotel in Dumaguete on October 31.

In line with this success, she exclaimed that DepEd is now pivoting on quality rather than access. She stressed that to achieve quality, teaching styles need to be changed. She further explained that pivoting from access to quality means pivoting traditional ways of teaching to different ways of teaching. Therefore, the role of teachers in the pursuit of quality education is quite enormous.

The statement of Secretary Briones is also in line with the idea of McKinsey [1], stating that the quality of educational system does not exceed the quality of its teachers. This indicates that quality of education will be realized if teachers are doing quality performance .Quality teachers means quality students. Indeed, teachers need to give their best teaching strategies in order to affect changes in the right direction. As a result, instructional supervision practices have evolved to help teachers improve instruction and provide the best learning experiences to students.

The above-mentioned facts correlates with the idea of Chen [2] which states that with the rise of global competition and the focus on teacher quality, teacher professional development is becoming increasingly crucial, and the stress and challenges for principals are more severe than ever. Teachers can improve their professional abilities through principals' instructional supervision and their own knowledge-management (KM) behaviors to benefit students.

As a result, to complement reform initiatives on teacher quality, the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) has been developed and nationally validated. And to formally implement the set standards, it was signed into policy by Department of Education (DepEd) Secretary Leonor Magtolis Briones through DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017. The PPST now defines what constitutes teacher quality through well-defined domains, strands and indicators that provide measures of professional learning, competent practice and effective engagement across teachers' career stages from beginning to distinguished level.This document serves as a public statement of professional accountability that can help teachers reflect on and assess their own practices as they aspire for personal growth and professional development.

In 2015, the DepEd issued Order No. 2, s. 2015 referring to the guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education" following Civil Service Commission Memorandum Circular No. 06, s. 2012 or the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) to ensure efficient, timely and quality performance among personnel. The guidelines explain mechanisms, criteria and processes for performance target setting, monitoring, evaluation and development planning. Through the RPMS, the DepEd ensures that work efforts focus towards achieving its vision, mission, values and strategic priorities toward the delivery of quality educational services to Filipino learners.

Now, to effectively measure teacher's performance, the development of new results-based assessment tools has come into reality through the alignment of RPMS with the PPST. These tools provide guidance and information to teachers and school heads in the performance assessment process.

For teachers, the tools describe and explain their different assessment phases. It also introduces the concept of annotations to guide teachers through critical reflection of their practices for their continuous improvement.

For school head and other raters, it contains all the information needed to assess teacher performance. It provides a detailed reference to help in the understanding of the tools and the different phases of assessment within the various cycles of RPMS, ensuring that mechanisms are in place to support teacher performance.

The significant steps and efforts exerted by the Department of Education to improve teachers' performance and intensify school heads' instructional practices for quality education is indeed remarkable and commendable. It provides opportunities to a more productive and effective collaboration between the teachers and school heads. It is known for a fact that school heads not only play administrative roles but also instruct teachers. In particular, school heads inspire teachers to overcome challenges and changes in education. School heads who are school leaders should consider the influence of teachers' instructional behaviors while emphasizing their own roles in instructional supervision. To positively affect teachers' quality, principals must engage teachers in ways that support improved practice and seek to empower teachers as creative and innovative.

It is in this premise that this study will be conducted to determine the relationship of school heads' instructional supervision practices and teachers' instructional practices based on the new assessment tools. Further, the study will develop a proposed mentoring program to improve instructional supervision roles and teachers' teaching practices.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study determined the relationship of school heads' supervision practices and teachers' instructional performance.

Specifically, it sought answer to the following statements.

First is the profile of secondary school teachers in terms of age, sex, civil status, length of years in service, highest educational attainment,

specialization, position, other designation,workshops and trainings attended, membership to professional organizations, and plus factors.

Second is the level of school heads' supervision practices along , instructional supervision, learning environment, human resource management and development, parent's involvement and community partnership, and school leadership management and operations .

Third is the level of secondary school teachers' instructional performance along content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment and diversity of learners, curriculum and planning, and assessment and reporting.

Fourth is the significant difference between the supervision practices of the school heads across their profile variables.

Fifth is the significant difference between the insructional perfromance of the teachers across their profile variables.

Sixth is the significant relationship between school heads' supervision practices and teachers' instructional performance.

Lastly is the mentoring program that can be proposed to improve the least instructional supervision practices and teachers' instructional performance.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study utilized the descriptive - correlation design. This is appropriate in this type of research since it will describe the profile of the respondents, instructional supervision practices of school heads and instructional practices of the teachers in secondary schools. The correlational aspect describes the relationship between the variables

The respondents of the study were two hundred (200) school heads and one thousand two hundred secondary school teachers (1200) which are randomly chosen from the six divisions of Pangasinan.

The instrument used were survey-questionnaires to collect, analyze and interpret school heads' supervision practices and teachers instructional performance.. The indicators in the questionnaires are adapted from the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) particularly on the Key Result Areas of both teachers and school heads. The research instrument was of two types. The first is for the school head and the other is for the teachers. Both have two (2) parts. Part 1 contains the information on the personal profile of the respondents. Part 2 consists of items on instructional supervision practices of the school heads and instructional practices of the teachers.

The researcher asked permission form the Schools Division Offices in Panagsinan to conduct the study. Upon approval of the request,survey-questionnaire was made available through google form and was then forwarded to the schools for the electronic gathering of the responses with the help of division personnel and school principals.The data collected were then subjected to statistical treatment for further interpretation.

To qualify the responses and to provide tools for the testing of the hypotheses, the following statistical techniques were used.

To determine the profile of the school heads and teachers, the researcher used frequency count and percent.

To determine the level of school heads' supervision practices and teachers' instructional performance, frequency count and average weighted mean were used.

T-Test and ANOVA were used to analyze the difference between school heads' supervision practices and teachers instructional performance and their profile variables.

Pearson r moment correlation is usde to determine the the relationship between school heads' supervision practices and teachers' instructional performance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presents the results of determining the relationship of school heads' supervision practices and teachers' instructional performance.

Table 1. Summary on the Level of Secondary School Teachers' Instructional Performance

INSTRUCTIONAL PERFOMANCE	MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE RATING
Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	4.08	Very Satisfactory
Learning environment and Diversity of Learners	4.35	Very Satisfactory
Curriculum and Planning	4.18	Very Satisfactory
Assessment and Reporting	4.27	Very Satisfactory
OVERALL MEAN	**4.22**	**Very Satisfactory**

Tale 1 presents the summary of teachers' instructional performance along content knowledge and pedagogy; learning environment and diversity of learners; curriculum and planning; and assessment and reporting. It shows that teachers performed better than the others along learning environment and diversity of learners with the highest mean of 4.35. This implies that teachers are very particular to the individual differences of their learners, thus providing them conducive learning environment suited to their interests.

On the other hand, their performance in content knowledge and pedagogy has the lowest mean of 4.08. This is a manifestation that teachers need to be better equipped with a range of strategies in the application of content knowledge and pedagogy within and across curriculum.

Table 2. Summary on the Level of Secondary School Heads' Supervision Practices

SUPERVISION PRACTICES	MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE RATING
Instructional Supervision	4.53	Outstanding
Learning Environment	4.75	Outstanding
Human Resource Management and Development	4.63	Outstanding
Parents' Involvement and Community Partnership	4.58	Outstanding
School Leadership Management and Operations	4.53	Outstanding
OVERALL MEAN	**4.60**	**Outstanding**

Table 2 shows the summary on the level of secondary school heads' supervision practices. It can be seen that all the practices have almost the same level of performance which is outstanding . This is an indication that school heads are doing their roles and responsibilities accordingly and effectively . The highest mean which is 4.75 falls under learning environment which means that school heads really provide a safe, conducive and motivating learning environment for both teachers and students.

Table 3. Multivariate Test on the Supervision Practices Across Profile Variables

Effect		F	Sig.
Age	Pillai's Trace	0.502	0.912
Sex	Hotelling's Trace	1.580[b]	0.159
Civil status	Pillai's Trace	0.746	0.706
Educational attainment	Pillai's Trace	1.095	0.345
Length of service	Pillai's Trace	1.106	0.356
Specialization	Pillai's Trace	0.775	0.827
Position	Pillai's Trace	**4.805****	**0.000**
Membership to Professional Organization	Pillai's Trace	0.890	0.558
Designation	Pillai's Trace	0.472	0.930
Seminars attended	Pillai's Trace	**3.214****	**0.006**
Plus factor	Pillai's Trace	**3.128****	**0.007**

Table shows the significant difference between the supervision practices of the school heads across their profile variables.

The result shows that the computed value as to position (f=4.805, p=0.000), seminars attended (f = 3.214, p = 0.006) and plus factor (f= 3.128, p=0.007) has a p-value lesser than the level of significance set at 0.05 which denotes that there is a significant difference on the supervision practices of school heads when grouped as to position, seminars attended and plus factor. This implies that the supervision practices of school heads vary based on the stated profile variables. Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference between school heads' supervision practices across profile variables is accepted.

The result shows similarities to the study on the influence of school heads' instructional competencies on teachers' management conducted by Goden, et.al.[3]. In terms of profile variables on age and position of the school head, the position shows significant relationship. The computed value for the position 0.000 was lesser at alpha =0.05. The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between position of the school head and theirn instructional competencies was rejected and therefore significant. Findings draw implication that the position of the school head directly relates or affects their instructional competencies.

Table 4. Anova Test on the Supervision Practices Across Profile Variable Position

Source		F	Sig.
Position	Instructional supervision	**2.624***	**0.02**
	Learning environment	1.924	0.083
	Human resource management and development	1.293	0.266
	Parents' involvement and community partnership	1.135	0.347
	School leadership management and operations	1.959	0.077
	Over -all	**2.074**	**0.062**

Table 4 shows the significant difference between school heads supervision practices across their position.

The computed value on instructional supervision (f = 2.624, *p* = 0.02*)* has a *p* value lesser than the level of significance set at 0.05 which means that the position of the school heads greatly affect their supervision practices particularly on instructional supervision. The result implies that head teachers and school principals vary their practices depending on their position.

Table 5. Multiple Comparison Test on the Supervision Practices Across Profile Variable Position

Multiple Comparison Test on the Supervision Practices across Profile Variable Position

(I)	(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
PI	P2	0.0529	0.748
	P3	-0.0337	0.849
	P4	**-.3280***	**0.020**
	HT1	-0.037	0.844
	HT2	0.1481	0.667
	HT3	0.1043	0.43
P2	P3	-0.0866	0.641
	P4	**-.3810***	**0.013**
	HT1	-0.0899	0.648
	HT2	0.0952	0.785
	HT3	0.0514	0.722
P3	P4	-0.2944	0.075
	HT1	-0.0034	0.987
	HT2	0.1818	0.608
	HT3	0.138	0.383
P4	HT1	0.291	0.102
	HT2	0.4762	0.16
	HT3	**.4323***	**0.000**
HT1	HT2	0.1852	0.608
	HT3	0.1413	0.409
HT2	HT3	-0.0439	0.896

Table shows the multiple comparison among school heads' position and their supervision practices.

The result reveals that the supervison practices of Principal I show significant difference when compared to Principal IV with a mean difference of -.3280 and a p value of 0.020 which is lesser that the significant level set at 0.05. This is an indication that in terms of position, Principal I and IV performed their supervision practices different from each other.

In like manner, when Principal II is compared to other positions, it shows that it has also significant difference to Principal IV with an mean difference of -.3810 and a p value of 0.013 which is lesser than the level of significance set at 0.05. This indivates that Principal II and IV performed their supervision practices differently.

On the other hand, when Principal IV is compared among other positions, it shows that it has a significant difference to Head Teacher III with amean difference of .4323 and a p value of 0.000 which is leasser that the level of significance set at 0.05. This only implies that Principal IV and Head Teacher III possess different level of their supervision practices.

Table 6 ANOVA Test On The Supervision Practices Across Profile Variable Number Of Seminars Attended

ANOVA Test on the Supervision Practices across Profile Variable Number of Seminars Attended

Source		F	Sig.
Seminars Attended	Instructional supervision	**3.097***	**0.012**
	Learning environment	1.618	0.161
	Human resource management and development	1.145	0.341
	Parents' involvement and community partnership	1.161	0.333
	School leadership management and operations	1.261	0.285
	Over -all	2.143	0.065

Table 6 shows the significant difference between school heads supervision practices across their seminars attened.

The computed value on instructional supervision (f = 3.097, p = 0.012*)* has a p value lesser than the level os significance set at 0.05 which means that the number of seminars attennded by the school heads greatly affect their supervision practices particularly on instructional supervision. The result implies that head teachers and school principals vary their supervision practices depending on the skills and knowledge they acquired when attnding seminars

Table 7 . Multiple Comparison Test on the Supervision Practices across Profile Variable Seminars Attended

(I)	(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
No Seminar	With 1 seminar	0.076	0.79
	With 2 Seminar	0.1022	0.506
	With 3 Seminar	0.2213	0.183
	With 4 Seminar	**.7268***	**0.001**
	With More than 5 Seminars	0.0523	0.665
With 1 seminar	With 2 Seminar	0.0261	0.928
	With 3 Seminar	0.1453	0.622
	With 4 Seminar	**.6508***	**0.042**
	With More than 5 Seminars	-0.0237	0.931
With 2 Seminar	With 3 Seminar	0.1192	0.482
	With 4 Seminar	**.6246***	**0.003**
	With More than 5 Seminars	-0.0498	0.693
With 3 Seminar	With 4 Seminar	**.5055***	**0.021**
	With More than 5 Seminars	-0.169	0.231
With 4 Seminar	With More than 5 Seminars	**-.6745***	**0**

Table 7 shows the significant difference between school heads supervision practices across their seminars attended.

The computed value on instructional supervision (f = 3.097, p = 0.012*)* has a p value lesser than the level of significance set at 0.05 which means that the number of seminars attended by the school heads greatly affect their supervision practices particularly on instructional supervision. The result implies that head teachers and school principals vary their supervision practices depending on the skills and knowledge they acquired when attending seminars.

Table 8. Multivariate Test on the Instructional Performance Across Profile Variables

Effect		F	Sig.
Age	Pillai's Trace	1.856	0.063
Sex	Hotelling's Trace	1.478[b]	0.207
Civil Status	Pillai's Trace	1.544	0.101
Educational Attainment	Pillai's Trace	**3.116****	**0.000**
Length of Service	Pillai's Trace	**4.214****	**0.000**
Specialization	Pillai's Trace	1.310	0.114
Position	Pillai's Trace	**5.818****	**0.000**
Membership to Professional Organization	Hotelling's Trace	0.746	0.706
Designation	Hotelling's Trace	1.095	0.345
Seminar Attended	Pillai's Trace	1.613	0.081
Plus Factor	Pillai's Trace	0.890	0.558

Table 8 shows the significant difference between the instructional performance of the teachers across their profile variables.

The result shows that the computed value as to educational attainment (f=3.116, p=0.000), length of service (f = 4.214, p = 0.000) and position (f= 5.818, p=0.000) has a p-value lesser than the level of significance set at 0.05 which denotes that there is a significant difference on the instructional performance of teachers when grouped as to educational attainment, length of service and position. This implies that the instructional performacne of teachers vary based on the stated profile variables. Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference between school heads' supervision practices across profile variables is accepted.

The result of this analysis is in consonnace with the study conducted by Malunda et.al. [4], in their research on instructional supervision and the pedagogical practices of secondary schools. It states that age and the number of years taught in

school were found to be statistically significant (ρ < 0.05) in explaining variations in pedagogical practices. Meanwhile, level of education, specialization and civil status taught did not significantly explain variations in the pedagogical practices (p > 0.05) of teachers.

Table shows the multiple comparison among the seminars attended by school head and their supervision practices.

The result reveals that the school heads with no seminar attended compared to the rest shows a significant difference only to those school heads with 4 seminars which is shown shown on their mean difference of .7268 and a p valu of .001. This only shows that those school heads with 4 seminars performd better than those with no seminars attended,

Similarly, when school heads with only 1 seminar is compared to the rest of the group, table shows that it has a significant difference when compared to school heads with four seminars which is also shown in their mean difference of .6508 and a p value of 0.042. This result is also true when school heads with 2 seminars is compared to the rest of the group, it shows that it has also significant difference to those school heads with four seminars. This results will give us the idea that thos school heads with 1 or 2 seminars performed differently to those school heads with four seminars.

On the other hand, it shows a significant difference when school heads with four seminars is compared to those with more than five seminars. This only indicates that the more seminars you have which is related to supervision, the more equipped you are in performing your supervision practices particulary on instructional supervision.

Table 9 ANOVA Test on the Instructional Performance Across Profile Variable Educational Attainment

Source		F	Sig.
Educational Attainment	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	**7.278****	**0.000**
	Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	**5.367****	**0.000**
	Curriculum and Planning	**8.884****	**0.000**
	Assessment and Reporting	**7.174****	**0.000**
	Over-all	**8.894****	**0.000**

Table 9 shows the significant difference between instructional performance of teachers across their educational attainment.

The computed value on content knowledge and pedagogy (f = 7.278, *p* = 0.000*)*, learning environment and diversity of learners (f = 5.367, *p* = 0.000, curriculum and planning (f = 8.884, *p* = 0.000*)* and assessment and reporting (f = 7.174, *p* = 0.000*)* has a *p* value lesser than the level of significance set at 0.05 which means that the educational attainment of the teachers greatly affect their their instructional performance in all the indicators The result implies that teachers performed differently with each other based on their educational attainment.

Table 10. Multiple Comparison on the Instructional Performance Across Profile Variable Educational Attainment

(I)	(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
BS Graduate	MA/MS Units	**-.1073***	**0.013**
	MA/MS Graduate	**-.1721***	**0.000**
	PhD/EdD Units	**-.1902***	**0.002**
	PhD/EdD Garduate	**-.5299***	**0.000**
MA/MS Units	MA/MS Graduate	-0.0648	0.095
	PhD/EdD Units	-0.0829	0.127
	PhD/EdD Garduate	**-.4226***	**0.000**
MA/MS Graduate	PhD/EdD Units	-0.0181	0.759
	PhD/EdD Garduate	**-.3578***	**0.002**
PhD/EdD Units	PhD/EdD Garduate	**-.3397***	**0.005**

Table 10 presents the multiple comparison of teachers' instructional performance across their educational attainment.

It shows that when BS Graduate is compared to the rest of educational attainment, it reveals that it has significant difference in all levels which is shown in their p values that are lesser than the level of significance at 0.005.This is an indication that BS graduate peformed differently when compared to other levels of educational attainment. It furthers shows that the higher educational attainment you have the better performance you will do.

Table 11. Correlational Analyses Between Instructional Performance of the Teachers and Supervision Practices of the School Heads

Indicators		Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	Curriculum and Planning	Assessment and Reporting
Instructional Supervision	r	**.220***	0.055	-0.165	**.214***
	sig.	**0.013**	0.534	0.063	**0.015**
Learning Environment	r	-0.028	**.174***	**.245****	0.154
	sig.	0.75	**0.05**	**0.005**	0.083
Human Resource Management and Development	r	0.084	0.094	-0.12	0.139
	sig.	0.344	0.29	0.176	0.118
Parents' Involvement and Community Partnership	r	0.018	0.089	0.096	0.132
	sig.	0.839	0.32	0.28	0.139
School Leadership Management and Operations	r	-0.16	**.186***	-0.137	0.162
	sig.	0.07	**0.035**	0.124	0.068

Table 11 shows the correlation of the Instructional Performance of the Teachers and the Supervision Practices of the School Heads utilizing the Pearson r correlation.

Findings revealed that Instructional Supervision established a *positive correlation* with Content Knowledge and Pedagogy (p=.013< 0.05) and Assessment and Reporting (p=.016< 0.05) which seemingly implies that the school heads who have high practices in instructional supervision lead to a high performance in Content Knowledge and Pedagogy and Assessment and Reporting of teachers.

Learning Environment established a *positive correlation* with Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners (p=.050< 0.05) and Curriculum and Planning (p=.005< 0.05) which seemingly implies that

the school heads who have high practices in learning environment lead to a high performance in Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners and Curriculum and Planning of teachers.

Lastly, School Leadership and Management Operations established a *positive correlation* with Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners ($p=.050< 0.05$) which seemingly implies that the school heads who have high practices in School Leadership and Management Operations lead to a high performance in Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners of teachers.

These findings are in consonance to the result from the study conducted by Iroegbu [5] who examined the differences in teachers' effectiveness based on principals' instructional supervision in public secondary schools. The findings show that there is a significant difference in teachers' effectiveness based on classroom observation, analysis/strategy, post-conference analysis and post-analysis conference. Teachers in schools where instructional supervision was adequate were more effective than those that had inadequate instructional supervision. It is, therefore, recommended among others that, the principals should carry out an adequate instructional supervision of teachers so as to enhance their teaching effectiveness.

In addition, the study of Umaru [6] who determined the relationship between principals' instructional supervision and teachers' performance is also in support to the present study. It was found out that the obtained R and sig value (R-Value=0.000 and sig=0.01) indicates that there is a significant relationship between the two. The researcher concluded that the principals should intensify more effort in their instructional supervision in terms of supporting teachers in their lesson, in terms of scheme of work, lesson plan and lesson note this will help to improve teachers‟ performance.

Uzoechina et.al, [7] also came up with the same result compared to the present study.. They conducted a study to determine whether there is a significant relationship that exists between principals' instruction supervision practices and teachers' job performance in secondary schools. Findings indicated that a moderate positive relationship exists between principals instructional supervision practices and teachers job performance. Among others, it was recommended that principals should use instructional supervision as an opportunity to equip their teachers with professional skills and knowledge.

CONCLUSION

As an outcome of the finding presented in the previous discussions, the following conclusions are drawn.

The results that teachers are mostly 25 to 40 years old and school heads are above 40 years old would give us the idea that both of them are mature enough to assume their roles in performing instruction and supervision. It can be further concluded that females are more interested in the teaching profession because males are being dominated by males as reflected in the result. In addition, both of them find time t pursue their graduate studies and to grow professionally as reflected in the result of their highest educational attainment, seminars attended, membership to professional organization, and plus factors. Teachers have a lesser teaching experience in the public service because most of the have less than 10 years of teaching experience. English and Mathematics majors probably possess instructional and supervision skills because of the fact that these are the most frequent majors of the respondents. The result reflected in the position of the school heads is an indication that they are newly promoted principals or they have been in the position for a longer time without any promotions.

Teachers' level of instructional performance will give as a picture of how they manage the teaching learning process. And as reflected, they need more support to become outstanding. The result also tells us that they are still on the process of adapting to the new standards set for quality teaching.

School Heads' level of supervision practices is definitely overwhelming because all the domains have an outstanding rating. This would give as the idea that school heads performed in accordance with the set standards for supervision.

School heads' supervision practices varies according to position, seminars attended and plus factors which indicates that the higher positions you have, the better practice you will do. The more trainings you have in the service ,the better skills you possess. The more plus factors you have earned, the better practices you will perform.

Teachers' instructional performance varies according to educational attainment, length of service

and positions. This means that the higher educational attainment you have, the better instructional experiences you will encounter. The longer years you are in the service, the more equipped you will be in terms of instruction. And the better positions you have, the better skills you possess.

Instructional performance and supervision practices established a positive correlation because school heads have an impact to their teachers. The practices they do in terms of supervision affect the teachers in terms of their teaching methodologies and practices.

The proposed mentoring program will be of great help for both school heads and teachers in the improvement of instructional performance.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing findings and conclusions, the researcher recommends the following.

First, trainings and workshops are recommended for both school heads and teachers to better equipped themselves in isntruction and supervision.

Second, school heads should maintain an outstanding level of performance particularly on instructional supervision, learning environment, human resource management and development for it greatly affect teachers' instructional performance.

Third, strategies or interventions on instruction should be developed to adapt to improve the least performed instructional performance.

Fourth, a similar study must be conducted using the new sets of indicators as indicated in the Key Result Areas for school heads and teachers.

Lastly, The proposed mentoring program to improve teachers' instructional performance may be considered to improve teaching strategies in developing reative and crtical thinking skilss as well as higher order thinking skills of the students.

REFERENCES

[1] McKinsey et.al (2015) Raising Your Digital Quotient

[2] Chen M. (2018), Meta-Analysis on the Effectiveness of Team-Based Learning, BMCmedical education 18 (1),77

[3] Goden et.al (2016) Influence of School Heads' Instructional Competencies on Teachers' Management In Leyte Division, Philippines, International Journal Of Engineering Sciences & Research
Technology, ISSN: 2277-9655

[4] Malunda, P., Onen, D., Musaazi, J., and Ounyo, J. (2016) Instructional Supervision and the Pedagogical Practices of Secondary School Teachers in Uganda, Journal of Education and Practice, ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online)
Vol.7, No.30, 2016

[5] Iroegbu, E.E. and Eyo, E.E. (2016) Principals' Instructional Supervision and Teachers' Effectiveness, British Journal of Education, Vol.4, No.7, pp.99-109, July 2016

[6] Umaru D., (2018) Principals' Instructional Supervision And Teachers' Performance Of Secondary Schools In Danko Wasagu Local Government Area Kebbi State, North-West Nigeria, REG.NO.1163-07096-05563

[7] Uzoechina, G. & Nwankwo I, (2017)., International Journal of World Policy and Development Studies, Academic Research Publishing Group, vol. 3(4), pages 21-25, 12-2017

[8] Lopez, C.A., (2016) Classroom Supervisory Practices and Their Relationship to Teacher Effectiveness As Perceived by Secondary Teachers, SMCC Higher Education Research Journal ISSN Print: 2449-4402 · ISSN online: 2467-6322 Volume 2 ·

[9] Kemunto, F. and Marwanga, O. (2014) . Relationship between Instructional Supervisory Practices by Principals and Academic Performance in Public Secondary Schools in Nakuru Municipality, Kenya, IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 19, Issue 11, Ver. III (Nov. 2014), PP 27-31 e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.

[10] Ampofo, S. Y., Onyango, G. A., & Ogola, M. (2019). Influence of School Heads' Direct Supervision on Teacher Role Performance in Public Senior High Schools, Central Region, Ghana, Journal of Education 7 (2), 9-26

[11] Arrifin, A.K, Idris, A.R. and Abdullah Z. (2015). The Relationship between Teaching Supervision with Teachers' Motivation in Secondary Schools, Journal of Advanced Research in Social and Behavioral Science 1, 1-11

[13] Daresh, J. (2016). Leading and Supervising Instruction. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin press.

[14] Glickman C.D. (2015). Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach (4th ed.). Boston.

[15] Darling – Hammond & Baratz – Snowden (2015). Instructional Supervision and the Pedagogical Practices of Secondary School Teachers in Uganda, Journal Education of Practice, Volume 18, Issue 12