International Journal of Research Studies in Education
2026 Volume 15 Number 25, 65-82

Instructional supervision challenges of selected elementary school heads in the second congressional district of Ilocos Sur



Palma, Thelma ✉
Osias Educational Foundation, Inc., Philippines (Thelmapalma2025@gmail.com)

ISSN: 2243-7703
Online ISSN: 2243-7711

Received: 5 November 2026 **Revised**: 18 November 2026 **Accepted**: 20 November 2026 OPEN ACCESS
Available Online: 21 November 2026 **DOI**: 10.5861/ijrse.2026.26477

Abstract

The current study revealed that elementary school heads encountered challenges in instructional supervision, particularly in classroom observation, time management, teacher cooperation, supervisory skills, and administrative workload. Administrative workload was rated Very Highly Serious, while time management and supervisory skills were rated Serious. Teacher cooperation and classroom observation were rated Moderately Serious, while technical assistance was considered a moderate challenge. The results also indicated the need to strengthen school heads' competencies in educational leadership, modern supervisory approaches, instructional supervision, and contemporary teaching and assessment strategies. Based on these findings, a training program was proposed to enhance their supervisory and instructional leadership competencies.

Keywords: instructional supervision, instructional leadership, school heads, supervisory challenges, training program

© The Author(s) / Attribution CC BY

Instructional supervision challenges of selected elementary school heads in the second congressional district of Ilocos Sur

1. Introduction

Instructional supervision plays a critical role in ensuring the quality of education in public elementary schools. At the national level, education systems consistently emphasize the need for effective leadership in guiding teaching and learning processes. School principals, as frontline instructional leaders, are entrusted with the responsibility of monitoring classroom practices, mentoring teachers, implementing curriculum reforms, and ensuring compliance with educational standards. However, despite their central role, public elementary school principals across the country face a multitude of challenges that hinder their capacity to provide effective instructional supervision. In many countries, public education systems are characterized by vast student populations, diverse learning needs, limited resources, and evolving policy mandates. These conditions create a complex operational environment for principals, who must balance administrative duties with instructional leadership functions. Challenges such as inadequate training in supervision, heavy workload, lack of support from higher authorities, and constrained professional development opportunities often compromise the ability of principals to monitor and improve teaching quality. As a result, variations in instructional supervision practices have been linked to differences in school performance, including student achievement, teacher effectiveness, and overall school improvement outcomes.

In furtherance, education plays a vital role in national development, serving as a foundation for economic growth, social equity, and global competitiveness. International organizations such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) emphasize that quality education is central to achieving sustainable development goals. Across countries, improving learner outcomes has become a major educational priority, with strong emphasis placed on school leadership as a key driver of school effectiveness. Globally, research consistently identifies school principals as instructional leaders who significantly influence teaching quality and student achievement. Organizations like the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) highlight that effective instructional supervision through classroom observation, feedback, curriculum monitoring, and teacher professional development contributes to improved school performance. However, principals worldwide face increasing administrative workloads, policy reforms, accountability pressures, and limited resources, which often reduce the time and capacity they can devote to instructional supervision.

In many developing countries, public elementary school principals encounter additional challenges such as overcrowded classrooms, insufficient teaching materials, inadequate training in instructional leadership, and limited autonomy in decision-making. These constraints may hinder their ability to effectively supervise instruction and support teachers. As a result, disparities in school performance continue to emerge, particularly in public elementary schools serving diverse and high-need communities. At the national level, educational reforms have expanded the responsibilities of public elementary school principals beyond traditional administrative tasks to include curriculum leadership, teacher mentoring, data-driven decision-making, and school improvement planning. While policies emphasize instructional supervision as a core function of school leaders, principals often struggle to balance managerial duties with instructional leadership roles. This imbalance may affect the overall academic performance of schools, as effective supervision is closely linked to teacher effectiveness and student outcomes.

At the local level, public elementary schools operate within unique contextual realities shaped by community characteristics, resource availability, and institutional support systems. Principals may face challenges such as teacher resistance to supervision, limited professional development opportunities, time constraints, and insufficient supervisory skills. These challenges can directly or indirectly influence school performance indicators such as student achievement, teacher performance ratings, and overall school effectiveness.

Despite the recognized importance of instructional supervision, there remains a need to examine the specific challenges encountered by public elementary school principals and how these challenges relate to school performance. Understanding this relationship is essential for informing leadership development programs, strengthening supervisory practices, and designing policies that support principals in fulfilling their instructional roles effectively. Instructional supervision is one of the most important responsibilities of public elementary school principals. It ensures that teaching practices are effective, curriculum standards are properly implemented, and student learning outcomes are continuously improved.

Under the Department of Education, principals are expected to serve as instructional leaders who monitor classroom instruction, provide feedback to teachers, support professional development, and ensure alignment of teaching practices with national standards. However, school principals often encounter challenges in performing instructional supervision due to workload, limited resources, teacher resistance, time constraints, and administrative demands. Understanding the nature of these supervision challenges at the local level is essential for informing policy interventions, leadership development programs, and support systems that enhance school performance. By examining the specific barriers that principals encounter and how these barriers influence instructional quality, stakeholders can develop strategies that strengthen leadership capacities and promote equitable learning outcomes across all public elementary schools. This study, therefore, seeks to illuminate the instructional supervision challenges faced by public elementary school principals and explore their relationship to school performance within the broader context of national educational goals and reforms.

Therefore, this study seeks to investigate the instructional supervision challenges faced by public elementary school principals and determine their relationship to school performance. By exploring this connection, the research aims to contribute to the development of strategies that enhance instructional leadership and ultimately improve educational outcomes at the elementary level. This study aims to examine the instructional supervision challenges experienced by public elementary school principals in Alilem District and determine how these challenges relate to school performance.

Statement of the Problem Statement of the Problem - This study aimed to determine the instructional supervision challenges of public elementary school heads in the second congressional district of Ilocos Sur. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

- What is the demographic profile of the public elementary school heads in terms of: a) Age; b) Sex; c) Civil Status; d) Highest Educational attainment; e) Length of Service as Principal; f) Rank/Position***;*** g) Relevant Trainings and Seminars; and h) Type of School?
- What instructional supervision challenges are experienced by public elementary school principals in terms of: a) Classroom observation; b) Time management; c) Teacher cooperation; d) Supervisory skills; e) Administrative workload; and f) Technical Assistance?
- What is the degree of seriousness of the instructional supervisory challenges encountered by the public elementary school heads along: a) Time Management; b) Administrative Workload; c) Teacher Cooperation; d) Supervisory Skills; and e) Classroom Observation?
- Based on the findings of the study, what program can be proposed to address the Instructional Supervision Challenges of Public Elementary School Heads in the second congressional district of Ilocos Sur?

Paradigm of the Study - This study employed the Input-Process-Output (IPO) as a conceptual framework. The input variables include the survey results of the following:

- demographic profile of the public elementary school heads in terms of: a) Age; b) Sex; c) Civil Status; d) Highest Educational attainment; e) Length of Service as Principal; f) Rank/Position***;*** g) Relevant Trainings and Seminars; and h) Type of School.

- instructional supervision challenges are experienced by public elementary school principals in terms of: a) Classroom observation; b) Time management; c) Teacher cooperation; d) Supervisory skills; e) Administrative workload; and f) Technical Assistance.
- the degree of seriousness of the instructional supervisory challenges encountered by the public elementary school heads, along: a) Time Management; b) Administrative Workload; c) Teacher Cooperation; d) Supervisory Skills; and e) Classroom Observation.

The process variables include the (A) Analysis and interpretation of

- demographic profile of the public elementary school heads in terms of: a) Age; b) Sex; c) Civil Status; d) Highest Educational attainment; e) Length of Service as Principal; f) Rank/Position; g) Relevant Trainings and Seminars; and h) Type of School.
- instructional supervision challenges are experienced by public elementary school principals in terms of: a) Classroom observation; b) Time management; c) Teacher cooperation; d) Supervisory skills; e) Administrative workload; and f) Technical Assistance.
- the degree of seriousness of the instructional supervisory challenges encountered by the public elementary school heads, along: a) Time Management; b) Administrative Workload; c) Teacher Cooperation; d) Supervisory Skills; and e) Classroom Observation.

The output of the study is a three-day training program on Upskilling Elementary School Heads of Alilem District on Supervision and Instructional Leadership Strategies that will ultimately improve educational outcomes at the elementary level.

Scope and Limitation - This study focused on the second congressional district public elementary school heads on their instructional supervision challenges. The study is limited to the public elementary schools of the second congressional district of Ilocos Sur and does not include private institutions. Data was collected through survey questionnaires. The study does not explore other leadership dimensions such as financial management or community relations unless directly related to instructional supervision.

2. Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive-quantitative research design to investigate the instructional supervision challenges encountered by school heads in four (4) public elementary schools, comprising two (2) upland and two (2) lowland schools in the second congressional district of Ilocos Sur.

Research Locale - This study was conducted in selected public **elementary schools** in the second congressional district of Ilocos Sur. In the Philippine context, public elementary schools operate under the supervision and policy framework of the Department of Education (DepEd), which is mandated to ensure access to quality basic education and to oversee school governance, instructional supervision, and performance standards. The study aimed to determine how supervision challenges encountered by principals and the findings may contribute to improved leadership support programs, policy adjustments, and capacity-building initiatives for principals.

Respondents of the Study - The respondents of this study consisted primarily of **Public Elementary School Heads** assigned within the Second Congressional District of Ilocos Sur. These individuals served as the key informants because they are directly responsible for instructional supervision. Table 1 shows how the respondent school heads are distributed across the participating schools in the Second Congressional District of Ilocos Sur.

Sampling Technique - This study utilized a descriptive – quantitative research design to determine the supervision challenges of public elementary school heads. To ensure that the respondents accurately represented the target population, a total enumeration procedure was employed.

Table 1
Distribution of Respondents by School

Upland Schools	*No. of School Head*	Lowland Schools	*No. of School Head*
1. ALILEM DISTRICT		1. TAGUDIN DISTRICT	
Aguiwas Elementary School	1	Ag-aguman Elementary School	1
Amilongan Elementary School	1	Ambalayat Elementary School	1
Anaao Elementary School	1	Baracbac Community School	1
Apang Elementary School	1	Becques Community School	1
Apaya Elementary School	1	Bimmanga Elementary School	1
Batbato Integrated School	1	Bitalag Elementary School	1
Daddaay Elementary School	1	Bio Elementary School	1
Dagdag Elementary School	1	Cabulanglangan Elementary School	1
Dalawa Elementary School	1	Garitan Elementary School	1
Guilong Primary School	1	Las-ud Elementary School	1
Kiat Elementary School	1	Libtong Integrated School	1
Naonao Elementary School	1	Pacac Elementary School	1
Palasipas Elementary School	1	Pallogan Elementary School	1
Total	13	Pudoc East Elementary School	1
		Pudoc West Elementary School	1
		San Miguel Elementary School	1
		San Pedro Elementary School	1
		Tagudin Integrated School	1
		Tallaoen Elementary School	1
		Tampugo Elementary School	1
		Total	20
2. SUGPON DISTRICT		2. STA. CRUZ DISTRICT	
Banga Elementary School	1	Amarao Elementary School	1
Caoayan Elementary School	1	Babayoan Elementary School	1
Calipayan Elementary School	1	Bacsayan Elementary School	1
Danac Elementary School	1	Banay Elementary School	1
Licungan Elementary School	1	Besalan Elementary School	1
Nagawa Elementary School	1	Calaoan Elementary School	1
Sugpon Central School	1	Capariaan Elementary School	1
Tangilig Elementary School	1	Dili Elementary School	1
Total	8	Lantag Elementary School	1
		Padaoil Elementary School	1
		Pattique-Gabur Sur Elem.School	1
		Pilar Elementary School	1
		Pinipin Elementary School	1
		Quinsoriano Primary School	1
		Sagat Elementary School	1
		San Jose Elementary School	1
		Sevilla Elementary School	1
		Sidaoen Elementary School	1
		Sta. Cruz Central School	1
		Villa Hermosa Elementary School	1
		Total	20
Total	21		40
Grand Total		61	

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument - To ensure that the data gathered in this study are accurate, consistent, and credible, the research instrument underwent rigorous procedures to establish both validity and reliability. The instrument was designed to measure the supervision challenges of public elementary school principals within the context of schools supervised by the Department of Education.

Data Analysis - This section describes the statistical procedures that were used to analyze the data gathered on the supervision challenges of public elementary school principals. To determine the instructional supervision challenges encountered by the school heads, the weighted mean was utilized. This allowed the researcher to assess the level of challenges experienced in different areas of instructional supervision. The results were interpreted using a predetermined scale to classify the degree of challenges. The study employed a descriptive-quantitative research design; thus, descriptive statistics were utilized.

Data Gathering Procedures - Before the administration of the questionnaire to the target respondents, the The researcher sought permission from the Schools Division Superintendent of Bantay, Ilocos Sur, Dr. Joel B. Lopez, CESO IV, with the recommendation of the Focal Person of the District, Dr. Mark E. Manzano, Planning Officer III, and endorsement of the Dean of the Graduate School, Dr. Rowena R. De Guzman. The validated questionnaire was distributed to the school heads with clear instructions for completion. Respondents were given sufficient time to answer the items accurately and thoughtfully. To ensure privacy and confidentiality, all questionnaires were collected directly by the researcher and handled securely. The data collected were organized, checked for completeness, and prepared for analysis. This procedure ensured that the information gathered was accurate, reliable, and sufficient to address the research objectives of the study.

Data Processing - The demographic profile of the public elementary school principals in terms of: a) Age; b) Sex; c) Civil Status; d) Highest Educational attainment; e) Length of Service as Principal; f) Rank/Position***;*** g) Relevant Trainings and Seminars; and h) Type of School were treated and analyzed through frequency count and statistical percentage. The level of instructional supervision challenges experienced by public elementary school principals was evaluated based on several key areas: classroom observation, time management, teacher cooperation, supervisory skills, and administrative workload. Each challenge area was measured using a rating scale where participants could indicate their agreement or disagreement with various statements. The response options ranged from "Strongly Agree" (5 points) to "Strongly Disagree" (1 point), with intermediate levels of agreement also accounted for. For instance, ratings between 4.21 and 5.00 indicated a "Strongly Agree" level of endorsement, while ratings between 3.41 and 4.20 suggested an "Agree" level.

To gauge the degree of seriousness associated with these instructional supervision challenges, another rating scale was employed. Responses here were categorized as "Very Highly Serious" (VHS) for scores from 4.21 to 5.00, indicating a severe level of concern. Scores between 3.41 and 4.20 were classified as "Highly Serious" (HS), while ratings between 2.61 and 3.40 fell into the "Moderately Serious" (MoS) category. Ratings from 1.81 to 2.60 suggested a "Fairly Serious" level of concern, and scores ranging from 1.00 to 1.80 were considered "Not Serious." The collected data was then encoded, tabulated, and analyzed using Microsoft Excel, leveraging its Data Analysis Tool Pack for statistical computations. Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, and means were utilized to provide a clear understanding of the challenges faced by school principals in their instructional supervision duties. This approach ensured accuracy and consistency in the presentation of data, facilitating a comprehensive analysis of the issues encountered by public elementary school leaders.

3. Results and Discussion

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets the findings of the study based on the data gathered. It aims to provide a clear and systematic presentation of results in relation to the research objectives and questions. The data are organized using appropriate tables, figures, and descriptive explanations to ensure clarity and coherence. Overall, this chapter serves as the core of the research, where raw data are transformed into meaningful information that contributes to a deeper understanding of the problem being investigated.

Profile of Respondents - Table I displays the demographic profile of the study respondents in terms of age bracket, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, length of service as school principal, rank or position held, relevant trainings/seminars attended, and type of school assignment. As reflected in the table. There are 61 school principals included in the study, which is within the second congressional district of Ilocos Sur. It is a total enumeration of the study universe. As to the length of service as school principals both in the upland and lowland districts of the second school districts of Ilocos Sur, there is a lone school principal who indicated that he has been in the service for less than a year, and another lone school principal who has served the division for over sixteen years. The highest frequency indicated was those school principals who have been serving between one and three years already, with a total of 22 or 36.07 percent. This is followed by those who claimed to have rendered between one to three years with a total of (16) sixteen. There are also seven or 11.17% who had been in the position for ten (10) to twelve (12) years, while there are also six others who had been school principals for thirteen (13) to fifteen

(15) years, or 9.83 percent.

Table 2

Demographic Profile of the Elementary School Principals

Indicators	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Age Bracket		
25-30	1	1.64%
31-35	1	1.64%
36-40	16	26.23%
41-45	20	32.79%
46-50	8	13.11%
51 years and above	15	24.59%
Total	61	100%
Sex		
Male	16	26%
Female	45	74%
Total	61	100%
Civil Status		
Single	2	3.28%
Married	1	1.64%
Widor/er	58	95.08%
Total	61	100%
Highest Educational Attainment		
Ed.D/Ph.D Graduate	26	42.62%
With Ed.D/Ph.D. Units	12	19.67%
M.A. Graduate	18	29.51%
With M.A. Units	5	8.20
Total	61	100%
Length of Service as School Head		
Below 1 year	4	6.56
1 to 3 years	16	26.23
4 to 6 years	22	36.07
7 to 9 years	5	8.20
10 to 12 years	7	11.47
13 to 15 years	6	9.83
16 years and above	1	1.64
Total	61	100%
Rank/Position		
Teacher 3/OIC	11	18.03%
Master Teacher II	1	1.64%
Master Teacher IV	1	1.64%
Head Teacher I	6	9.83%
Head Teacher II	6	9.83%
Head Teacher III	9	14.74%
Principal I	12	19.67%
Principal II	1	1.64%
Principal III	9	14.74
Principal IV	5	8.20
Total	61	100%
Relevant Trainings and Seminars		
School-based level	1	1.64%
District-wide level	10	16.39%
Division level	2	3.28%
Regional level	21	34.43%
National level	16	26.23%
International level	11	18.03%
Total	61	100%
Type of School		
Upland	20	33%
Lowland	41	67%
Total	61	100%

It appears that the study population had been in their positions for some years, while others are still newly assigned to their positions. They are neophytes as school heads, considering that those assigned to a school for three years or less are considered new. They constitute 26.59 percent or more than one-fourth of the total. On the

other hand, only fourteen (14) had been in their positions for ten or more years. These could be considered as already seasoned school heads, as they had already been there long enough. As regards sex, the school heads are predominantly female, a characteristic that is common in many local studies in the province where there are more females than males. In many school settings, starting from kindergarten to elementary, then to high school and college, the population is obvious that there are more females than males. Especially in education classes, females outnumber males. And so, there are more female teachers than males. In this study, nearly three-fourths are female school heads. There are 45 female school heads, which is 74 percent, as against 16 males.

As regards civil status, only two declared they are still single, while one declared being married. The remaining are either widows or widowers to showcase that many of the respondents had remained single after their partners left them or had died. No one claimed to have been divorced or separated. Regarding their highest educational attainment, 26 or 42.62 percent were through with their doctorate degrees. Meaning, the school heads endeavored to update their educational status to qualify them to grow in the profession. This is being seconded with twelve school heads who are taking doctoral studies. Eighteen school heads also indicated that they finished their master's degrees, while only five are still pursuing their master's studies. This means that the elementary school heads of Ilocos Sur prepared themselves educationally with the bright future of landing a school head position.

As to the length of service in the profession as school heads, there are four who indicated that they are newly installed as school heads, as they have been school heads for less than one year. There are 38 who indicated that they had been school heads for one to six years, meaning these school heads are still developing their skills and abilities to perform their duties and responsibilities, like sixteen or 36.07 percent, or over one third, have been in their position for only one to three years. Seven or 11.47 percent were appointed as school heads between ten and twelve years. In effect, there are only a few who have served for more than thirteen years. Therefore, only a few who had long been assigned as school heads. These few had been there in their ranks and only waiting, perhaps for their retirement days. In effect, the school heads being studied had served their assignments from newly assigned to those who had been serving until their retirement days.

As far as. The ranks being held by the respondents, the table presents the different ranks or positions that they have recently held. The table shows that the school heads hold different ranks or positions ranging from being a Teacher III or being installed as OIC to master teacher positions, to head teacher, and ultimately rising to Principal positions. The table shows that there are eleven or 18.03 percent hold Teacher III positions or are detailed as Officer-in-Charge. Relatively, these school heads are the ones who have been installed as new or are holding recent assignments. According to the newest promotion scheme, a teacher cannot be promoted to an item after serving his or her item after serving at least some years. Relatively, the new promotion scheme is very favorable and very encouraging for those who would rise in the professional ladder. For instance, one cannot be promoted to a master teacher post if he/she had not held a Teacher III position.

The table shows that there is one who has recently held Master Teacher II and Master Teacher IV items. There is a total of 27 among the 61 school heads who are holding Principal positions. Twelve or 19.67% hold Principal Teacher items. Twelve hold Principal I items, one holding Principal II item wile nine are installed as Principal III. Finally, five or 8.20 % hold Principal IV items, which are at the end of the ladder. Regarding relevant trainings and seminars attended, the table displays that the school heads attended various seminars at different levels of training. Perhaps the attendance at a school-based training was the one attended by the newly appointed school head. Also, it could be said that those in the lower-rank school heads were also required to attend district-wide seminars/trainings, as this is a basic requirement, especially for the neophytes. Ten reported having attended district-wide trainings. Twenty-one claimed that they had attended regional-level trainings, while sixteen others had been in attendance at national-level trainings. Eleven others indicated they had attended international-level seminars/trainings. It is supposed that those in the higher ranks/positions are those who have attended higher-level training, while those who are new and hold lower positions are required to attend the lower-level seminars.

Finally, the table also indicated the type of school assignment by the respondents. It is indicated that twenty

school heads were assigned to upland schools while the remaining forty-one were assigned to lowland schools.

Instructional Supervision Challenges - As shown in the table, classroom observation concerns all got mean values categorized as Agree. The highest rated is the item "Some observations are delayed due to urgent administrative tasks". This shows that instructional supervision challenges, along with classroom observation, were viewed by the respondents as a delimiting factor in their administration of classroom observation. This is really the true picture, as scheduled classroom observation cannot be regularly conducted, as there are other administrative functions to be prioritized. And so, the scheduled observation cannot be carried out as planned or scheduled. This is being followed by the fact that "limited time to conduct regular classroom observation" is another factor that prevents classroom observation from being done regularly. This function is then relegated to another important task to be performed. However, this task could be relegated to master teachers as they serve as supervisory help to the school head. However, when schools do not have master teacher positions, then the function rests on the school head. The situation is more pronounced in big schools as the number to be observed is large, and this challenge is real. Coming closely are two items that got identical ranks of 3.5. These are schedule does not allow frequent observation, and follow-up observations are not always conducted as planned. This means that conducting regular classroom observation is not feasible, as there are other tasks and functions that school heads have to perform.

Table 3
Supervision Challenges Along Classroom Observation

Indicators	WAM	DER	RANK
Some observations are delayed due to urgent administrative tasks.	3.93	A	1
Limited time to conduct regular classroom observations.	3.87	A	2
The schedule does not allow frequent instructional monitoring.	3.62	A	3
Conducting post-observation conferences is challenging.	3.61	A	4
Monitoring all teachers regularly is difficult.	3.48	A	5
Average Mean	3.60	A	

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Strongly Agree (SA) 4 3.41 4,20 Agree (A) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Agree (MA) 2 1.81– 2.69 Disagree (D) 1 1.00 -1.80 Agree (A).

Table 4
Instructional Supervision Challenges Along Time Management

Time Management	WAM	DER	RANK
Unexpected school concerns interrupt supervision schedules.	4.43	SA	1
Deadlines from higher offices affect instructional focus	4.39	SA	2
Administrative reports consume most of my time.	4.31	SA	3
Meetings reduce time for instructional supervision.	4.21	SA	4
Compliance requirements affect classroom monitoring.	3.89	A	5
Managing school operations limits supervision efforts.	3.57	A	6
Average Mean	4.13	A	1

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Strongly Agree (SA) 4 3.41 4,20 Agree (A) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Agree (MA) 2 1.81– 2.69 Disagree (D) 1 1.00 -1.80 Agree (A).

The second challenge under instructional supervision is long-term Time Management. This is shown in Table 2B, which follows. As indicated in the table, the greatest challenge is on the situation that unexpected school concerns interrupt supervision schedules. Academic contests, athletics, fiestas, meetings, seminars, and the commemoration of special events are some of these activities that interrupt scheduled observation. Athletic meets at different levels usually interrupt scheduled activities. For instance, the province has to host the regional meet, and then the schedules are interrupted. More so, there are climatic incidents such as typhoons, earthquakes, floods, and pandemics, to name a few, that really have to be attended to.

Following closely is the condition that deadlines emanating from higher offices, such as the department, the local government units, or the central office of DepEd, had to be complied/attended to. And so, these deadlines have to be attended to as they are a must. Hence, there are unnecessary disruptions of scheduled activities. Deadlines have to be met and necessarily prioritized, as meeting the deadline becomes a must. Coming as a third concern is the situation that there are reports to be accomplished, such as quarterly reports, liquidation reports of Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses **(**MOOE) expenditures, that have to be done or accomplished. The

poor school head had to meet deadlines; otherwise, they would be reprimanded or considered not complying. Moreover, there is the. The constraints of power interruption make the accomplishment of reports unnecessarily delayed or heath problem .of those needed to accomplish the report are incapacitated, Moreover the conduct of meetings, such as district meetings, school-based meetings, reduces the time for instructional supervision. Especially, school heads from some upland schools have to spend some time attending the district meeting, and the travel from school to the district and from the district to the school is time-consuming. As such, compliance with requirements affects classroom monitoring.

Table 5
Instructional Supervision Challenges Along Teacher Cooperation

Teacher Cooperation	WAM	DER	RANK
Some teachers feel uncomfortable during observations.	4.46	SA	1
Some teachers perceive supervision negatively.	4.25	SA	2
Teachers sometimes resist supervisory feedback.	3.85	A	3
Not all teachers implement suggested improvements.	3.74	A	4
Teachers are hesitant to discuss instructional weaknesses.	3.49	A	5
Feedback sessions are sometimes unproductive.	3.21	MA	6
Average Mean	3.83	A	

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Strongly Agree (SA) 4 3.41 4,20 Agree (A) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Agree (MA) 2 1.81– 2.69 Disagree (D) 1 1.00 -1.80 Agree (A).

As presented in the above table, the average mean is described as “agree” with a weighted mean of 3.83. Comparatively, this section got one of the lowest mean averages as compared to time management concerns; it could be seen that one item was rated “moderately agreed”. There are two items rated as ‘strongly agree” while three items were rated as “agree”. Rank 2 among the items is the situation where some teachers perceive supervision negatively. There are really teachers who discount supervision as if to claim that they are already good professionals and that they seem to negate supervision. However, supervision is there to stay as nobody knows everything. This is especially true for new teachers, as their pre-service training was thorough and adequate. Nobody knows it all. This situation is backed up by the third item, which is about some teachers who resist supervisory feedback. Some teachers are of the opinion that supervisory feedback is not necessary. There is a saying that goes, “damn if you do, damn if you don’t,” meaning whether you believe or not, it matters. Besides, no one could his or her mistake. It has to be someone, not the person. Then comes the fourth item, which the respondents “agreed” with, which is along the lines of the practice that not all the teachers implement suggested improvements. Moreover, this is backed up by the situation that there are non-cooperative teachers how hesitant to discuss instructional weaknesses.

The next table displays the responses along supervisory skills, this portion got the second highest average mean along with challenges in instructional supervision. This was the third time management, which got the highest average of 4.13. All items in the table were categorically “agree”. The same with the area of classroom supervision, where all items were categorically “agreed”. The highest rated concern was that supervisory skills need additional training. This implies that the school heads studied are of the opinion that there is a real need for further training and or retooling along this endeavor.

Table 6
Instructional Supervision Challenges Along Supervisory Skills

Supervisory Skills	WAM	DER	RANK
Needs additional training in instructional supervision.	3.97	A	1
Needs updated strategies in instructional leadership.	3.95	A	2
Coaching teachers requires more professional preparation.	3.77	A	3
Evaluating teaching effectiveness requires further skill development	3.67	A	4
Providing constructive feedback is challenging.	3.62	A	5
Identifying instructional gaps is sometimes difficult.	3.57	A	6
Average Mean	3.76	A	

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Strongly Agree (SA) 4 3.41 4,20 Agree (A) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Agree (MA) 2 1.81– 2.69 Disagree (D) 1 1.00 -1.80 Agree (A)

In addition, the second concern of the respondents are of the belief of the need to be updated with strategies

along with educational leadership. Since many of the respondents are still new in their assignments as school heads, they expressed the idea that they needed more strategies and techniques in educational leadership. Since knowledge is evolving with modern-day technology, there is a real need to update and retooling along being leaders in education. Educational Leadership is one of the offerings in some graduate courses. This is one of the latest trends in education. Third in the table is the item "coaching teachers requires more professional preparation with a mean of 3.77. This is really true that coaching teachers is not as easy as saying. It is because teachers are diverse; they have different tastes, likes, dislikes, orientations, and values. They are individuals with different needs, whims, and capacities. Teachers have different personalities, so to speak. Consequently, school heads have to be clothed with differing skills and capabilities. One that could blend or as pliant as bamboo. The school heads must then be cognizant. of individual virtues, values, and ways of thinking. There is the notion that no two individuals are alike. The necessary thing is that school heads have to maintain a smooth organizational climate, where teachers can see eye to eye with their peers or fellow teachers, and can see eye to eye with their school head.

Table 7
Instructional Supervision Challenges Along Administrative Workload

Administrative Workload	WAM	DER	RANK
Paperwork reduces time for instructional leadership.	4.33	SA	1
Multiple responsibilities reduce classroom presence.	4.16	A	2
Financial management tasks limit supervision time.	3.62	A	3
Managing school facilities affects instructional focus.	3.52	A	4
Compliance with policies limits instructional engagement.	3.38	MA	5
Coordination with stakeholders consumes supervision time.	2.92	MA	6
Average Mean	3.66	A	

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Strongly Agree (SA) 4 3.41 4,20 Agree (A) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Agree (MA) 2 1.81– 2.69 Disagree (D) 1 1.00 -1.80 Agree (A).

Besides, according to the professional ethics of the school head, he/she must always be very protective of every member of the school system. The professional preparation of the school head is of utmost importance. Furthermore, evaluating teaching effectiveness requires skill development which to be enhanced. Also, providing constructive feedback is challenging and must be done with the right actions and procedures. The highest rated item is the concern that paperwork reduces time for instructional supervision. As could be deduced from the table, there is only one item rated as "strongly agree and two items rated as "moderately agree". It has to be recognized that there is a lot of paperwork that school administrators have to comply with and submit. As one graduate claimed, he does not desire to become a school head or principal, as to him, it is a burden to become an administrator due to paperwork.

Next highest is the item identifying "multiple responsibilities reduce classroom presence. Meaning, due to other responsibilities aside from classroom supervision, the time allotted to classroom supervision is greatly reduced, and this is compounded in big schools as the number to be monitored/supervised. In smaller schools with fewer teachers to supervise is not as complicated as in bigger schools. This is followed by the challenge about financial management tasks that limit time for supervision. It is because the money that is downloaded has to be properly disposed of with proper documentation to justify the disbursement. The task is cumbersome and tedious, requiring school heads to allot enough time to this duty. Moreover, there is a duty to manage and maintain school facilities such as buildings, equipment, facilities, land, and other infrastructures. The school head has to monitor the site, see to it that buildings are in order or in A-1 condition. Touring the campus is also time-consuming, affecting focus on keeping a sound instructional atmosphere. On top of these duties, there is also the task of coordinating with stakeholders and patrons of the school, including that of maintaining sound relations with parents, stakeholders, and local government officials.

Table 8 displays the responses to Technical Assistance. Comparatively, this set got the lowest average rating when compared with the other five sets. The average weighted mean was the lowest among the sets, as it ended with a mean of 3.41. This is because three items got ratings that are categorically "agree" and the other three "moderately agree". The highest rated item in the set is the item regarding the conduct of regular classroom, observations, and providing constructive feedback. And categorized as "agree". This means that in this set,

assistance for the classroom supervision to provide constructive feedback is supposed to happen. Classroom supervision had to resort to constructive feedback to complete the system. The teachers have to be served with constructive feedback, as this is a technical assistance. The respondents agree that this technical assistance is given. This is followed by the activity that supports teachers in integrating innovative teaching strategies and learner-centered approaches. Meaning the teachers believe that they are being supported to implement innovative teaching strategies that would benefit the learners.

Table 8
Instructional Supervision Challenges Along Technical Assistance

Technical Assistance	WAM	DER	RANK
Conducts regular classroom observations and provides constructive feedback	3.61	A	1
Supports teachers in integrating innovative teaching strategies and learner-centered approaches.	3.46	A	2
Identifies teachers' training needs based on classroom observations and performance results.	3.43	A	3
Supports the implementation of remediation and enrichment programs for learners.	3.39	MA	4
Uses evaluation results to support teacher improvement and professional growth.	3.31	MA	5
Helps teachers identify learning gaps and appropriate interventions.	3.26	MA	6
Average Mean	3.41	MA	

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Strongly Agree (SA) 4 3.41 4,20 Agree (A) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Agree (MA) 2 1.81– 2.69 Disagree (D) 1 1.00 -1.80 Agree (A).

There is also the activity to identify the training needs based on classroom and performance results. Then there is the needed support for the implementation of innovative teaching strategies.

Degree of Seriousness of Challenges of Instructional Supervision - Table 9 displays the perceived degree of seriousness of the challenges that are associated with the activities related to the implementation of instructional supervision of school heads of the second congressional district of Ilocos Sur. The highest rated problem, along with time management, is the perceived limited time to conduct regular classroom instructional observation. This situation is being backed up by previous tables, as limited time is the real issue.

Table 9
Degree of Seriousness of Instructional Supervision Challenges Along Time Management

INDICATORS	WAM	DER	RANK
Time Management			
Limited time to conduct regular classroom observations due to administrative tasks.	3.97	HS	1
Difficulty balancing managerial duties and instructional supervision responsibilities.	3.95	HS	2
Scheduling conflicts that affect the supervision of classroom instruction.	3.62	HS	3
Insufficient time to provide follow-up coaching and mentoring to teachers.	3.59	HS	4
Average Mean	3.78	HS	

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Very Highly Serious (VHS) 4 3.41 4,20 Highly Serious (HS) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Serious (MS) 2 1.81– 2.69 Slightly Serious (SS) 1 1.00 -1.80 Not Serious (NS).

This is closely seconded with the notion that there is difficulty in balancing managerial duties, instructional, and tonal supervision. Priority-wise, managerial duties would be first. There is no issue with this choice. School administrators have multi-faceted tasks and responsibilities, and these tasks/duties have to be done duty-bound. Third in rank went to the item on conflicts in scheduling that affects the conduct of observation of classroom supervision. There are real situations where there are conflicts in schedules. Also comes the problem of providing follow-up sessions, which is also affected by interferences. As a result, time management is very much affected, and schedules are not followed with delays or are no longer conducted.

Table 10 discloses the responses along with the administrative workload. This set got the degree of seriousness among the five subsections. It is because three of the four. Items had means that were categorized as "very highly serious". In effect. Administrative workload is considered the most serious condition and cannot be avoided, as there are tasks or duties that have to be attended to, relegating the conduct of instructional activities. This is confounded by the schedules of meetings and other administrative responsibilities. There are situations where there are urgent meetings, school programs, and activities that it is a must to attend or comply with. Then there is also the very serious problem of limited time for instructional leadership due to clerical concerns.

Table 10

Degree of Seriousness of Instructional Supervision Challenges Along Administrative Workload

Administrative Workload	WAM	DER	RANK
Numerous meetings and administrative responsibilities.	4.28	VHS	1
Multiple school programs and activities require supervision.	4.25	VHS	2
Limited time for instructional leadership due to clerical and managerial duties.	4.21	VHS	3
Excessive paperwork and reporting requirements.	4.18	HS	4
Average Mean	4.23	VHS	

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Very Highly Serious (VHS) 4 3.41 4,20 Highly Serious (HS) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Serious (MS) 2 1.81– 2.69 Slightly Serious (SS) 1 1.00 -1.80 Not Serious (NS).

Table 11

Degree of Seriousness of Instructional Supervision Challenges Along Teacher Cooperation

Teacher Cooperation	WAM	DER	RANK
Teachers cooperate in providing necessary documents such as lesson plans, instructional materials, and assessment records.	3.43	HS	1
Teachers collaborate with the school head in planning strategies to improve teaching and learning	3.28	MS	2.5
Teachers communicate openly with the school head regarding instructional concerns and challenges	3.28	MS	2.5
Teachers actively implement the recommendations given by the school head after supervision.	3.23	MS	3
Average Mean	3.31	MS	

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Very Highly Serious (VHS) 4 3.41 4,20 Highly Serious (HS) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Serious (MS) 2 1.81– 2.69 Slightly Serious (SS) 1 1.00 -1.80 Not Serious (NS).

Table 11 discloses the serious problems that are attached to the cooperation of teachers that challenge supervisory functions. As could be deduced from the table. This set is less serious than the. other sets, like time management and classroom observations. The highest rated concern was the contention that teachers cooperate in providing necessary documents such as lesson plans, instructional materials, and assessment records. This means that whenever their instructional supervision is conducted, the teacher being observed, the assigned teacher has to provide his/her lesson plan, provide an assessment record, and other records needed.

Table 12

Degree of Seriousness of Instructional Supervision Challenges Along Supervisory Skills

Supervisory Skills	WAM	DER	RANK
Lack of adequate training in instructional supervision techniques.	3.66	HS	1
Limited knowledge of modern teaching strategies and assessment practices.	3.49	HS	3
Need for further professional development related to instructional leadership.	3.64	HS	2
Difficulty providing constructive feedback to teachers after observation.	3.36	MS	4
Average Mean	3.64	HS	

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Very Highly Serious (VHS) 4 3.41 4,20 Highly Serious (HS) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Serious (MS) 2 1.81– 2.69 Slightly Serious (SS) 1 1.00 -1.80 Not Serious (NS).

Coming close are two items with identical means of 3,28 categorized as moderately serious, and these are the collaboration of teachers with the school head in planning strategies to improve the teaching and learning process, and teachers communicating properly with the school head regarding instructional concerns. It appears that there is open communication between school heads and their teachers to indicate the presence of harmonious relationships established in the schools under study. As shown in the table, the average mean of the table is 3.64, categorized as “highly serious”. This shows that, as a whole, the challenges along supervisory skills are generally highly serious.

Comparatively, this set is the third highest among the sets, next to time management, with a mean of 3.78. The most serious among the set is the administrative workload, with a mean of 4.23. Meaning, the degree of seriousness of supervisory skills ranks third among the different challenges. Apparently, the school heads of the second district of Ilocos Sur are not comfortable with the factors affecting their supervisory skills, as three of the four enumerated factors were viewed as “highly serious. This is compared with the items listed under time management, where all four of the factors were categorized as “highly serious”. To top the challenges is the condition of the perceived lack of adequate training in instructional supervision. The school heads are sounding off on this lack of their training as instructional supervisors. This problem is closely seconded with the notion of

their need for further professional development related to their instructional leadership capabilities. This seems to be an eye-opener to the system in the Department of Education. Instructional leadership skills seem to be inadequate, as claimed. This is backed up by the third concern, which theorizes their limited knowledge of modern teaching strategies and skills in assessment practices.

The last set along instructional supervision and along classroom observation, which is elucidated in Table 13 below.

Table 13
Degree of Seriousness of Instructional Supervision Challenges Along Classroom Observation

Classroom Observation	WAM	DER	RANK
Uses appropriate observation tools or checklists during classroom supervision.	3.26	MS	1.5
Monitors the alignment of lesson objectives, activities, and assessments during observation.	3.26	MS	1.5
Conducts regular classroom observations to monitor teaching practices.	3.20	MS	3
Documents observations to support teacher performance evaluation.	3.15	MS	4
Average Mean	3.22	MS	

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Very Highly Serious (VHS) 4 3.41 4,20 Highly Serious (HS) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Serious (MS) 2 1.81– 2.69 Slightly Serious (SS) 1 1.00 -1.80 Not Serious (NS).

As displayed in the table, the last set is the least rated among the five areas of instructional supervision, which is along classroom supervision. Seemingly, the factors listed in the set are seen as the least problematic area. As can be noted in the table, all of the enumerated factors resulted in categorical ratings of "moderately" serious. The overall mean of the set is 3.22. which is moderate in category. In effect, this area is where the school heads are more comfortable. The highest items are two concerns, as they resulted in identical means of 3.26, categorized as "moderately serious. These are: uses appropriate observation tools or checklists during observations, and monitors the alignment of lesson objectives, activities, and assignments. This means that the observation tool must bring about what is to be discovered in the observation, and necessarily it jibes with what the teacher aims to deliver and achieve as an objective, and the manner in which such an objective is achieved. The lesson must freely flow and proceed as planned by the teacher. The observation tool must be consistent, administrable, and true to its aim. The third item tells about the conduct of regular observation to monitor the proper teaching process following recent teaching methodologies and strategies.

Table 14
Summary Table Degree of Seriousness of Challenges of Instructional Supervision

INDICATORS	WAM	DER	RANK
Administrative Workload	4.23	VHS	1
Time Management	3.78	HS	2
Supervisory Skills	3.64	HS	3
Teacher Cooperation	3.31	MS	4
Classroom Observation	3.22	MS	5
Average Mean	3.64	HS	

Legend: Rating Scale Point Value Scale Descriptive Rating: 5 4.21 – 5.00 Very Highly Serious (VHS) 4 3.41 4,20 Highly Serious (HS) 3 2.61 3.49 Moderately Serious (MS) 2 1.81– 2.69 Slightly Serious (SS) 1 1.00 -1.80 Not Serious (NS).

Table 14 presents the degree of seriousness of the challenges encountered in instructional supervision. The overall average mean of 3.64, interpreted as "Highly Serious" (HS), indicates that instructional supervisors experience considerable challenges in carrying out their supervisory functions. This finding suggests that while instructional supervision remains a critical component of educational quality assurance, several factors hinder its effective implementation. Among the indicators, Administrative Workload obtained the highest weighted average mean (WAM = 4.23, Very Highly Serious), ranking first. This result highlights that supervisors are burdened with numerous administrative responsibilities, such as report preparation, documentation, compliance requirements, and other clerical tasks, which may reduce the time and attention devoted to instructional leadership. The finding implies that excessive administrative duties can negatively affect the quality and frequency of supervision provided to teachers. This corroborates the study of Hallinger, who emphasized that school leaders often struggle to balance administrative responsibilities with instructional leadership functions, resulting in reduced effectiveness in supporting teaching and learning.

Time Management ranked second with a mean of 3.78 (Highly Serious). This finding indicates that supervisors face difficulties allocating sufficient time for classroom observations, teacher mentoring, feedback conferences, and other supervisory tasks. The challenge may stem from competing responsibilities and increasing workloads. The result implies the need for better scheduling mechanisms and workload distribution to enable supervisors to focus on instructional improvement. This finding is consistent with the work of Blase and Blase, who noted that time constraints significantly affect the ability of school leaders to perform effective instructional supervision. The indicator Supervisory Skills ranked third with a mean of 3.64 (Highly Serious). This suggests that supervisors perceive a need for continuous enhancement of their competencies in conducting observations, providing constructive feedback, coaching teachers, and implementing supervisory practices. The implication is that professional development programs should be strengthened to equip supervisors with the necessary skills and knowledge. This finding supports the assertion of Glickman that effective supervision requires specialized competencies and continuous training to improve instructional practices and teacher performance.

Meanwhile, Teacher Cooperation received a mean of 3.31 (Moderately Serious) and ranked fourth. Although considered less serious than the preceding indicators, the result suggests that some supervisors encounter challenges in securing teacher participation and openness during the supervisory process. This may affect collaboration and the successful implementation of improvement plans. The finding implies that fostering trust, communication, and collegial relationships between supervisors and teachers remains essential for effective instructional supervision. Lastly, Classroom Observation obtained the lowest mean of 3.22 (Moderately Serious), ranking fifth. While still considered a challenge, it appears to be less problematic compared to administrative workload and time management concerns. This suggests that supervisors are generally capable of conducting classroom observations; however, issues such as scheduling, observation frequency, and follow-up feedback may still need improvement. The finding implies that schools should continue strengthening observation protocols to ensure meaningful instructional support.

Overall, the results demonstrate that administrative workload is the most significant challenge confronting instructional supervisors, followed by time management and supervisory skills. The predominance of these challenges indicates that organizational and capacity-building concerns have a greater impact on instructional supervision than interpersonal factors such as teacher cooperation. Therefore, educational institutions should prioritize reducing administrative burdens, improving time allocation, and enhancing supervisory competencies to strengthen the effectiveness of instructional supervision and ultimately improve teaching quality and student learning outcomes.

Validity of the Questionnaire - The questionnaire was designed to accurately measure the instructional supervision challenges of public elementary school principals. To ensure its validity, it was evaluated by a panel of five experts, including experienced educators and school administrators, who assessed the items for clarity, relevance, and appropriateness to the research objectives. Based on the feedback, the questionnaire was revised to improve wording, remove redundant items, and ensure all aspects of instructional supervision challenges were covered. The experts rated the instrument as very highly acceptable, confirming its suitability for the study. The validity of the questionnaire was assessed through two primary indicators: face validity and content validity. For face validity, which evaluates the appearance and legibility of the questionnaire, three sub-indicators were considered:

- **General Appearance**: This includes neatness, alignment, and typing quality, with a mean score of 4.52, indicating “Very Highly Acceptable” (VHA).
- **Layout**: This involves spacing and balance on the sheet, scoring a mean of 4.51, also rated as VHA.
- **Grammar**: This covers correct tense usage and parallelism, with a mean score of 4.46, again classified as VHA.

The average face validity score was 4.50, indicating very high acceptability overall.

For content validity, which assesses the practical aspects and relevance of the questionnaire's content, six sub-indicators were evaluated:

- **Functionality**: This measures how well the questionnaire serves its intended purpose, with a mean score of 4.70 (VHA).
- **Implementability**: This evaluates the ease of implementing the questionnaire in practice, scoring 4.61 (VHA).
- **Appropriateness**: This considers whether the content is suitable for the target audience, with a mean score of 4.59 (VHA), tied for third rank.
- **Sustainability**: This assesses long-term relevance and usefulness, also scoring 4.59 (VHA) and sharing third rank with appropriateness.
- **Acceptability**: This evaluates the general approval from respondents, with a mean score of 4.57 (VHA).
- **Timeliness**: This measures whether the content is current and relevant at the time of administration, scoring 4.57 (VHA) and ranked fourth.

The average content validity score was 4.61, indicating very high acceptability overall. The descriptive ratings were based on a scale where scores from 4.21 to 5.00 indicated "Very Highly Acceptable" (VHA), 3.41 to 4.20 indicated "Highly Acceptable" (HA), 2.61 to 3.40 indicated "Moderately Acceptable" (MoA), and scores from 1.81 to 2.60 and below were classified as "Slightly Acceptable" (SA) or "Not Acceptable" (NA).

4. Conclusions

The following conclusions were derived from the above findings:

- The respondents held different school positions, and many of them are of the retirement age categories and had attended many seminars and trainings.
- While they claimed to be in attendance at relevant trainings and seminars, these attendances did not prepare them adequately for instructional supervision and expressed inadequate along educational leaderships.
- The respondents became problematic due to their numerous administrative loads, time management, and supervisory skills.

Recommendations

- Provide intensive training on instructional supervision to strengthen school heads' skills in classroom observation, instructional strategies, and assessment practices.
- Enhance educational leadership development through regular leadership training, mentoring, and capacity-building programs.
- Reduce administrative workload by delegating routine tasks, providing administrative support, and implementing efficient management systems.
- Improve teacher cooperation by promoting collaboration, open communication, and regular feedback among teachers and school heads.
- Strengthen technical assistance mechanisms through instructional coaching, peer mentoring, and accessible support resources.

- Equip school heads with modern supervisory practices by providing training on digital tools, learner-centered approaches, and current assessment methods.
- Promote continuous professional development to ensure school heads remain updated on emerging educational trends and best practices.
- Conduct further studies to explore additional factors affecting instructional supervision and evaluate interventions that address identified challenges.

5. References

Ansong, J., Kusi, H., Sarfo, F. K., & Addo-Fordjour, M. (2024). An exploratory study of instructional leadership challenges of headteachers: Promoting and supporting instructional improvement, supervising and evaluating instruction. *Journal of Education Management and Leadership, 3*(1), 48–62. https://doi.org/10.51317/jeml.v3i1.648

Antonio, A. D. G., & Eslabon, R. T. (2023). School heads' instructional supervisory skills and teachers' performance. *Polaris Global Journal of Scholarly Research and Trends.* https://doi.org/10.58429/pgjsrt.v3n1a104

Cabildo, G. S. (2025). Empowering school leaders: Supervisory practices and challenges among public elementary school heads in Ilocos Sur. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis.* https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i03-59

Castillo, M. A. (2024). Impact of instructional supervision strategies on teacher performance in Hinabangan Samar District 1. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 5*(9), 3602–3608. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.09.19

Dacer, G. B., Magana, M. D., Bayani, V. C., & Saenz, C. R. (2025). Extent of instructional supervision and its impact on teacher performance in secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, 12*(3), 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1234/jelm.2025.12345

Daigon, M. E., & Alcopra, A. R. (2024). Instructional supervision practices and efficacy of teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis.* https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i08-13

Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*(2), 125–142. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111116699

He, P., Guo, F., & Abazie, G. A. (2024). School principals' instructional leadership as a predictor of teachers' professional development. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 9*, Article 63. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00290-0

Lani, A., & Pauzi, H. (2024). Instructional leadership: Principal's challenges and solutions in enhancing students' academic performance. *Jurnal Kependidikan, 10*(3), 1268–1282. https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v10i3.12862

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2020). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management, 40*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077

Magno, G. C. (2023). Challenges and coping mechanisms in supervision of instructional leaders in the new normal. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 5*(2), 86–96.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results.* ASCD.

Olarte, J. P., & Tagadiad, C. L. (2025). Perceived instructional supervision of school heads and teacher change commitment. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 9*(2). https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.9020297

Plopino, M. E. B., & Carbonell, S. S. (2025). Assessment of instructional supervision level of pre-service teachers in learning delivery. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science.* https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.905000198

Ralebese, M. D., Currell Jita, L., & Badmus, O. T. (2025). Perceptions and practices of principals: Examining instructional leadership for curriculum reform. *Frontiers in Education.* https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1591106

Rivera, B. H., Jr. (2024). Relationship of instructional leadership practices among school administrators and school performance. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8(*7). https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.807040

Rizada, M. C. S. (2024). Supervision of instruction: Teachers and school heads' perspective. *American Journal of Education and Technology, 3*(4), 78–85. https://doi.org/10.54536/ajet.v3i4.3862

Sanchez, J., & Lugo, M. G. R. (2024). Teachers' proficiency, instructional supervision, and ICT integration in public elementary schools. *East Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research***.** https://mtiformosapublisher.org/index.php/eajmr/article/view/110

San Roque, J. O., & Valle, A. M. (2025). School heads' instructional supervision and teachers' self-efficacy. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 8*(4). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i04-16

Sugiar, L., Sukirman, & Sanusi, S. (2025). Academic supervision as a strategy for improving teaching and learning quality. *International Journal of Educational Administration, Management, and Leadership, 5*(2). https://doi.org/10.51629/ijeamal.v5i2.205

Zepeda, S. J. (2017). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (4th ed.). Routledge.