

# Leadership strategies of school heads in enhancing teaching-learning delivery management

Jocelyn R. Fresco, LPT<sup>a</sup>, Consuelo R. Saenz, EdD<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>jocelynfresco@mabinicolleges.edu.ph

<sup>b</sup>consuelosaez@mabinicolleges.edu.ph

Mabini Colleges, Inc., Governor Panotes Avenue,  
Daet, Camarines Norte, 4600, Philippines

---

## Abstract

This study examined the leadership strategies of school heads and their relationship to the effectiveness of teaching-learning delivery management in Tagalog-speaking districts of Camarines Norte during the School Year 2025–2026. Specifically, it assessed leadership strategies and the level of effectiveness of teaching-learning delivery management across eight domains: school-based review, contextualization, and implementation of learning standards; teaching standards and pedagogies; teacher performance feedback; learner achievement; learning assessment; learning environment; career awareness and opportunities; and learner discipline. It also explored the significant relationships between these variables, identified challenges encountered by school heads, and proposed an intervention program. Using a descriptive-correlational design, the study involved 180 elementary and secondary school heads selected through total enumeration. Findings showed that school heads demonstrated very strong leadership strategies across all domains, and the effectiveness of teaching-learning delivery management was rated as highly effective. Results also revealed significant positive relationships between leadership strategies and management effectiveness, with correlations ranging from strong to very strong. Despite these positive results, challenges such as limited time for school-based reviews, insufficient professional development, resource constraints, and classroom behavior management were identified. To address these concerns, the study proposed an intervention program designed to strengthen instructional leadership and improve teaching-learning delivery.

*Keywords:* Leadership strategies, school leadership, teaching-learning, teaching-learning delivery management, challenges

---

## 1. Introduction

The leadership strategies of school heads are essential in shaping the overall quality of educational processes. Effective leadership influences teachers, learners, and the wider school community by guiding efforts that strengthen teaching and learning. School leaders help establish direction, motivate stakeholders, and coordinate actions that support educational improvement. Because leaders employ different strategies depending on their contexts and goals, their approaches can significantly affect the effectiveness of school operations and learning outcomes.

Research emphasizes that strong leadership improves the management of teaching and learning in schools. Transformational leadership practices, such as inspiring teachers, encouraging collaboration, and adapting to changing needs, have been found to improve teacher morale and overall school effectiveness (Esogon and Gumban, 2024). Likewise, school-based management allows leaders to design strategies tailored to the specific needs of their institutions, leading to more relevant and responsive educational practices (Biñas

et al., 2023). These approaches highlight the importance of leadership in addressing challenges such as limited resources and evolving educational demands.

Globally, school principals play a crucial role in strengthening teaching–learning delivery by adopting various instructional leadership strategies. They are responsible for integrating Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) into instruction and promoting innovative practices, particularly in rural settings (Nhlumayo, 2024). Instructional leadership also focuses on curriculum management, effective planning, and maintaining high-quality instruction (Chabalala and Naidoo, 2021; Iqbal et al., 2021). Moreover, these leadership practices contribute to promoting social justice and reducing inequalities within schools (Shaked, 2023).

Furthermore, educational leaders influence the school climate by establishing a clear vision, creating inclusive learning environments, and supporting teachers through professional development opportunities. Through effective leadership, they set clear expectations, develop policies that guide teaching practices, and foster collaboration among school stakeholders. These efforts contribute to a supportive and safe learning environment where students feel valued and motivated to succeed (Brauckmann et al., 2023).

In the Philippines, the role of school heads is particularly significant in ensuring quality education, as emphasized by global and national mandates such as the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 4 and the 1987 Philippine Constitution. Despite efforts to strengthen the education system, challenges remain, especially in resource-limited schools (Symaco and Bustos, 2022). Studies indicate that school success is closely linked to the quality of leadership provided by school heads (Villanueva et al., 2021; Gamala and Marpa, 2022).

However, school leaders often face difficulties in meeting competency standards and adapting programs to local contexts (Lincuna and Caingcoy, 2020; Verbo et al., 2023). In provinces such as Camarines Norte, challenges including multigrade classes, limited resources, and diverse learner needs highlight the importance of effective leadership strategies. Addressing existing research gaps, particularly regarding integrated leadership strategies that enhance teaching–learning delivery management, remains crucial for improving educational outcomes (Elep, 2024).

## 2. Methodology

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive–correlational design to examine the relationship between school heads' leadership strategies and the effectiveness of teaching–learning delivery management. The respondents were 180 elementary and secondary school heads from Tagalog-speaking districts in Camarines Norte, including Capalonga, Jose Panganiban, Paracale, Labo, and Sta. Elena, selected through total enumeration sampling.

Data were gathered using a validated, researcher-made questionnaire consisting of three parts. The first part measured the leadership strategies utilized to enhance teaching–learning delivery management. The second part determined the effectiveness of this delivery management along the same indicators, and the third part identified the challenges encountered. A five-point Likert scale was used to measure levels of agreement and effectiveness. Content validation was conducted by five school heads from other districts, and reliability was confirmed through a pilot test with 20 school heads using Cronbach's Alpha.

Ethical protocols were strictly observed, including securing approval from division authorities, obtaining informed consent, maintaining confidentiality, and ensuring voluntary participation. Data analysis utilized SPSS Version 21.0, with frequency counts and weighted means used to determine the levels of strategy employment and management effectiveness, Spearman's Rank Correlation to analyze relationships, and frequency counts with ranking for the identified challenges.

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1. Leadership Strategies that Enhance Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads

Examining leadership strategies that enhance teaching-learning delivery management, findings for the "School-Based Review, Contextualization, and Implementation of Learning Standards" domain reveal a strong overall emphasis on instructional alignment (overall weighted mean = 4.52, "Strongly Agree"). School heads primarily focus on ensuring teaching materials and lesson plans reflect current standards (highest weighted mean = 4.57) through daily reviews, academic meetings, and observation feedback to safeguard curriculum integrity. While still highly rated, guiding teachers to contextualize the curriculum for specific learner needs scored slightly lower (lowest weighted mean = 4.43), indicating it receives relatively less direct top-down emphasis and is instead facilitated collaboratively during Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions and in-service trainings. Ultimately, through continuous review, feedback, and collaboration, school heads effectively align everyday teaching practices with mandated competencies to strengthen overall instructional quality.

Table 1. Leadership Strategies that Enhance Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of School-Based Review, Contextualization and Implementation of Learning Standards

| Indicators                                                                                         |  | Weighted Mean          | Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|------------------------|----------------|
| 1. I lead regular school-based reviews to ensure alignment of teaching with learning standards.    |  | 4.56                   | Strongly Agree |
| 2. I guide teachers in contextualizing the curriculum to address learners' specific needs.         |  | 4.43                   | Strongly Agree |
| 3. I ensure teaching materials and lesson plans reflect current learning standards.                |  | 4.57                   | Strongly Agree |
| 4. I monitor and provide feedback on teachers' implementation of learning standards in classrooms. |  | 4.52                   | Strongly Agree |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                              |  | 4.52                   | Strongly Agree |
| <i>Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:</i>                                                   |  |                        |                |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                                      |  | Strongly Agree (SA)    |                |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                                      |  | Agree (A)              |                |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                                      |  | Neutral (N)            |                |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                                      |  | Disagree (D)           |                |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                                      |  | Strongly Disagree (SD) |                |

In the domain of Teaching Standards and Pedagogies, school heads demonstrate highly effective instructional mentoring (overall weighted mean = 4.54, "Strongly Agree"), primarily by guiding teachers to adopt effective and innovative teaching strategies (highest weighted mean = 4.58) through coaching, demonstration teaching, and Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions. They concurrently ensure compliance with national teaching standards (weighted mean = 4.57) and encourage the integration of pedagogical best practices (weighted mean = 4.52) to foster continuous professional growth. Although conducting classroom observations and providing instructional feedback scored slightly lower (lowest weighted mean = 4.51), likely because formal evaluations utilizing the Classroom Observation Tool (COT) occur at scheduled intervals rather than daily, the results confirm that school heads successfully cultivate a supportive environment that enhances overall instructional effectiveness and learner engagement.

Table 2. Leadership Strategies that Enhance Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of Teaching Standards and Pedagogies

| Indicators                                                                                    |  | Weighted Mean | Interpretation |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---------------|----------------|
| 1. I mentor teachers in adopting effective and innovative teaching strategies.                |  | 4.58          | Strongly Agree |
| 2. I encourage the integration of best practices in pedagogy for improved learning outcomes.  |  | 4.52          | Strongly Agree |
| 3. I ensure teaching practices comply with national teaching standards.                       |  | 4.57          | Strongly Agree |
| 4. I conduct classroom observations and provide feedback to improve instructional strategies. |  | 4.51          | Strongly Agree |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                         |  | 4.54          | Strongly Agree |

*Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:*

|               |                               |
|---------------|-------------------------------|
| 4.20 - 5.00 - | <i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>    |
| 3.40 - 4.19 - | <i>Agree (A)</i>              |
| 2.60 - 3.39 - | <i>Neutral (N)</i>            |
| 1.80 - 2.59 - | <i>Disagree (D)</i>           |
| 1.00 - 1.79 - | <i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i> |

In the area of Teacher Performance Feedback, school heads strongly prioritize collaborative mechanisms to drive instructional improvement (overall weighted mean = 4.56, "Strongly Agree"). They primarily focus on facilitating peer review and collaborative sessions to promote professional growth (highest weighted mean = 4.69) through routine Learning Action Cell (LAC) and departmental meetings, while also conducting regular performance evaluations with constructive feedback (weighted mean = 4.60) and ensuring that this feedback is actionable (weighted mean = 4.53). Conversely, supporting teachers in developing professional goals based on performance feedback received a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.41), primarily because such goal setting is often confined to infrequent, formal evaluation cycles like Individual Performance and Commitment Review (IPCR) conferences rather than daily interactions. Ultimately, through continuous peer reflection and structured evaluations, leaders effectively cultivate a collegial environment that strengthens teaching–learning delivery management.

Table 3. Leadership Strategies that Enhance Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of Teacher Performance Feedback

| Indicators                                                                               |                                    | Weighted Mean | Interpretation |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1. I conduct regular performance evaluations and give constructive feedback to teachers. |                                    | 4.60          | Strongly Agree |
| 2. I facilitate peer review and collaborative sessions to promote professional growth.   |                                    | 4.69          | Strongly Agree |
| 3. I ensure feedback is actionable and focused on improving teaching performance.        |                                    | 4.53          | Strongly Agree |
| 4. I support teachers in developing professional goals based on performance feedback.    |                                    | 4.41          | Strongly Agree |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                    |                                    | 4.56          | Strongly Agree |
| <i>Rating Scale:</i>                                                                     | <i>Descriptive Interpretation:</i> |               |                |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                            | <i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>         |               |                |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                            | <i>Agree (A)</i>                   |               |                |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                            | <i>Neutral (N)</i>                 |               |                |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                            | <i>Disagree (D)</i>                |               |                |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                            | <i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i>      |               |                |

In the domain of Learner Achievement, school heads strongly emphasize addressing learning gaps through structured academic interventions (overall weighted mean = 4.54, "Strongly Agree"). They prioritize implementing interventions to support learners who are struggling academically (highest weighted mean = 4.63) through remedial classes and differentiated instruction, while concurrently establishing strategies to monitor and enhance academic performance (weighted mean = 4.56) and guiding teachers in setting measurable learning goals (weighted mean = 4.49). Conversely, recognizing and celebrating learners' achievements to motivate continued academic excellence received a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.48), primarily because such recognition typically occurs during less frequent, scheduled events like end-of-grading ceremonies rather than daily instructional management. Ultimately, by combining targeted academic support with progress monitoring and periodic recognition, school heads effectively foster a learning environment that sustains both academic growth and student engagement.

Table 4. Leadership Strategies that Enhance Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of Learner Achievement

| Indicators                                                                            |  | Weighted Mean | Interpretation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---------------|----------------|
| 1. I establish strategies to monitor and enhance learners' academic performance.      |  | 4.56          | Strongly Agree |
| 2. I implement interventions to support learners who are struggling academically.     |  | 4.63          | Strongly Agree |
| 3. I guide teachers in setting measurable and achievable learning goals for students. |  | 4.49          | Strongly Agree |

|                                                                                                |                        |                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 4. I recognize and celebrate learners' achievements to motivate continued academic excellence. | 4.48                   | Strongly Agree |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                          | 4.54                   | Strongly Agree |
| <i>Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:</i>                                               |                        |                |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                                  | Strongly Agree (SA)    |                |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                                  | Agree (A)              |                |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                                  | Neutral (N)            |                |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                                  | Disagree (D)           |                |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                                  | Strongly Disagree (SD) |                |

In the domain of Learning Assessment, school heads consistently promote evidence-based practices to strengthen instructional quality (overall weighted mean = 4.41, "Strongly Agree"). They place the highest priority on encouraging teachers to use assessment outcomes to refine teaching strategies (highest weighted mean = 4.54) through regular discussions during faculty and departmental meetings. Conversely, the foundational tasks of supporting assessment quality, specifically, leading initiatives to ensure teachers use diverse and reliable assessment tools, guiding teachers in analyzing assessment results to inform instruction, and regularly reviewing assessment practices to ensure validity and reliability, tied for a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.37 for all three), primarily because these structured, analytical reviews typically occur during scheduled periodic workshops rather than daily classroom routines. Ultimately, school heads effectively leverage assessments not merely to measure student performance, but to drive practical, reflective adjustments in everyday teaching.

Table 5. Leadership Strategies that Enhance Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of Learning Assessment

| Indicators                                                                          | Weighted Mean          | Interpretation |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 1. I lead initiatives to ensure teachers use diverse and reliable assessment tools. | 4.37                   | Strongly Agree |
| 2. I guide teachers in analyzing assessment results to inform instruction.          | 4.37                   | Strongly Agree |
| 3. I regularly review assessment practices to ensure validity and reliability.      | 4.37                   | Strongly Agree |
| 4. I encourage teachers to use assessment outcomes to refine teaching strategies.   | 4.54                   | Strongly Agree |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                               | 4.41                   | Strongly Agree |
| <i>Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:</i>                                    |                        |                |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                       | Strongly Agree (SA)    |                |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                       | Agree (A)              |                |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                       | Neutral (N)            |                |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                       | Disagree (D)           |                |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                       | Strongly Disagree (SD) |                |

In the Learning Environment domain, school heads highly prioritize psychosocial well-being and safety (overall weighted mean = 4.57, "Strongly Agree"). They place the highest emphasis on fostering a safe, inclusive, and conducive learning environment for students (highest weighted mean = 4.63) by implementing anti-bullying programs, equitable policies, and promoting positive teacher-student relationships. Conversely, ensuring classrooms and school facilities support effective teaching and learning received a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.51), primarily because efforts regarding physical classroom organization, routine maintenance, and instructional resource allocation are sometimes limited by logistical and budget constraints. Ultimately, by actively managing both the psychosocial climate and the physical infrastructure, school heads successfully cultivate supportive spaces that promote holistic learner well-being and academic success.

Table 6. Leadership Strategies that Enhance Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of Learning Environment

| Indicators                                                                            | Weighted Mean | Interpretation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1. I foster a safe, inclusive, and conducive learning environment for students.       | 4.63          | Strongly Agree |
| 2. I ensure classrooms and school facilities support effective teaching and learning. | 4.51          | Strongly Agree |
| 3. I encourage the use of technology and innovative tools to enhance learning.        | 4.52          | Strongly Agree |

|                                                                                      |                        |                |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 4. I promote extracurricular activities that support students' holistic development. | 4.62                   | Strongly Agree |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                | 4.57                   | Strongly Agree |
| <i>Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:</i>                                     |                        |                |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                        | Strongly Agree (SA)    |                |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                        | Agree (A)              |                |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                        | Neutral (N)            |                |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                        | Disagree (D)           |                |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                        | Strongly Disagree (SD) |                |

In terms of Career Awareness and Opportunities, school heads actively promote future-oriented education (overall weighted mean = 4.40, "Strongly Agree") by placing the highest priority on providing programs to enhance learners' awareness of potential career paths (highest weighted mean = 4.52) through highly visible initiatives like career talks, seminars, and work immersion partnerships. They concurrently facilitate partnerships with industries and professionals (weighted mean = 4.37) and ensure learners have access to information and counseling on career development (weighted mean = 4.37) to expose students to real-world opportunities. Conversely, supporting teachers in integrating career guidance into their instruction received a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.34), largely because embedding career-related discussions into daily lessons via instructional coaching is inherently less visible than formal, standalone career programs; however, these combined efforts successfully help learners explore pathways and prepare for opportunities beyond school.

Table 7. Leadership Strategies that Enhance Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of Career Awareness and Opportunities

| Indicators                                                                                                     | Weighted Mean          | Interpretation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 1. I provide programs to enhance learners' awareness of potential career paths.                                | 4.52                   | Strongly Agree |
| 2. I facilitate partnerships with industries and professionals to expose learners to real-world opportunities. | 4.37                   | Strongly Agree |
| 3. I support teachers in integrating career guidance into their instruction.                                   | 4.34                   | Strongly Agree |
| 4. I ensure learners have access to information and counseling on career development.                          | 4.37                   | Strongly Agree |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                                          | 4.40                   | Strongly Agree |
| <i>Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:</i>                                                               |                        |                |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                                                  | Strongly Agree (SA)    |                |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                                                  | Agree (A)              |                |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                                                  | Neutral (N)            |                |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                                                  | Disagree (D)           |                |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                                                  | Strongly Disagree (SD) |                |

In the domain of Learner Discipline, school heads actively combine clear rules with proactive support programs to maintain order and guide responsible behavior (overall weighted mean = 4.53, "Strongly Agree"). They place the highest emphasis on guiding teachers in consistently implementing discipline strategies (highest weighted mean = 4.60) through counseling and mentoring sessions, while concurrently implementing programs to promote positive behavior and support students with challenges (weighted mean = 4.57) and addressing behavioral issues promptly, fairly, and consistently (weighted mean = 4.52) to ensure discipline is managed through reinforcement rather than punishment alone. Conversely, establishing and communicating clear rules and behavioral expectations to learners received a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.42), primarily because these foundational policies are typically disseminated during less frequent orientation

sessions and assemblies; nevertheless, these integrated practices successfully foster a supportive environment where students are encouraged to internalize positive behavioral standards.

Table 8. Leadership Strategies that Enhance Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in Terms of Learner Discipline

| Indicators                                                                                 | Weighted Mean                 | Interpretation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. I establish and communicate clear rules and behavioral expectations to learners.        | 4.42                          | Strongly Agree |
| 2. I guide teachers in consistently implementing discipline strategies.                    | 4.60                          | Strongly Agree |
| 3. I address behavioral issues promptly, fairly, and consistently.                         | 4.52                          | Strongly Agree |
| 4. I implement programs to promote positive behavior and support students with challenges. | 4.57                          | Strongly Agree |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                      | 4.53                          | Strongly Agree |
| <i>Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:</i>                                           |                               |                |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                              | <i>Strongly Agree (SA)</i>    |                |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                              | <i>Agree (A)</i>              |                |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                              | <i>Neutral (N)</i>            |                |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                              | <i>Disagree (D)</i>           |                |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                              | <i>Strongly Disagree (SD)</i> |                |

### 3.2. Level of Effectiveness of Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of the School Heads

Examining the perceived effectiveness of teaching-learning delivery management, findings for the "School-Based Review, Contextualization, and Implementation of Learning Standards" domain reveal that school heads are highly effective (overall weighted mean = 4.43). They excel most at ensuring all teaching materials align with established learning standards (highest weighted mean = 4.45) through weekly lesson plan reviews and targeted classroom observations monitoring adherence (weighted mean = 4.42), while also effectively facilitating curriculum contextualization to meet specific learner needs (weighted mean = 4.43). Conversely, regularly conducting school-based reviews to ensure the effective implementation of these standards scored slightly lower (lowest weighted mean = 4.41), primarily because these structured monitoring processes, such as the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and scheduled academic meetings, occur less frequently than routine daily alignment checks. Ultimately, by systematically integrating these standards into planning, monitoring, and feedback, school heads successfully maintain consistent, standards-based instruction across all subjects and grade levels.

Table 9. Level of Effectiveness of Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of School-Based Review, Contextualization and Implementation of Learning Standards

| Indicators                                                                                               | Weighted Mean                    | Interpretation   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. I regularly conduct school-based reviews to ensure the effective implementation of learning standards | 4.41                             | Highly Effective |
| 2. I facilitate the contextualization of the curriculum to meet the specific needs of our learners       | 4.43                             | Highly Effective |
| 3. I ensure that all teaching materials are aligned with the established learning standards              | 4.45                             | Highly Effective |
| 4. I monitor the adherence to learning standards through regular classroom observations                  | 4.42                             | Highly Effective |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                                    | 4.43                             | Highly Effective |
| <i>Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:</i>                                                         |                                  |                  |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                                            | <i>Highly Effective (HE)</i>     |                  |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                                            | <i>Effective (E)</i>             |                  |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                                            | <i>Moderately Effective (ME)</i> |                  |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                                            | <i>Slightly Effective (SE)</i>   |                  |



1.00 - 1.79 - Not Effective (NE)

In the domain of Teaching Standards and Pedagogies, school heads demonstrate highly effective instructional leadership (overall weighted mean = 4.57) by placing the highest priority on ensuring that teaching practices are aligned with national teaching standards, specifically the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) (highest weighted mean = 4.63), which they enforce through rigorous curriculum planning and lesson plan reviews. Concurrently, they actively provide continuous professional development opportunities to enhance teachers' pedagogical skills (weighted mean = 4.57) and encourage the adoption of innovative teaching strategies to improve student engagement (weighted mean = 4.56). While regularly assessing the effectiveness of teaching methodologies through feedback and evaluations received a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.52), school heads still effectively utilize self-reflections, lesson observations, and stakeholder feedback to help teachers refine methods such as differentiated instruction; ultimately, this ongoing evaluation and strict alignment with the PPST foster a culture of continuous improvement that links professional growth directly to student achievement.

Table 10. Level of Effectiveness of Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of Teaching Standards and Pedagogies

| Indicators                                                                                                      |                           | Weighted Mean | Interpretation   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 1. I provide continuous professional development opportunities for teachers to enhance their pedagogical skills |                           | 4.57          | Highly Effective |
| 2. I encourage the adoption of innovative teaching strategies to improve student engagement                     |                           | 4.56          | Highly Effective |
| 3. I ensure that teaching practices are aligned with national teaching standards                                |                           | 4.63          | Highly Effective |
| 4. I regularly assess the effectiveness of teaching methodologies through feedback and evaluations              |                           | 4.52          | Highly Effective |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                                           |                           | 4.57          | Highly Effective |
| <i>Rating Scale:</i>                                                                                            |                           |               |                  |
| <i>Descriptive Interpretation:</i>                                                                              |                           |               |                  |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                                                   | Highly Effective (HE)     |               |                  |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                                                   | Effective (E)             |               |                  |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                                                   | Moderately Effective (ME) |               |                  |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                                                   | Slightly Effective (SE)   |               |                  |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                                                   | Not Effective (NE)        |               |                  |

In evaluating the effectiveness of Teacher Performance Feedback, school heads demonstrate highly effective instructional leadership (overall weighted mean = 4.51) by actively fostering a supportive environment for continuous teacher growth. They place the highest emphasis on providing technical assistance to teachers on teaching standards, pedagogies, and subject matter across learning areas (highest weighted mean = 4.64) through proactive guidance and one-on-one coaching, while concurrently establishing mentorship programs to support new or struggling teachers (weighted mean = 4.52) and scheduling regular classroom visits to provide immediate instructional feedback (weighted mean = 4.49). Conversely, effectively using feedback acquired from students, parents, and other stakeholders to assist teachers in enhancing instructional effectiveness received a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.38), primarily because such multi-stakeholder input is typically gathered during periodic events like parent-teacher conferences rather than daily observations; nevertheless, by combining proactive technical support with stakeholder insights, school heads successfully drive a continuous cycle of instructional improvement.

Table 11. Level of Effectiveness of Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of Teaching Performance Feedback

| Indicators | Weighted | Interpretation |
|------------|----------|----------------|
|------------|----------|----------------|



|                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Mean                               |                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. I schedule regular classroom visits to observe teaching practices, identify areas for improvement, and provide immediate feedback to teachers                                                              | 4.49                               | Highly Effective |
| 2. I establish mentorship programs where experienced teachers can support and guide new or struggling teachers in instructional strategies and classroom management                                           | 4.52                               | Highly Effective |
| 3. I provide technical assistance to teachers on the teaching standards, pedagogies, and subject matter across many learning areas to offer technical support to teachers in enhancing their teaching methods | 4.64                               | Highly Effective |
| 4. I effectively use feedback acquired from students, parents, and other individuals involved in education to assist teachers in enhancing their instructional effectiveness.                                 | 4.38                               | Highly Effective |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                                                                                                                                         | 4.51                               | Highly Effective |
| <i>Rating Scale:</i>                                                                                                                                                                                          | <i>Descriptive Interpretation:</i> |                  |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Highly Effective (HE)              |                  |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Effective (E)                      |                  |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Moderately Effective (ME)          |                  |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Slightly Effective (SE)            |                  |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Not Effective (NE)                 |                  |

In evaluating the effectiveness of Learner Achievement management, school heads demonstrate highly effective instructional leadership (overall weighted mean = 4.49) by successfully balancing public recognition with data-driven strategic guidance. They place the highest emphasis on celebrating and recognizing student achievements to motivate continued academic excellence (highest weighted mean = 4.65) through visible commendations during school assemblies and award ceremonies that foster a culture valuing success. Concurrently, they actively implement intervention programs to support learners who are at risk of underachievement (weighted mean = 4.48) and regularly analyze student performance data to inform instructional decisions (weighted mean = 4.44) through focused tutorials and remedial planning. While setting clear academic goals and expectations for student performance received a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.39), reflecting that these foundational goals are strategically derived from periodic reviews of test results and report cards rather than daily motivational events, school heads effectively integrate these data-informed expectations and targeted interventions to ensure all learners receive the necessary support to maximize their academic growth.

Table 12. Level of Effectiveness of Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of Learner Achievement

| Indicators                                                                                   | Weighted Mean                      | Interpretation   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. I set clear academic goals and expectations for student performance                       | 4.39                               | Highly Effective |
| 2. I implement intervention programs to support learners who are at risk of underachievement | 4.48                               | Highly Effective |
| 3. I regularly analyze student performance data to inform instructional decisions            | 4.44                               | Highly Effective |
| 4. I celebrate and recognize student achievements to motivate continued academic excellence  | 4.65                               | Highly Effective |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                        | 4.49                               | Highly Effective |
| <i>Rating Scale:</i>                                                                         | <i>Descriptive Interpretation:</i> |                  |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                                | Highly Effective (HE)              |                  |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                                | Effective (E)                      |                  |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                                | Moderately Effective (ME)          |                  |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                                | Slightly Effective (SE)            |                  |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                                | Not Effective (NE)                 |                  |

In evaluating the effectiveness of Learning Assessment management, school heads demonstrate highly effective instructional leadership (overall weighted mean = 4.48) by actively enhancing evaluation quality to ensure tools accurately measure learning and guide instruction. They place the highest emphasis on providing teachers with guidance on creating valid and reliable assessment instruments (highest weighted mean = 4.51) through hands-on reviews of test items, tables of specifications, and rubric design workshops. Concurrently, they regularly review assessment results to identify areas for instructional improvement (weighted mean = 4.50)

and ensure the use of diverse assessment tools to evaluate student learning outcomes (weighted mean = 4.47). While promoting the use of assessment data to inform curriculum adjustments and teaching strategies received a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.45), reflecting the practical challenges of consistently translating data into targeted, subject-specific interventions, school heads still actively collaborate with teachers to address the least mastered competencies through responsive small-group tutorials and enrichment activities. Ultimately, by integrating rigorous assessment design with data-driven decision-making, school heads empower teachers to continuously refine their instruction and improve school-wide learning outcomes.

Table 13. Level of Effectiveness of Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in Terms of Learning Assessment

| Indicators                                                                                       |  | Weighted Mean             | Interpretation   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|------------------|
| 1. I ensure the use of diverse assessment tools to evaluate student learning outcomes            |  | 4.47                      | Highly Effective |
| 2. I provide teachers with guidance on creating valid and reliable assessment instruments        |  | 4.51                      | Highly Effective |
| 3. I regularly review assessment results to identify areas for instructional improvement         |  | 4.50                      | Highly Effective |
| 4. I promote the use of assessment data to inform curriculum adjustments and teaching strategies |  | 4.45                      | Highly Effective |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                            |  | 4.48                      | Highly Effective |
| <i>Rating Scale:</i>                                                                             |  |                           |                  |
| <i>Descriptive Interpretation:</i>                                                               |  |                           |                  |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                                    |  | Highly Effective (HE)     |                  |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                                    |  | Effective (E)             |                  |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                                    |  | Moderately Effective (ME) |                  |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                                    |  | Slightly Effective (SE)   |                  |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                                    |  | Not Effective (NE)        |                  |

In evaluating the effectiveness of Learning Environment management, school heads demonstrate highly effective instructional leadership (overall weighted mean = 4.54) by actively promoting a structured, safe, and respectful school climate. They place the highest emphasis on establishing and communicating clear rules and expectations for behavior and academic performance to create a structured and conducive learning environment (highest weighted mean = 4.63) by reinforcing DepEd guidelines through assemblies, visible classroom rules, and positive discipline policies. Concurrently, they conduct regular classroom observations and provide constructive feedback to teachers to help them improve their classroom management practices (weighted mean = 4.53). While the tasks of offering professional development sessions focused on effective classroom management techniques to help teachers handle diverse classroom situations and effectively managing a school setting that is conducive to learning, promotes inclusivity, and fosters a healthy atmosphere tied for a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.49 for both), reflecting the ongoing logistical challenges of training for large, diverse classes, school heads still successfully organize conflict resolution training and maintain welcoming spaces to ensure an orderly environment that enhances both student achievement and instructional quality.

Table 14. Level of Effectiveness of Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in Terms of Learning Environment

| Indicators                                                                                                                                                  |  | Weighted Mean | Interpretation   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---------------|------------------|
| 1. I establish and communicate clear rules and expectations for behavior and academic performance to create a structured and conducive learning environment |  | 4.63          | Highly Effective |
| 2. I offer professional development sessions focused on effective classroom management techniques to help teachers handle diverse classroom situations      |  | 4.49          | Highly Effective |
| 3. I conduct regular classroom observations and provide constructive feedback to teachers to help them improve their classroom management practices         |  | 4.53          | Highly Effective |
| 4. I effectively manage a school setting that is conducive to learning, promotes inclusivity, and fosters a healthy atmosphere                              |  | 4.49          | Highly Effective |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                                                                                       |  | 4.54          | Highly Effective |

|                      |                                    |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>Rating Scale:</i> | <i>Descriptive Interpretation:</i> |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -        | Highly Effective (HE)              |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -        | Effective (E)                      |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -        | Moderately Effective (ME)          |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -        | Slightly Effective (SE)            |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -        | Not Effective (NE)                 |

In evaluating the effectiveness of Career Awareness and Opportunities, which in this specific context focuses heavily on teacher empowerment and professional growth, school heads demonstrate highly effective management (overall weighted mean = 4.33). They place the highest emphasis on providing teachers with access to adequate teaching materials, technology, and other resources needed to deliver high-quality instruction (highest weighted mean = 4.40) by integrating educational software into training sessions to support interactive lessons. Concurrently, they actively encourage teachers to participate in professional development programs in order to build on their strengths and reduce performance gaps (weighted mean = 4.38) and create an environment where teachers feel comfortable discussing their challenges and needs, ensuring they have access to support and resources (weighted mean = 4.31). While the task of implementing programs focused on the wellbeing and mental health of teachers to help them manage stress and maintain a healthy work-life balance received the lowest rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.23), largely because formal wellness initiatives and flexible planning times are not consistently available to all, school heads still effectively utilize regular check-ins to connect staff with DepEd resources, thereby fostering a balanced school culture that sustains both teacher satisfaction and instructional excellence.

Table 15. Level of Effectiveness of Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of Career Awareness and Opportunities

| Indicators                                                                                                                                           | Weighted Mean | Interpretation   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 1. I create an environment where teachers feel comfortable discussing their challenges and needs, ensuring they have access to support and resources | 4.31          | Highly Effective |
| 2. I implement programs focused on the wellbeing and mental health of teachers to help them manage stress and maintain a healthy work-life balance   | 4.23          | Highly Effective |
| 3. I provide teachers with access to adequate teaching materials, technology, and other resources needed to deliver high-quality instruction         | 4.40          | Highly Effective |
| 4. I encourage teachers to participate in professional development programs in order to build on their strengths and reduce performance gaps         | 4.38          | Highly Effective |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                                                                                | 4.33          | Highly Effective |

|                      |                                    |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>Rating Scale:</i> | <i>Descriptive Interpretation:</i> |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -        | Highly Effective (HE)              |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -        | Effective (E)                      |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -        | Moderately Effective (ME)          |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -        | Slightly Effective (SE)            |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -        | Not Effective (NE)                 |

In evaluating the effectiveness of Learner Discipline management, school heads demonstrate highly effective leadership (overall weighted mean = 4.47) by strategically balancing clear communication with supportive interventions. They place the highest emphasis on establishing and communicating clear behavioral expectations to students (highest weighted mean = 4.51), introduced during early flag ceremonies and reinforced daily to minimize disruptions, while concurrently collaborating with teachers and parents to promote positive student behavior (weighted mean = 4.50) and providing support and counseling services to students exhibiting behavioral challenges (weighted mean = 4.45). Conversely, implementing consistent and fair disciplinary procedures to address misconduct received a slightly lower rating (lowest weighted mean = 4.44), primarily because routine behavioral issues are typically resolved directly at the classroom level, thereby limiting the school head's need for direct involvement; nevertheless, through the application of DepEd-aligned restorative

practices and parent conferences, school heads successfully maintain a safe, orderly environment that maximizes instructional time and allows students to thrive.

Table 16. Level of Effectiveness of Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of School Heads in terms of Learner Discipline

| Indicators                                                                                |                           | Weighted Mean | Interpretation   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 1. I establish and communicate clear behavioral expectations to students                  |                           | 4.51          | Highly Effective |
| 2. I implement consistent and fair disciplinary procedures to address misconduct          |                           | 4.44          | Highly Effective |
| 3. I collaborate with teachers and parents to promote positive student behavior           |                           | 4.50          | Highly Effective |
| 4. I provide support and counseling services to students exhibiting behavioral challenges |                           | 4.45          | Highly Effective |
| Overall Weighted Mean                                                                     |                           | 4.47          | Highly Effective |
| <i>Rating Scale:</i>                                                                      |                           |               |                  |
| <i>Descriptive Interpretation:</i>                                                        |                           |               |                  |
| 4.20 - 5.00 -                                                                             | Highly Effective (HE)     |               |                  |
| 3.40 - 4.19 -                                                                             | Effective (E)             |               |                  |
| 2.60 - 3.39 -                                                                             | Moderately Effective (ME) |               |                  |
| 1.80 - 2.59 -                                                                             | Slightly Effective (SE)   |               |                  |
| 1.00 - 1.79 -                                                                             | Not Effective (NE)        |               |                  |

### 3.3. Significant Relationship Between the Leadership Strategies of School Heads and the Effectiveness of Enhancing Teaching-Learning Delivery Management

Utilizing Spearman's rank-order correlation ( $\rho$ ) following a non-normal distribution indicated by the Shapiro–Wilk test ( $p < 0.05$ ), findings reveal that all leadership strategies share statistically significant positive relationships with teaching–learning delivery variables ( $p < .01$ ), effectively rejecting the null hypothesis. Specifically, school-based review and contextualization strongly correlate with learner achievement ( $\rho = .832$ ) and learning environment ( $\rho = .831$ ); teaching standards and pedagogies link highest to learning environment ( $\rho = .802$ ), learner achievement ( $\rho = .781$ ), and learner discipline ( $\rho = .766$ ); and teacher performance feedback strongly impacts learner achievement ( $\rho = .830$ ), learning environment ( $\rho = .759$ ), and learner discipline ( $\rho = .749$ ). Furthermore, learner achievement strongly correlates with learning environment ( $\rho = .851$ ), learning assessment ( $\rho = .808$ ), and learner discipline ( $\rho = .779$ ), while the structural pillars themselves demonstrate high interdependence, as learning environment correlates highest with learner discipline ( $\rho = .892$ ) and strongly with learning assessment ( $\rho = .791$ ). Finally, although career awareness exhibits strong but comparatively lower correlations, peaking with learning environment ( $\rho = .671$ ) and learner achievement ( $\rho = .650$ ) and lowest with school-based review ( $\rho = .417$ ) due to its often-standalone programmatic nature, the comprehensive results definitively confirm that actively strengthening leadership competencies across all these interconnected domains drives sustained improvements in overall instructional quality.

Table 17. Test for Significant Relationship Between the Leadership Strategies and the Level of Effectiveness of Teaching-Learning Delivery Management of the School Heads

| Teaching-Learning Delivery Management                                           |                                                                                 |         |         |         |                                   |         |                              |         |                     |         |                      |         |                     |         |                                    |         |                    |         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|------------------------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|
| Leadership Strategies                                                           | School-Based Review, Contextualization and Implementation of Learning Standards |         |         |         | Teaching Standards and Pedagogies |         | Teacher Performance Feedback |         | Learner Achievement |         | Learning Environment |         | Learning Assessment |         | Career Awareness and Opportunities |         | Learner Discipline |         |
|                                                                                 | □                                                                               | p-value | □       | p-value | □                                 | p-value | □                            | p-value | □                   | p-value | □                    | p-value | □                   | p-value | □                                  | p-value | □                  | p-value |
|                                                                                 |                                                                                 |         |         |         |                                   |         |                              |         |                     |         |                      |         |                     |         |                                    |         |                    |         |
| School-Based Review, Contextualization and Implementation of Learning Standards | .73 2**                                                                         | .00 0   | .611 ** | .0 00   | .701**                            | .000    | .832**                       | .000    | .831**              | .000    | .692**               | .00     | .668**              | .00 0   | .677 **                            | .000    |                    |         |
| Teaching Standards and Pedagogies                                               | .62 2**                                                                         | .00 0   | .736 ** | .0 00   | .66 2**                           | .00 0   | .78 1**                      | .00 0   | .80 2**             | .00 0   | .66 5**              | .00 0   | .72 2**             | .00 0   | .766 **                            | .0 00   |                    |         |
| Teacher Performance Feedback                                                    | .67 8**                                                                         | .00 0   | .714 ** | .0 00   | .78 4**                           | .00 0   | .83 0**                      | .00 0   | .75 9**             | .00 0   | .74 8**              | .00 0   | .65 2**             | .00 0   | .749 **                            | .0 00   |                    |         |
| Learner Achievement                                                             | .73 1**                                                                         | .00 0   | .773 ** | .0 00   | .77 0**                           | .00 0   | .86 9**                      | .00 0   | .85 1**             | .00 0   | .72 9**              | .00 0   | .74 3**             | .00 0   | .779 **                            | .0 00   |                    |         |
| Learning Assessment                                                             | .73 5**                                                                         | .00 0   | .733 ** | .0 00   | .71 1**                           | .00 0   | .80 8**                      | .00 0   | .79 1**             | .00 0   | .62 1**              | .00 0   | .75 3**             | .00 0   | .798 **                            | .0 00   |                    |         |
| Learning Environment                                                            | .70 5**                                                                         | .00 0   | .756 ** | .0 00   | .76 9**                           | .00 0   | .84 2**                      | .00 0   | .81 3**             | .00 0   | .79 7**              | .00 0   | .77 5**             | .00 0   | .775 **                            | .0 00   |                    |         |
| Career Awareness and Opportunities                                              | .41 7**                                                                         | .00 0   | .636 ** | .0 00   | .55 2**                           | .00 0   | .65 0**                      | .00 0   | .67 1**             | .00 0   | .44 6**              | .00 0   | .79 0**             | .00 0   | .597 **                            | .0 00   |                    |         |
| Learner Discipline                                                              | .70 0**                                                                         | .00 0   | .671 ** | .0 00   | .72 9**                           | .00 0   | .85 8**                      | .00 0   | .89 2**             | .00 0   | .67 6**              | .00 0   | .63 9**             | .00 0   | .742 **                            | .0 00   |                    |         |

\*\*Correlation is significant @ 0.01 level.

### 3.4. Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in Enhancing Teaching-Learning Delivery Management

Examining the challenges in School-Based Review, Contextualization, and Implementation of Learning Standards, findings indicate that logistical constraints significantly outweigh material shortages. The most pressing issue is the difficulty scheduling regular school-based reviews due to teacher workload (Rank 1, frequency = 111), as extensive DepEd reporting and portfolio duties complicate coordination without disrupting instruction. This is followed by a limited understanding among teachers of how to contextualize the curriculum (Rank 2, frequency = 78) and limited time to monitor classroom implementation of learning standards (Rank 3, frequency = 66). Conversely, the least reported challenge is the lack of adequate learning materials aligned with standards (Rank 4, frequency = 63), a resource gap that school heads actively mitigate by improvising instructional aids and coordinating division supplies. Ultimately, school heads must strategically integrate observations and evaluations into the school calendar to consistently uphold instructional quality without overburdening their staff.

Table 18. Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in Enhancing Teaching-Learning Delivery Management in terms of School-Based Review, Contextualization, and Implementation of Learning Standards

| Indicators                                                                     | Frequency | Rank |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| 1. Difficulty scheduling regular school-based reviews due to teacher workload  | 111       | 1    |
| 2. Limited understanding among teachers of how to contextualize the curriculum | 78        | 2    |
| 3. Lack of adequate learning materials aligned with standards                  | 63        | 4    |
| 4. Limited time to monitor classroom implementation of learning standards      | 66        | 3    |

In the domain of Teaching Standards and Pedagogies, findings reveal that professional development constraints significantly outweigh issues of standard compliance. The most prominent challenge is insufficient professional development programs for teachers (Rank 1, frequency = 80), as budget limitations and scheduling conflicts frequently restrict formal Division-level and Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, prompting school heads to compensate through targeted in-school coaching. This is followed by a limited ability to observe and provide feedback on teaching practices (Rank 2, frequency = 71) and teachers' reluctance to adopt innovative teaching strategies (Rank 3, frequency = 68). Conversely, the least reported challenge is the difficulty ensuring

all teachers follow national teaching standards (Rank 4, frequency = 57), indicating that most educators generally adhere to the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers; nevertheless, school heads must actively address any minor instructional misalignments through routine lesson plan reviews and collaborative peer mentoring to consistently uphold DepEd guidelines and enhance overall pedagogical skills.

Table 19. Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in Enhancing Teaching-Learning Delivery Management in terms of Teaching Standards and Pedagogies

| Indicators                                                               | Frequency | Rank |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| 1. Teachers' reluctance to adopt innovative teaching strategies          | 68        | 3    |
| 2. Insufficient professional development programs for teachers           | 80        | 1    |
| 3. Difficulty ensuring all teachers follow national teaching standards   | 57        | 4    |
| 4. Limited ability to observe and provide feedback on teaching practices | 71        | 2    |

In the area of Teacher Performance Feedback, logistical barriers to collaborative professional development significantly outweigh actual resistance to the evaluation process. The most frequently reported challenge is organizing peer review or mentoring sessions (Rank 1, frequency = 94), as scheduling conflicts and heavy teaching loads routinely force school heads to utilize smaller group mentoring to avoid disrupting instruction. This is followed by a limited time to support teachers in setting and achieving professional goals (Rank 2, frequency = 80). Conversely, the least reported challenges tied for the lowest rank: difficulty providing timely and constructive feedback to teachers (Rank 3.5, frequency = 51) and teachers' low receptiveness to feedback (Rank 3.5, frequency = 51); while occasional hesitance occurs due to differing experience levels or mindsets, school heads successfully mitigate these minor barriers by carefully scheduling observations, modeling constructive feedback techniques, and holding targeted follow-up sessions to foster an actionable culture of continuous improvement.

Table 20. Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in Enhancing Teaching-Learning Delivery Management in terms of Teacher Performance Feedback

| Indicators                                                                | Frequency | Rank |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| 1. Difficulty providing timely and constructive feedback to teachers      | 51        | 3.5  |
| 2. Challenges organizing peer review or mentoring sessions                | 94        | 1    |
| 3. Teachers' low receptiveness to feedback                                | 51        | 3.5  |
| 4. Limited time to support teachers in setting and achieving professional | 80        | 2    |

In the domain of Learner Achievement, managing diverse student needs presents the most significant obstacle to equitable progress. The most frequently reported challenge is the difficulty improving performance of learners with diverse learning needs (Rank 1, frequency = 82), as providing tailored interventions for varying academic abilities and knowledge gaps is highly time- and resource-intensive. This is closely followed by tied challenges regarding limited resources for remediation programs for underperforming students (Rank 2.5, frequency = 69) and difficulty motivating learners to achieve academic excellence (Rank 2.5, frequency = 69). Conversely, the least frequently reported challenge is setting realistic and measurable learning targets (Rank 4, frequency = 65); while establishing these goals remains essential, fluctuations in student readiness can complicate their feasibility. Ultimately, to navigate these hurdles, school heads actively collaborate with teachers to provide targeted support through remedial sessions and individualized learning plans, continuously adjusting strategies based on quarterly assessments to ensure struggling learners have an equitable opportunity to improve.

Table 21. Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in Enhancing Teaching-Learning Delivery Management in terms of Learner Achievement

| Indicators                                                                  | Frequency | Rank |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| 1. Difficulty improving performance of learners with diverse learning needs | 82        | 1    |
| 2. Limited resources for remediation programs for underperforming students  | 69        | 2.5  |
| 3. Challenges in setting realistic and measurable learning targets          | 65        | 4    |
| 4. Difficulty motivating learners to achieve academic excellence            | 69        | 2.5  |

In the domain of Learning Assessment, translating data into actionable instructional decisions remains the primary obstacle due to heavy teacher workloads and time constraints. The most frequently reported challenge is the inadequate capacity to review the quality of assessments regularly (Rank 1, frequency = 87), followed by the difficulty ensuring assessment results are used to improve teaching strategies (Rank 2, frequency = 73) and teachers' limited use of varied and reliable assessment methods (Rank 3, frequency = 63). Conversely, the least frequently reported challenge is the difficulty guiding teachers to analyze and interpret assessment results (Rank 4, frequency = 59). This indicates that while teachers can generally interpret assessment data with occasional coaching from school heads, the structural hurdle of consistently applying these insights to targeted interventions requires leadership to actively foster a culture of evidence-based, data-driven instruction.

Table 22. Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in Enhancing Teaching-Learning Delivery Management in terms of Learning Assessment

| Indicators                                                                        | Frequency | Rank |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| 1. Teachers' limited use of varied and reliable assessment methods                | 63        | 3    |
| 2. Difficulty guiding teachers to analyze and interpret assessment results        | 59        | 4    |
| 3. Inadequate capacity to review the quality of assessments regularly             | 87        | 1    |
| 4. Difficulty ensuring assessment results are used to improve teaching strategies | 73        | 2    |

In the Learning Environment domain, resource and infrastructure constraints present the most significant obstacle to instructional delivery. The most frequently reported challenge is limited access to technology for teaching and learning (Rank 1, frequency = 99), which restricts the integration of digital tools and forces a reliance on traditional methods. This is followed by inadequate classroom or school facilities (Rank 2, frequency = 86) and difficulty maintaining a safe and inclusive learning environment (Rank 3, frequency = 48). Conversely, the least frequently reported challenge is providing extracurricular or enrichment activities for students (Rank 4, frequency = 45); while organizing clubs and sports remains constrained by heavy teacher workloads, large classes, and limited funding, the data definitively shows that foundational technology access is the primary hurdle in cultivating a modern, engaging learning environment.

Table 23. Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in Enhancing Teaching-Learning Delivery Management in terms of Learning Environment

| Indicators                                                                    | Frequency | Rank |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| 1. Inadequate classroom or school facilities                                  | 86        | 2    |
| 2. Difficulty maintaining a safe and inclusive learning environment           | 48        | 3    |
| 3. Limited access to technology for teaching and learning                     | 99        | 1    |
| 4. Challenges providing extracurricular or enrichment activities for students | 45        | 4    |

In the domain of Career Awareness and Opportunities, structural resource constraints significantly hinder student exploration of future pathways. The most frequently reported challenge is limited access to career information and counseling services for students (Rank 1, frequency = 83), a critical gap exacerbated in schools lacking dedicated guidance counselors. This is closely followed by the difficulty arranging industry exposure or mentorship opportunities (Rank 2, frequency = 81) and limited career guidance programs for students (Rank



3, frequency = 80). Conversely, the least frequently reported challenge is teachers' lack of integration of career guidance into lessons (Rank 4, frequency = 56); while school heads still utilize mentoring and training to encourage educators to contextualize daily learning with potential careers, the data clearly indicates that securing external partnerships and foundational career resources remains a far more pressing leadership challenge than internal instructional integration.

Table 24. Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in Enhancing Teaching-Learning Delivery Management in terms of Career Awareness and Opportunities

| Indicators                                                                    | Frequency | Rank |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| 1. Limited career guidance programs for students                              | 80        | 3    |
| 2. Difficulty arranging industry exposure or mentorship opportunities         | 81        | 2    |
| 3. Teachers' lack of integration of career guidance into lessons              | 56        | 4    |
| 4. Limited access to career information and counseling services for students. | 83        | 1    |

In the domain of Learner Discipline, managing diverse student behaviors to prevent instructional disruption remains the most pressing concern for leadership. The most frequently reported challenge is supporting teachers in managing classroom behavior (Rank 1, frequency = 82), as providing the consistent, individualized mentoring required to handle varied disruptions is highly demanding. This is followed by the difficulty of addressing disciplinary cases consistently and fairly (Rank 2, frequency = 78) and the difficulty of establishing and communicating clear rules and expectations (Rank 3, frequency = 71). Conversely, the least frequently reported challenge is limited programs or support for promoting positive behavior (Rank 4, frequency = 56); while funding and personnel constraints sometimes restrict school-wide values formation and recognition initiatives, school heads must primarily prioritize direct teacher workshops and classroom behavior monitoring to maintain an orderly, safe, and motivating environment.

Table 25. Challenges Encountered by the School Heads in Enhancing Teaching-Learning Delivery Management in Terms of Learner Discipline

| Indicators                                                                | Frequency | Rank |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| 1. Difficulty establishing and communicating clear rules and expectations | 71        | 3    |
| 2. Difficulty addressing disciplinary cases consistently and fairly       | 78        | 2    |
| 3. Limited programs or support for promoting positive behavior            | 56        | 4    |
| 4. Challenges supporting teachers in managing classroom behavior          | 82        | 1    |

### 3.5. Proposed Intervention to Enhance the Leadership Strategies of School Heads along Teaching-Learning Delivery Management

One of the most urgent findings of the study is the difficulty in scheduling regular school-based reviews due to teacher workload, a challenge reported by 111 respondents that reflects broader gaps in instructional leadership and teacher support. Additional challenges include insufficient professional development programs (80 respondents) and difficulties in organizing peer review or mentoring sessions (94 respondents). This indicates an absence of sustained collaborative structures, which inherently limits teachers' ability to apply innovative strategies, align instruction with national standards, and provide effective feedback. Managing learner diversity and improving the performance of students with varied needs represents another critical area, as 82 respondents reported challenges in this domain, a finding further supported by the inconsistent use of learner performance data for instructional decisions. Moreover, limited access to technology and instructional resources, cited by 99 respondents, further constrains the implementation of learner-centered and data-driven teaching practices. Career guidance and learner discipline also require targeted intervention, with 83 respondents noting insufficient career counseling and 82 identifying challenges in classroom behavior

management. To address these gaps, the B.R.I.D.G.E. Activity will be implemented over three days during the District School Heads Meeting, focusing on structured professional development, mentoring, differentiated instruction, resource optimization, career guidance integration, and positive discipline strategies. By institutionalizing systematic, collaborative, and data-driven leadership practices, this program aims to strengthen school heads' instructional leadership, enhance teacher performance, and improve overall learner outcomes, ultimately promoting sustainable and effective teaching–learning delivery.

#### **4. Conclusion and Recommendations**

The school heads demonstrate very strong leadership strategies across all areas of teaching–learning delivery management, reflecting effective instructional leadership that supports curriculum alignment, teacher development, learner achievement, assessment, learning environment, career readiness, and learner discipline. Their teaching–learning delivery management is consistently highly effective, showing a strong capacity to implement instructional standards, support teachers, motivate learners, and maintain conducive and orderly learning environments. Leadership strategies were found to have a significant positive relationship with the effectiveness of teaching–learning delivery management; consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected, confirming that thorough, instructional, and learner-focused leadership directly improves teaching–learning practices. Despite these strengths, school heads face critical challenges such as time constraints, limited professional development, learner diversity, resource limitations, and classroom behavior management. The proposed Project B.R.I.D.G.E. addresses these gaps through targeted professional development, data-driven practices, resource optimization, career integration, and positive discipline, thereby promoting sustainable improvements in teaching–learning delivery and learner outcomes.

Based on the study's conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed. School heads should further strengthen instructional leadership by sustaining high-impact practices, such as curriculum alignment, mentoring, and learner-centered strategies, while providing additional focus to curriculum contextualization, career guidance integration, and positive learner discipline. They should also enhance teaching–learning delivery management by institutionalizing regular school-based reviews, expanding data-informed instructional monitoring, and refining pedagogical practices through targeted professional development. Furthermore, school administrators and heads should intentionally align leadership strategies with instructional management priorities, recognizing that thorough instructional, assessment, and learner-focused leadership directly improves teaching effectiveness and learner outcomes. To address identified challenges, it is recommended that schools develop time-efficient review mechanisms, strengthen the implementation of School Learning Action Cells (SLAC), optimize resources and technology, and provide increased support for learner diversity and classroom management. The Schools Division Office and school heads may pilot Project B.R.I.D.G.E. to reinforce leadership and positive discipline, while future researchers may explore mixed-methods studies or assess the effectiveness of these interventions across varied school contexts.

#### **Acknowledgment**

The researcher sincerely acknowledges and appreciates everyone who contributed to the successful completion of this study. Special thanks are extended to the Graduate School Dean for fostering academic excellence and serving as a continual source of inspiration; to the thesis adviser for their invaluable guidance, expertise, and support; and to the panel of evaluators for their constructive feedback, which greatly enhanced the quality of this work. Gratitude is also expressed to the faculty and staff of the Graduate School for providing a nurturing and supportive academic environment; to colleagues and friends for their encouragement and insightful suggestions; and particularly to the researcher's family for their unwavering love, patience, and

support. Above all, heartfelt thanks are offered to God for granting wisdom, strength, and countless blessings throughout this journey.

## References

- Biñas, J. P., Siason, N., & Paulino, R. (2023). Quality micro-decision-making at selected Philippine public secondary Schools: an iterative process of planning and implementing the curriculum. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 5(5), 44–54. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jhsss.2023.5.5.6>
- Brauckmann, S., Pashiardis, P., & Ärlestig, H. (2020). Bringing context and educational leadership together: fostering the professional development of school principals. *Professional Development in Education*, 49(1), 4–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2020.1747105>
- Chabalala, G., & Naidoo, P. (2021). Teachers' and middle managers' experiences of principals' instructional leadership towards improving curriculum delivery in schools. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v11i1.910>
- Elep, V. C. (2024). Excellent and equitable school: A goal of every leader. Department of Education – Schools Division Office Camarines Norte. <https://depedcamnorte.ph/w/index.php/articles/admin-and-supervisors-articles/excellent-and-equitable-school-a-goal-of-every-leader.html>
- Esogon, S. G. T., & Gumban, J. L. (2024). Transformational leadership of school heads in public elementary schools in Bacolod City, Philippines. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VIII(IIIS), 3244–3255. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2024.803231s>
- Gamala, J. J., & Marpa, E. P. (2022). School Environment and School Heads' Managerial Skills: Looking into their Relationships to School's Performance. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, 4(2), 218–235. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijones.285>
- Iqbal, M., Munir, F., & Nawaz, F. (2021). Comparison of Principals' Instructional Leadership Style for Quality Learning between Public and Private Schools. *Global Educational Studies Review*, VI(1), 1–10. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2021\(vi-i\).01](https://doi.org/10.31703/gesr.2021(vi-i).01)
- Lincuna, M. L. B., & Caingcoy, M. E. (2020). Instructional leadership practices of school administrators: the case of El Salvador City Division, Philippines. *Open Access Journals*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3876710>
- Nhlumayo, B. S. (2024). Rural primary school principals' leadership strategies for ICT integration. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 9(1), 171–184. <https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2024.10>
- Shaked, H. (2023). How instructional leaders promote social justice. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 174114322311682. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432231168227>
- Symaco, L. P., & Bustos, M. T. A. (2022). Overview of Education in the Philippines. *International Handbook on Education in Southeast Asia*, 127.
- Verbo, R. J. C., Fernando, A. I., & Cabrera, W. C. (2023). Principals' Leadership Style towards the Implementation of Decentralized School-Based Management in Selected Secondary Public Schools in Mandaluyong City, Philippines. *International Journal of Economics Development Research (IJEDR)*, 4(1), 48–72. <https://doi.org/10.37385/ijedr.v4i1.970>
- Villanueva, A. A., Disu, S. S., & Villanueva, K. F. P. A. (2021). Assessing the school heads leadership in the towns of Nueva Ecija, Philippines: Inter-Relationship of supervisory skills, interpersonal skills and leadership skills. *OALib*, 08(11), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1108088>