

Instructional Supervision and Innovative Pedagogy in Building Capable Classroom Executives

Irish B. Barcenas, Elisa N. Chua

0322-3014@lspu.edu.ph, elisa.chua@lspu.edu.ph

Teacher I, Masiit Elementary School, Masiit, Caluan Laguna 4012, Philippines

Associate Professor 5, Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City, Laguna 4000, Philippines

Abstract

This study examined the relationship of instructional supervision and innovative pedagogy in the building of capable classroom executives in public schools. It assessed the level of supervisory practices in terms of clinical, developmental, differentiated, scientific, humanistic, and integrated supervision, pre-observation, actual observation, and post-observation processes. It evaluated the extent of innovative pedagogy utilization in terms of technology integration, differentiated instruction, contextualized and localized learning, and collaborative and inquiry-based learning. Moreover, the study determined the capability of classroom executives in terms of instructional competence, classroom management, reflective practice and decision making, pedagogical knowledge, and professional commitment. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected from teachers through a validated survey instrument and analyzed using mean and Pearson correlation. Results revealed that most instructional supervision practices and innovative pedagogical approaches were highly practiced/utilized. Innovative pedagogy was found to have significant positive relationships with instructional competence, classroom management and reflective practice with the strongest association in collaborative and inquiry-based learning. However, weaker or non-significant relationships were observed in pedagogical knowledge and professional commitment. Notably, some of the supervisory practices, especially pre-observation, were negatively or non-significantly associated with some capability domains, despite being widely practiced. This suggests that frequency of implementation does not necessarily translate into effectiveness and some supervisory processes may be more compliance than development focused. The study concludes that while instructional supervision is widely implemented, its effectiveness depends on the quality, depth and alignment of its iv practices. Innovative pedagogy plays a significant role in enhancing teachers' instructional and reflective capabilities. It is recommended that school leaders adopt a more integrated and developmental approach to supervision and strengthen the meaningful implementation of innovative teaching strategies to improve both teacher capability and student learning outcomes.

Keywords: Instructional Supervision; innovative pedagogy; classroom executives

1. Introduction

In today's fast-paced education system, the quality of teaching and learning depends not just on the ability of instructors, but also on the strength of the mechanisms that guide and assist them. Instructional

monitoring has long been seen as one of the primary tools to ensure that the teaching practices are in line with the curriculum standards and institutional objectives (Glickman, et al, 2018). It is not simply monitoring but also mentoring, coaching and professional assistance to teachers, providing an environment conducive to effective pedagogy. When done correctly, instructional supervision gives instructors with the resources, feedback and confidence to lead in their classrooms.

New pedagogy has also become a key driver of change in education. 21st century learning demands approaches that value creativity, critical thinking, collaboration, and the integration of technology into teaching (Fullan & Quinn, 2017). The innovative pedagogy put in discussion the current teacher-centered model, highlighting the involvement of students, differentiated education and context-based approaches. Responsive supervision together with this makes teachers expert classroom executives, leaders who can manage education effectively, make sound decisions, and promote the total development of students.

In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) highlights both monitoring and innovation on education through policies such as the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Furthermore, these frameworks show that effective education is also a function of instructional leadership, professional development, and learner-centered teaching (DepEd, 2019). But the reality of many public schools such as big class sizes, limited instructional resources, supervisory overload, and teacher preparedness levels make it difficult to implement these rules uniformly. Supervisors are often too busy with administrative work to provide personalized mentorship, and teachers struggle to use innovative instructional methods in resource-poor contexts.

Department of Education further states that instructional supervision is a professional, collaborative process that is intended to improve instruction. Teachers can enjoy guidance, help, exchange of ideas, facilitation and invention to improve learning environment and quality in schools. This program offers support to a colleague with advanced knowledge and skills working in the context of a school to develop a professional learning community requires a supervisor or an instructional leader.

Despite the fact that many studies have been conducted on instructional supervision and creative teaching approaches, little research has been done to explore the direct relationship between the two to help develop teachers into successful classroom leaders. Most of the previous research has focused either on supervision as a management role or innovative pedagogy as a classroom method but rarely on their combined impact on teacher development as instructional leaders. This gap is most pronounced in the Philippine context, where systemic issues need to be better understood in terms of how oversight and innovation can go hand in hand. Filling this gap is necessary to provide evidence-based strategies to improve both supervisory practices and pedagogical innovations in support of teacher leadership and professional development.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Instructional Supervision

Supervision is an essential component of the overall service provided by school systems. Instructional supervision is an essential role in improving the quality of teaching and learning in educational institutions. It is a systematic process of directing, supporting and enabling teachers to improve their instructional effectiveness and to achieve the desired learning outcomes.

Instructional supervision in the Department of Education (DepEd) is guided by the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), with an emphasis on developmental, collaborative and learner-centered approaches to supervision (DepEd, 2015, 2017). It requires an identity in the organizational structure and administrative support to carry out its objectives.

Supervisors and other educational leaders are expected to provide professional development, to form teacher teams or cohorts, and to empower teachers to make decisions about their instructional performance. It is recognized as an important function of leadership that enhances the growth of teachers, creativity in instruction, and improvement of the school. Instructional supervision has always been used as a tool to assess the effectiveness of the teacher.

However, contemporary systems, especially in the DepEd, focus on developmental and supportive supervision rather than inspectional supervision. Glickman, Gordon, and Ross Gordon (2018) defined instructional supervision as “the process of continuous evaluation and improvement of teaching practices through reflection, dialogue, and coaching.” Similarly, Aguinaldo and Torres (2023) report that Philippine school supervision has shifted to become more professionally collaborative in developing instructional skills, and moving away from just assessing teacher competence.

DepEd recognizes instructional supervision as a means of increasing teacher capacity and strengthening instructional leadership at the school level. Supervisors observe the classrooms, mentor, coach, and develop professional learning communities (PLCs) to ensure that the teachers achieve the goals indicated in the PPST domains. As such, supervision is a way of empowering teachers to be competent classroom leaders who can make sound instructional decisions and develop learner-centered environments.

Instructional supervision has evolved significantly as education systems, including the Department of Education (DepEd), recognize its critical role in improving teaching quality and professional development. Recent studies conducted across Philippine school divisions confirm that successful supervision comprises organized observation, differentiated advice, relational mentorship, and data-driven evaluation (Impasugong I District, 2024; DepEd Laguna, 2025). These approaches are aligned with the ideas of the Results-Based Performance Management System - Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (RPMS-PPST) and the MATATAG Curriculum, both of which emphasize teacher growth, reflective practice, and instructional leadership.

Recent Philippine study shows that supervision is not monolithic; rather, it adapts, combines, and borrows from numerous models to suit DepEd's standards (RPMS-PPST) 18 and the demands of teachers in various situations. These studies provide tangible examples of how different models are employed or indirectly recommended. Additionally, scholars have identified various models of instructional supervision that will cater the diverse needs and professional stages of teachers; (a) clinical, (b) developmental, (c) differentiated, (d) scientific, (e) humanistic, and (f) integrated.

2.2. Innovative Pedagogy

Pedagogies guide teachers' decision-making regarding teaching methods. Pedagogical innovation, like any other type of innovation, combines existing ideas, tools, or practices in innovative ways to solve difficulties when present practice fails to fulfil demands.

Teachers with access to high-quality education and professional infrastructures are better placed to choose effective pedagogies rather than improvising or basing them on personal experiences. Jensen et al., 2015 suggest the teachers should be able to make informed pedagogical choices and design approaches to learning based on the impact they wish to have.

Innovative Pedagogy involves different creative, research-based and student centered teaching methods that are designed to increase student engagement, create a deeper learning and improve learning outcomes. It moves away from conventional teacher centered methods to those that promote critical thinking, collaboration and flexibility. Creative pedagogy is the amalgamation of innovative methods, digital instruments and context-based approaches to learning that makes education relevant in the 21st century (Mishra and Koehler, 2016).

Kivunja (2018) described innovative pedagogy as a shift in the delivery of classroom teaching to a dynamic process that prepares students for the 21st-century abilities of communication, teamwork, creativity, and critical thinking. It inspires instructors to become facilitators of learning, to create experiences instead of providing knowledge. In the same vein, Laurillard (2019) stated that teaching innovation is not only about the use of technologies but also about the practices that encourage engagement, reflection, and empowerment of learners.

The Department of Education (DepEd, 2020) recognizes the role of contextualized, inclusive and technology-enhanced learning in Philippine educational system as provided in its K-12 curriculum implementation and Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan. Teachers should take on different approaches to cater to the diverse needs of learners yet remain relevant to local and global contexts.

Innovative pedagogy is a new and creative approach to teaching and learning that goes beyond traditional instructional approaches to improve students' engagement, motivation, and achievement (Ramos, 2020). It involves the use of techniques, technology, and learning designs that promote active participation, collaboration, and critical thinking among students. Innovation in pedagogy occurs when teachers are able to combine curriculum, pedagogy, and technology to respond to the diverse needs of their students, as Mishra and Koehler (2019) describe. Creative pedagogy in 21st-century education allows teachers to become learning facilitators and to allow students to develop higher-order thinking skills, creativity, and problem-solving skills.

In the 21st century classroom, the teacher needs to move away from being an information provider to being a facilitator of learning through innovative pedagogy. Fullan (2020) describes teachers as "learning designers" who use data, digital tools, and reflective practices to design dynamic learning experiences. The Department of Education (DepEd) (2020) also identifies innovation as an important element of professional practice for public school teachers in the Philippines consistent with the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers.

Moreover, good teaching requires innovation and adaptation. Fullan (2020) states that good teachers are change agents, who are flexible enough to adapt to the evolving educational environment, which involves the integration of technology, diverse student populations, and global expectations.

Innovative teachers use new pedagogies and technology, as well as research-based strategies, to improve instruction (Ramos, 2020). Adaptability, on the other hand, is related to the ability to be flexible when

confronted with instructional challenges such as curriculum changes, online learning, and learner diversity (OECD, 2021).

Instructional supervision provides a support structure for developing these skills by helping teachers to reflect, experiment and polish innovations in practice. Supervision and innovation come together to produce professional maturity and leadership in the classroom. The next subsections discuss the major dimensions of innovative pedagogy— (1) technology integration, (2) differentiated instruction, (3) contextualized and localized learning and (4) collaborative and inquiry-based learning.

2.3. Capable Classroom Executives

Effective classroom executives are teachers who exhibit excellent instructional leadership, professional competence and decision-making skills in the conduct of the teaching-learning process. These teachers are reflective practitioners and learning leaders and curriculum implementers who ensure quality instruction and student achievement.

Hallinger and Murphy (2017) believe that classroom executives have leadership attributes like school administrators, but function inside their own learning contexts. They are change agents, connecting policy and practice, and encouraging instructional innovation. This is in line with the goal of the Department of Education (DepEd) to produce teacher leaders through the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) in the Philippines (DepEd, 2017). It highlights the teachers' mastery of the subject matter and pedagogy and their capability to work professionally with others. The developmental role is supported by a number of mechanisms including (1) Instructional Competence, (2) Classroom Management, (3) Reflective Practice, (4) Pedagogical Knowledge, and (5) Professional Commitment of teachers.

3. Methodology

The researcher utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to determine the relationship between instructional supervision and innovative pedagogy in building capable classroom executives. This study involved teachers from the 22 public elementary schools in Calauan District, Division of Laguna. Specifically, 200 teacher-respondents from the total population of 382.

Descriptive research aimed at accurately and effectively describing a population, situation or wonder. It is described as a study approach that illustrates the qualities of the population under consideration. This method further focuses on the "what" of the study topic as opposed to the "why" of the research topic (McCombes, 2020).

On the other hand, a correlational research design estimated a connection between two factors without the analyst controlling both of them. It means to see if there is either a positive correlation, a negative correlation, or zero connection (McCombes, 2020). With the use of this research design, the researcher will determine the significant relationship of the variables being compared in the study.

4. Results and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to provide vital information regarding instructional supervision and innovative pedagogy in building capable executives of public elementary schools.

Table 1*Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices as to Clinical Supervision*

Indicators		Mean	SD	VI
1.	My supervisor observes my classroom teaching regularly.	4.60	0.49	HP
2.	My supervisor provides detailed feedback after classroom observations.	4.65	0.48	HP
3.	My supervisor uses structured observation forms such as checklists and rubrics.	4.62	0.49	HP
4.	My supervisor believes that observation is also used for professional growth.	4.63	0.48	HP
5.	My supervisor motivates me to improve my instructional practices through clinical supervision.	4.64	0.48	HP
Overall		4.63	0.48	HP

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Practiced at all (NPA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Practiced (SP); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Practiced (MP); 3.50-4.49 Practiced (P); 4.50-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)

Table 1 shows how the respondents perceive instructional supervision practices as to clinical supervision. All indicators under this supervision practices were consistently rate as Highly Practiced, with mean scores ranging from 4.60 to 4.65, and an overall mean of 4.63. This indicates that supervisors actively and consistently implement key components of clinical supervision which is crucial in ensuring that teaching practices are continuously monitored and improved. This means that principals and master teachers are effective instructional leaders and supervisors who develop a culture of supervision that is not compliance oriented but supportive of continued growth. Supervisors can use systematic classroom observation and formalized monitoring via checklists and rubrics to offer objective and constructive feedback to enhance instructional effectiveness.

Although classroom observation is a common practice, teachers may find it difficult with anxiety during observation, the pressure of an evaluative situation and time constraints for feedback. Some teachers find the feedback to be too technical or not immediately practical. Schools may support this process by emphasizing a coaching approach to supervision, creating a non-threatening environment for observation and providing feedback that is specific, constructive and timely. Encouraging reflective conversations rather than one-way evaluation may also support the growth of teachers.

The high ratings shows that post-observation conferences and professional dialogues are meaningful and contribute to teachers' reflective practice and instructional enhancement which serves as the culmination of the observation process and the most important step in encouraging professional development. DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017 (PPST) and DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015 (RPMS), underscores that the post-observation discussions should be based on PPST indicators and conducted using coaching and mentoring strategies.

Moreover, teachers perceive classroom observation not merely as an evaluative requirement but as a developmental strategy that fosters professional growth and strengthens their capability as classroom executives. Supervisors' motivational support further reinforces teachers' willingness to adopt improved and innovative pedagogical approaches in the teaching-learning process. This supportive supervision culture contributes to building teacher confidence, strengthening instructional competence, and promoting collaborative professional relationships within the school.

The consistently good ratings on all indicators suggest that clinical supervision is a well-embedded component of the school's framework for instructional supervision. Effective supervision techniques are of paramount importance in the enhancement of teaching performance and in the creation of competent classroom executives who are alive to the needs of creative pedagogy and quality instruction in the present

learning environment.

Clinical supervision is intended to improve teaching performance through the planned cycles of observation that comprise pre-conference, observation, and post-conference feedback sessions (Glanz, 2014). Jeffrey Glanz (2014) states that clinical supervision improves instructional efficacy. These formal supervisory contacts allow instructors to improve their delivery of education and classroom practices so increasing their capacity as classroom leaders.

In addition, structured rubric-based regular observation is an accountability measure for meeting the requirements of instruction and helps teachers to adopt creative teaching methods.

Thus, the strong implementation of clinical supervision practices suggests that school leaders actively support teachers' professional growth, enabling them to function more effectively as instructional managers and facilitators of learning.

Table 2

Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices as to Developmental Supervision

	Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1.	My supervisor adapts the supervision style based on my teaching experience.	4.55	0.52	HP
2.	My supervisor believes that less experienced teachers must receive more guidance, while experience teachers receive more autonomy.	4.49	0.56	P
3.	My supervisor and I have reflective conversations about my growth.	4.54	0.52	HP
4.	My supervisor allows me to self-direct my professional development.	4.52	0.54	HP
5.	My supervisor supports me through modeling, coaching, and mentoring.	4.46	0.57	P
	Overall	4.51	0.54	HP

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Practiced at all (NPA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Practiced (SP); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Practiced (MP); 3.50-4.49 Practiced (P); 4.50-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)

Table 2 shows how the respondents perceive instructional supervision practices as to developmental supervision. The overall result of 4.51 states that this supervision was highly practiced. It means that supervisors demonstrate awareness of differentiated supervision strategies that will allow them to give appropriate levels of support, ensuring that novice teachers receive guidance while experienced teachers are given autonomy. This creates a differentiated professional culture within the school. Also, align with teachers' level of experience and instructional competence, thereby strengthening teachers' capacity as classroom executives in dynamic teaching-learning environments.

Notably, three indicators were rated as highly practiced, while two indicators were rated as practiced. Although still positively rated, these slightly lower scores may suggest variations in how consistently differentiated supervision and coaching support are implemented across teachers. Possible reasons may include mismatch between supervision style and teacher needs, differences in supervisors' time availability, variations in mentoring structures, or unequal access to demonstration teaching opportunities and professional learning sessions. By having these challenges, supervisors may improve strategies that includes strengthening structured monitoring programs, enhancing instructional leadership training, and peer coaching systems.

The highest-rated indicator, which states that supervisors adapt supervision styles based on teachers' experience, reflects the presence of flexible instructional leadership practices that recognize teacher's developmental stages. Supervisors attempt to match the styles of supervision to the teachers' readiness for

instruction, providing support and autonomy as appropriate. Likewise, the high score on reflective conversations between supervisors and teachers regarding professional development, suggests that collaborative dialogue is a significant component of the supervisory process. These reflective conversations provide teachers the opportunity to analyze their teaching practices and identify ways to improve their performance in the classroom.

The same is true for the indicator that supervisors allow teachers to direct their own professional development, which further indicates that developmental supervision promotes teacher autonomy and professional responsibility, that is, teachers are encouraged to take the initiative to seek learning opportunities that are relevant to their instructional needs and career goals.

Nevertheless, the indicators for differentiated assistance for less experienced teachers and mentoring help through modelling and coaching, still in use, should be seen as potential for enhancing organized mentoring systems in the school. In actual classroom scenarios, beginning teachers may still require more regular example lessons, joint lesson preparation meetings, or guided classroom management support, while experienced teachers may need leadership positions like peer coaching or mentoring assignments. The further improvement of these practices could make the developmental supervision more effective and ensure more regular professional assistance in all groups of teachers.

Girma and Dawit (2023) show that pedagogical mentoring is very effective for the development of novice teachers and coaching for the competence of experienced teachers through peer collaboration and planned reflection.

According to Glickman et al., (2018), developmental supervision is an instructional leadership approach that adapts supervisory styles to a teacher's specific developmental level, expertise, and commitment. Its ultimate goal is to increase teacher's conceptual growth and independent problem-solving ability, moving them toward self-directed instructional improvement.

Similarly, reflective dialogues between supervisors and teachers allow for continuous professional learning and decision-making skills required for innovative pedagogical implementation. Through guided reflection, teachers become more capable of evaluating instructional strategies and improving classroom engagement practices.

Moreover, this supports the Department of Education's emphasis on career-stage progression in the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers that serves as the framework for the teacher development continuum, which aligns closely with Glickman's Developmental Supervision by recognizing that teachers need different types of support as they progress through career stages.

Table 3

Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices as to Differentiated Supervision

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. My supervisor allows me to work cooperatively with him/her when needed.	4.57	0.50	HP
2. My supervisor provides me with opportunities for self-directed supervision.	4.54	0.51	HP
3. My supervisor conducts formal administrative reviews as part of the supervision process.	4.55	0.51	HP
4. My supervisor provides flexibility in how I demonstrate my instructional competence.	4.54	0.51	HP
Overall	4.55	0.51	HP

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Practiced at all (NPA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Practiced (SP); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Practiced (MP); 3.50-4.49 Practiced (P); 4.50-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)

Table 3 shows how the respondents perceive the instructional supervision practices as to differentiated supervision. The overall result of 4.55 mean shows that this model was highly practiced which

means that supervisors consistently implement flexible supervision approaches that recognize teachers' varying instructional needs, professional strengths, and preferred modes of professional support. In the reality of school teaching-learning environment, differentiated supervision were used to empower teachers to take ownership of their professional growth. Encourages teachers for collaboration, innovation, and self-directed improvement which is strongly embedded in the school's instructional leadership practices that will allow them to be a capable classroom executive.

All four indicators were rated as highly practiced, indicating a uniform perception among teachers that supervisors provide opportunities for collaboration, autonomy, administrative guidance, and flexibility in demonstrating instructional competence. The highest rated indicator was that supervisors allow teachers to work jointly with them when necessary. This suggests an existing supportive professional relationship between teachers and their supervisors. Instructional leaders promote open communication and increased accessibility for teachers to seek aid to overcome instructional challenges and enhance classroom practices. For instance, a teacher dealing with group activities in the classroom should work with the supervisor to reframe teaching strategies to increase active participation and classroom engagement.

Similarly, the indicator that supervisors conduct formal administrative reviews during the course of supervision indicates the existence of formal monitoring systems for accountability and adherence to instructional standards. These reviews support the quality of instruction and provide clear expectations for teacher performance. Supervisors may conduct the performance reviews with specified evaluation tools to evaluate lesson preparation, classroom management, and assessment strategies to ensure instruction is provided in accordance with the institutional standards.

Supervisors who provide opportunities for self-directed supervision, indicates that teachers are encouraged to take initiative in evaluating and improving their instructional practices. This practice encourages reflective teaching and enhances professional responsibility. In a teaching-learning environment, teachers are given the freedom to choose instructional strategies independently such as the use of digital learning tools or the use of differentiated instruction techniques according to the needs of the learners with the guidance of supervisors when needed.

Similarly, the indicator that supervisors permit flexibility in how teachers demonstrate instructional competence suggests that supervisors acknowledge diverse teaching styles and professional strengths. This flexibility allows teachers to showcase their effectiveness through varied instructional approaches such as demonstration teaching, action research participation, collaborative lesson planning, or integration of innovative pedagogical strategies suited to their learners' contexts. Such supervisory support encourages creativity and responsiveness in instructional delivery.

Although all indicators were highly practiced, challenges may still occur and that includes lack of clarity in supervision options, unequal participation, and difficulty in monitoring individualized approaches. To improve, schools should provide clear supervision frameworks, monitor progress regularly, and strengthen Learning Action Cells (LACs) for collaborative learning which is supported by DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016 (LAC Policy).

Responsive supervisory system that recognizes individual teacher needs which is supported by the work of Allan Glatthorn, who emphasized teacher choice and professional independence in supervision.

Differentiated supervision according to (Charlotte, 2016), is effectively using evaluations to inform meaningful decisions on teacher needs, it occurs when school leaders recognize that teacher vary greatly in their readiness levels, their skill sets, and their confidence. It relates to the teacher performance because it provides a framework for professional growth designed to improve their instructional practices.

This also aligns with the Department of Education's push for teacher empowerment and personalized professional development under the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS).

Table 4*Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices as to Scientific Supervision*

	Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1.	My supervisor collaborates with me in collecting data about my teaching to guide supervision process.	4.52	0.51	HP
2.	My supervisor uses evidence-based techniques during supervision to improve outcomes.	4.58	0.51	HP
3.	My supervisor works with me to set hypotheses on how I can improve instruction and test them.	4.57	0.51	HP
4.	My supervisor encourages me to conduct classroom-based inquiry or action research.	4.51	0.53	HP
5.	My supervisor provides feedback based on empirical evidence.	4.55	0.51	HP
	Overall	4.55	0.51	HP

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Practiced at all (NPA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Practiced (SP); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Practiced (MP); 3.50-4.49 Practiced (P); 4.50-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)

Table 4 shows how the respondents perceive the instructional supervision practices as to scientific supervision. The overall result of 4.55 shows that this model was highly practiced. This means that supervisors consistently apply data-driven and evidence-based approaches in guiding teachers' instructional improvement, focusing on measurable teaching performance and learner outcomes. It reflects that supervision in schools is anchored on evidence, structured observation, and objective feedback mechanisms, which help teachers improve their instructional effectiveness in the teaching-learning environment. This also means that supervisors foster a culture of accountability and continuous improvement, using data to inform instructional decisions and teaching strategies.

All indicators were scored as highly practiced, signifying teachers' common perception that supervisors actively involve them in processes of evidence-based instructional improvement. The highest rated indicator is that supervisors use evidence-based practices in supervision to improve outcomes. This means that instructional decisions are informed by actual classroom data such as assessment results, learner performance, and observation records. This implies that teachers are required to align their teaching strategies with measurable outcomes, so that teaching practices directly address the needs of the learners. In a classroom situation, for example, a supervisor might sit with the teacher to review learners' formative assessment results to identify gaps in understanding and suggest targeted intervention strategies such as differentiated activities or scaffolded instruction.

Similarly, the indicator that supervisors work with teachers to set hypotheses on how instruction can be improved and test them also indicates that supervision promotes a reflective and inquiry-based teaching approach. This is evident in classrooms where teachers use specific strategies such as differentiated instructions or remediation and measure their impact using students' performance. For example, a teacher and supervisor might agree to use a new cooperative learning strategy to improve students' engagement and then assess the outcomes through observation and learner feedback.

Likewise, supervisors providing feedback based on empirical evidence collaborating with teachers in collecting data further support the idea that supervision is objective and collaborative. Teachers receive feedback that is specific, measurable, and aligned with observed classroom practices rather than general impressions. This allows teachers to know their strengths and areas for further development. In real teaching and learning situations, this is evident when supervisors use observation tools, student assessment outcomes and lesson artifacts as a framework for post observation discussions.

Moreover, the indicator related to encouraging teachers to conduct classroom-based inquiry or action research, while still highly practiced, may suggest an area that requires continuous strengthening. However,

teachers may experience difficulties in carrying out action research in authentic classroom situations because they lack time, are burdened with heavy teaching loads or do not have the technical knowledge. Newly qualified teachers, in particular, may need structured support in planning and carrying out research-based interventions, while experienced teachers may need opportunities to lead research initiatives or to share best practice across the school.

The consistently highly practiced ratings across all indicators confirm that scientific supervision is effectively implemented in the school setting. These practices strengthen teachers' ability to use classroom data, test instructional strategies, and engage in reflective inquiry processes that support continuous improvement. As a result, scientific supervision plays a significant role in developing teachers into capable classroom executives who are responsive to learner needs and committed to implementing innovative and evidence-based pedagogical practices in contemporary teaching-learning environments.

Guskey (2000) points out that data-driven supervision enhances instructional effectiveness by associating teaching practices with student learning outcomes. Marzano (2012) also states that successful supervision is based on measurable indicators and evidence-based feedback to improve teacher performance.

Thomas J. Sergiovanni (2007) defines effective supervision as the use of empirical evidence and professional reflection to direct the improvement of instruction and to build the accountability systems of teaching. Evidence-based supervision helps teachers identify effective strategies that improve classroom instruction and learners' performance.

In this regard, teachers can be guided through an inquiry process in the classroom to make instructional decisions that can be systematically assessed and improved, hence the importance of scientific supervision in developing teachers' analytical thinking, reflective practice and instructional leadership skills.

This is also in line with the implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and the use of the Classroom Observation Tool (COT) by the Department of Education which focus on measurable teaching standards and evidence-based evaluation respectively, to encourage teachers to use data in improving instruction, which is very much in line with the principles of scientific supervision. In public school teaching-learning environments, this ensures that instructional practices are not only monitored but also continuously improved through systematic and evidence-based processes.

Table 5

Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices as to Humanistic Supervision

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. My supervisor supports the testing and evaluation of instructional changes using measurable indicators.	4.59	0.50	HP
2. My supervisor shows genuine care for me as a person.	4.58	0.50	HP
3. My supervisor encourages me to express my thoughts, challenges, and teaching philosophies.	4.58	0.51	HP
4. My supervisor allows supervisory sessions to include reflection on my teaching philosophy.	4.57	0.52	HP
5. My supervisor facilitates discussions help me clarify my teaching purpose and values.	4.59	0.49	HP
6. My supervisor fosters a supportive and trust-filled relationship through humanistic supervision.	4.51	0.53	HP
Overall	4.57	0.51	HP

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Practiced at all (NPA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Practiced (SP); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Practiced (MP); 3.50-4.49 Practiced (P); 4.50-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)

Table 5 shows how the respondents perceive the instructional supervision practices as to humanistic supervision. The overall result of 4.57 shows that this model was highly practiced. This means that supervisors emphasize mutual trust, open communication, and supportive relationships, which help build teachers' confidence, motivation, and professional growth. It implies that school supervision is not only results-oriented but also in creating a positive and respectful teaching-learning environment where teachers are appreciated and motivated to improve their instructional practices as reflective professionals with individual needs, values, and teaching philosophies.

Interestingly, all indicators received high practice ratings, indicating that humanistic supervision is practiced uniformly in schools. However, slight differences in mean scores could mirror the varied experience of teachers with respect to these practices. These differences can be linked to leadership styles, communication patterns, opportunities for meaningful dialogue, and interpersonal relationships between supervisors and teachers. Supervisors may, however, enhance humanistic supervision through establishing stable communication channels, creating a psychologically safe environment, and ensuring that all teachers have the same level of support and heard.

Supervisors help teachers to try and assess improvements in instruction with measurable indicators. This shows a balance between provision of emotional support and professional progress. This shows that supervisors not only support teachers in enhancing their education, but also in developing a deeper sense of purpose and direction in their teaching. In classroom circumstances this may be seen when supervisors engage teachers in reflective discussions about the results of lessons and urge them to match their teaching practices with their professional goals and learner needs.

Similarly, the findings reveal that supervisors care about instructors as individuals and encourage them to communicate their views, concerns and philosophies of teaching, which demonstrates a trusting and open professional atmosphere. This provides a secure space for instructors to discuss problems, get advice, and work together to find solutions to instructional issues. This can be seen in real teaching-learning situations when teachers feel safe to share problems in the classroom such as problems with student engagement or problems with instruction without fear of being judged. In real teaching-learning contexts, teachers who face obstacles such as large class sizes, different learner requirements, or technology integration in instruction may be more confident to bring up such issues with their supervisors during mentoring sessions. This underscores the need of supporting leadership in promoting teacher well-being and sustaining professional engagement in DepEd contexts, amidst increased teaching demands and administrative obligations.

The high ratings also suggest that supervisors allow reflective supervisory sessions that help clarify teachers' teaching philosophy, purpose, and values, which strengthens teachers' sense of professional identity as classroom executives. For instance, during post-observation conferences, supervisors may guide teachers in reflecting on how their instructional strategies support learner-centered approaches, inclusive education, or values integration—key priorities in DepEd's curriculum framework. Such reflective discussions help teachers align their classroom practices with institutional goals while maintaining their individual teaching styles and strengths.

Moreover, it also confirms that supervisors have positive discussions that clarify instructional goals of teachers and create supportive and trustful relationships. Supervision is not just technical supervision but entails building positive interpersonal relationships that promote collaboration and openness. This may be shown in classroom contexts when supervisors acknowledge teachers' efforts in implementing innovative approaches such as contextualized instruction, differentiated learning activities, or use of technology to address diverse learners. Such supportive exchanges create a positive school climate that benefits both teacher performance and student involvement.

The consistently highly practiced ratings across all indicators demonstrate that humanistic supervision is effectively implemented and plays a vital role in strengthening professional relationships between supervisors and teachers, where teachers are expected to respond to diverse learner needs while meeting curriculum standards and performance expectations, humanistic supervision helps sustain teacher

motivation, reflective practice, and professional growth. As a result, this supervisory approach contributes significantly to the development of capable classroom executives who are confident, values-oriented, and responsive to the evolving demands of quality and innovative education which is consistent with DepEd's Coaching and Mentoring Framework (2019) and the use of Learning Action Cells (LACs) as collaborative spaces for teachers' reflection and development.

As supported by Sonia (2022), Humanistic supervision provides a healthy dialogue space between supervisor and teachers to jointly find solutions to the learning obstacle faced. In practice, the humanistic supervision model emphasizes three main aspects; good interpersonal relationships, effective communication, and empowering teachers to develop themselves. These three aspects serve as the foundation in forming professional, creative, and innovative teachers.

Table 6

Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices as to Integrated Supervision

	Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1.	My supervisor integrates multiple supervisory approaches to support teaching improvement.	4.49	0.52	P
2.	My supervisor considers teachers' individual needs and professional levels when providing supervision.	4.42	0.55	P
3.	My supervisor aligns classroom observations, feedback, and coaching as part of one coherent supervisory process.	4.42	0.54	P
4.	My supervisor balances accountability with professional support and development during supervision.	4.45	0.53	P
5.	My supervisor uses results from classroom observations are used to guide professional learning and instructional decisions.	4.50	0.54	HP
6.	My supervisor collaborates with teachers to plan strategies for instructional improvement.	4.54	0.53	HP
7.	My supervisor motivates me to try new or innovative teaching strategies through instructional supervision.	4.50	0.54	HP
Overall		4.47	0.54	P

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Practiced at all (NPA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Practiced (SP); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Practiced (MP); 3.50-4.49 Practiced (P); 4.50-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)

Table 6 shows how the respondents perceive the instructional supervision practices as to integrated supervision. The overall result of 4.47 states that this supervision was practiced. This means that supervisors demonstrate efforts to combine elements from various supervisory models to create a more holistic and balanced approach to instructional supervision. However, integrated supervision has been less consistently implemented than other supervision practices. This suggests that this approach exists but is not yet fully used to meet the different needs of teachers and the school context.

Integrated supervision is the coordinated use of multiple supervisory strategies (e.g., classroom observation, coaching, mentoring, reflective dialogue, and data-based decision-making) within one coherent support system. Although supervisors demonstrate efforts to apply these approaches, there are areas where implementation can still be strengthened to maximize instructional improvement and teacher development as capable classroom executives.

Three indicators were rated as highly practiced and four indicators were rated as practiced. This difference implies that although integrated supervision seems to be well-implemented in some areas, there are

areas for improvement, which could be attributed to factors such as time constraints for collaborative planning, difficulty in integrating several supervisory approaches, and differences in the instructional leadership skills of supervisors, as well as inability to synchronize observation, feedback, and coaching into a single cohesive system. These challenges could affect the consistency in the delivery of a fully integrated supervisory process. Supervisors may counteract this by increasing the use of structured planning, improving coaching structures and ensuring better alignment of supervision components in the school system.

The highest-rated indicators include using results from classroom observations to guide professional learning and instructional decisions and motivating teachers to try new or innovative teaching strategies, as well as collaborating with teachers to plan strategies for instructional improvement. The results indicate that the supervisors are good at connecting the results of supervision to real teaching practices and encouraging innovation in the classroom. This can be seen in the real teaching-learning situations when the supervisor uses the observation data to recommend concrete instructional strategies, and the teachers implement them to improve learner engagement and achievement.

Similarly, these highly practiced indicators suggest that collaboration and data-driven decision-making are key strengths of integrated supervision. Teachers are not only guided but also take an active part in planning improvements, encouraging professional growth and shared accountability in the school.

The indicators rated as practiced, however, such as combining different supervisory approaches, taking into account teachers' individual needs and professional levels, aligning observation, feedback and coaching into a coherent process, and balancing accountability with professional support, point to areas that may need further development. In practice, some teachers may experience supervision as fragmented, for example, receiving observation feedback without follow-up coaching, or experiencing evaluation-oriented supervision with limited developmental support. New teachers may need more scaffolded, continuous support while experienced teachers may need differentiated, flexible supervision that acknowledges their expertise.

The findings reveal some aspects of integrated supervision but need improvement of the regularity and congruence of supervisory methods. Schools may help by offering clearer frameworks for supervision, strengthening the collaboration between school leaders and providing training on how to blend different kinds of supervision effectively.

Instructional supervision should be a variable blend of approaches based on the developmental levels of the instructors and the demands of the school (Glickman et al., 2018). The integrated supervision model enables supervisors to move between directive, collaborative and non-directive styles as appropriate, increasing accountability and professional development.

Furthermore, this conclusion supports the Department of Education's emphasis on holistic instructional leadership where supervision is not limited to observation but also involves coaching, mentoring and professional development that is tailored to teachers' needs. Programs like the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and Learning Action Cells (LAC) emphasize the value of feedback, collaboration and continual improvement in the teaching-learning environment.

Table 7
Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices as to Pre-Observation

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. My supervisor discusses the objectives of the classroom observation before it takes place.	4.58	0.52	HP
2. My supervisor communicates clear expectations and observation criteria.	4.58	0.52	HP
3. My supervisor encourages me to identify specific areas for feedback prior to the observation.	4.59	0.50	HP
4. My supervisor clarifies instructional strategies to be observed prior the observation.	4.57	0.53	HP
5. My supervisor provides an opportunity for professional dialogue and reflection through the pre-observation conference.	4.57	0.52	HP
6. My supervisor aligns with my individual professional development goals with the observation plan.	4.61	0.50	HP
7. My supervisor compares feedback from previous observations is reviewed.	4.50	0.52	HP
Overall	4.57	0.51	HP

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Practiced at all (NPA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Practiced (SP); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Practiced (MP); 3.50-4.49 Practiced (P); 4.50-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)

Table 7 shows how the respondents perceive the instructional supervision practices as to pre-observation. The overall result of 4.57 states that this supervision was highly practiced. This means that supervisors consistently engage teachers in the planning phase of supervision, where lesson objectives, instructional strategies, and focus areas are clearly discussed prior to classroom observation. It reflects that supervision begins with a structured and collaborative preparation process, ensuring that both the supervisor and the teacher have a shared understanding of the goals and expectations of the observation. This contributes to a more focused and purposeful teaching-learning environment. The uniformly high ratings across all indicators tells that supervisors consistently implement structured and collaborative pre-observation processes prior to classroom visits that encourages teachers' transparency, and helps them prepare adequately, lowering anxiety and creating spirit of professional conversation.

Pe-observation conferences are effectively used by supervisors such as principals and master teachers as preparatory mechanisms to clarify expectations, align instructional goals, and support teachers' professional development. In the teaching-learning environment, strong pre-observation practices contribute to purposeful classroom observations that focus on instructional improvement rather than mere compliance monitoring.

It further shows that supervisors clearly discuss observation objectives, communicate expectations and criteria, and clarify instructional strategies prior to classroom observation, which reflects a transparent and supportive supervisory process. In actual classroom situations, for example, a supervisor may meet with a teacher before observing a lesson on differentiated instruction to agree on the specific teaching strategies to be monitored, such as learner engagement techniques, questioning strategies, or assessment methods. This preparation allows teachers to organize their lesson delivery more effectively and ensures that the observation process is aligned with intended instructional outcomes. Such practices are consistent with the implementation of classroom observation protocols aligned with professional standards and Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) indicators that guide teachers toward improved instructional performance.

Similarly, the findings indicate that supervisors encourage teachers to identify areas for feedback prior to observation and provide opportunities for professional dialogue and reflection through pre-observation conferences. This demonstrates that supervision is conducted through a collaborative rather than directive approach. In the teaching–learning environment, teachers may request feedback on specific aspects of instruction such as classroom management strategies, integration of technology, or implementation of learner-centered activities. These targeted discussions strengthen teachers' reflective practices and ensure that classroom observations address relevant instructional concerns. Collaborative planning is often supported through professional learning structures like Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions and mentoring conversations that reinforce continuous instructional improvement.

Moreover, this confirm that supervisors align observation plans with teachers' individual professional development goals and review feedback from previous observations, highlighting the continuity of the supervisory process. Classroom observation is not treated as an isolated activity but as part of an ongoing professional growth cycle. For instance, if a previous observation identified the need to strengthen formative assessment practices, the supervisor may coordinate with the teacher before the next observation to focus specifically on strategies such as exit tickets, performance tasks, or questioning techniques that promote learner understanding. Such alignment strengthens the coherence of instructional supervision and supports sustained teacher development within the classroom environment.

Structured classroom observation is an essential component of instructional quality assurance and teacher professional growth, strong pre-observation practices help ensure that classroom visits are purposeful, collaborative, and development-oriented. These practices contribute significantly to preparing teachers as capable classroom executives who are reflective, goal-oriented, and responsive to learners' needs while continuously improving their instructional strategies through guided supervision.

As supported by Jeffrey Glanz (2003), the conduct of pre-observation conferences is an essential component of clinical supervision because it establishes clear expectations, promotes professional dialogue, and ensures that classroom observations are purposeful and development-oriented rather than evaluative in nature. Also, pre-observation conferences help clarify instructional goals and observation focus areas, making supervision more collaborative and supportive of teachers' instructional improvement.

Table 8*Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices as to Actual Observation*

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. My supervisor observes the class objectively using the prescribed observation tool.	4.46	0.53	P
2. My supervisor captures both teacher strategies and learner engagement during the observation process.	4.51	0.52	HP
3. My supervisor minimizes disruption while observing the class.	4.50	0.53	HP
4. My supervisor emphasizes that classroom observation is a learner-centered pedagogy and must have effective use of materials.	4.55	0.52	HP
5. My supervisor gives me enough time and autonomy during the observation to demonstrate my teaching competencies.	4.48	0.57	P
6. My supervisor adheres to professional and ethical standards during observation.	4.44	0.52	P
Overall	4.49	0.53	P

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Practiced at all (NPA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Practiced (SP); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Practiced (MP); 3.50-4.49 Practiced (P); 4.50-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)

Table 8 shows how the respondents perceive the instructional supervision practices as to actual observation. The overall result of 4.49 states that this supervision was practiced. This means that supervisors generally observe the interaction between teachers and learners, as well as the instructional strategies used in

the classroom. However, the actual observation is carried out with a little less consistency compared to other phases of supervision, which shows that although there are observation practices, there are areas that need to be strengthened to make the observation process within the teaching-learning environment more objective, supportive and comprehensive.

While classroom observation procedures are generally implemented effectively, some aspects of the observation process still require strengthening to achieve a consistently highly practiced level, maybe because some challenges occur. Research today demonstrates that even when observation procedures are faithfully implemented, they often come with psychological and procedural burdens. A major concern is teacher anxiety; studies by Zaide (2017) and recent findings in the International Journal of Instruction show that teachers often perceive observations as high-stakes monitoring rather than supportive coaching. This perception creates a “delicate” environment where stress and discomfort may trigger instability in teaching. Also, the “observer effect” can often get in the way of the natural flow of the classroom as teachers and students may change their behavior when a third party is around, which can make it hard to get an authentic depiction of the instructional day. The problem of observer bias also remains a major barrier to achieving a “highly practiced” level of implementation. Minh et al. (2023) Assessment of observations for administrative or professional development purposes often results in subjective or inconsistent ratings and the lack of tight controls can allow the observer’s own background or subconscious biases to influence the outcome, thus reducing the reliability of the feedback given to the teacher.

To address these issues, the literature has advocated for the shift to more objective and collaborative frameworks. Asio and Riego de Dios (2019) have pointed out the importance of standardized tools, arguing that rubrics-based guidelines change the process from subjective opinion to evidence-based practice, and such tools allow teachers to perform more accurate self-assessment and lead to specific pedagogical improvements. Along with improved tools, observer training and non-intrusive techniques are seen as key to improving the process. Intensive training is the best way to reduce enumerator bias and to obtain consistency across different observers (World Bank, 2021). In addition, the use of pre-observation conferences—a key non-intrusive technique—has been shown to significantly reduce teacher anxiety. By establishing a shared focus and clear expectations before the observer enters the room, the process becomes a collaborative dialogue rather than a top-down inspection, ultimately promoting a more professional and effective school culture.

Actual observation is a critical and most important phase of instructional supervision because it provides direct evidence of teaching practices, learner engagement, classroom management strategies, and instructional delivery within the teaching-learning environment. Supervisors were asked to use the DepEd Class Observation Tool (COT) to capture and evaluate teacher performance against specific PPST indicators such as lesson delivery, classroom management, learner participation, and assessment procedures. Supervisors are actively engaged in observation activities; however, certain procedural and relational aspects of observation can still be enhanced to support teachers more effectively as capable classroom executives.

Indicators under highly practiced states that supervisor demonstrate strong awareness of observation protocols that prioritize authentic teaching-learning interactions. Such practice may be observed in classroom settings when supervisors neutrally observe learner participation during group work, observe the questioning techniques used by the teacher, and observe how the instructional materials such as visual aids, manipulatives, or digital tools support the lesson objectives without affecting the flow of instruction. This is aligned with the classroom observation standards of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) that highlights learner-centered instruction and evidence-based teaching practices. These strengths indicate that the observation processes are generally conducive to the improvement of the quality of instruction.

On the other hand, the indicator on practiced, although positive, presents opportunities for improvement in terms of consistency, transparency and teacher comfort during the observation process. The time available to supervisors in certain school settings may be limited so the length of classroom visits may be limited, resulting in shorter periods of observation that may not be representative of the range of teaching competencies that are on display during the lesson. Improvements in structured observation schedules and full

period classroom visits may help address this challenge.

Likewise, the indicator on objective use of prescribed observation tools may reflect the differences in the way observation instruments are understood or applied by supervisors. This may happen if observation rubrics are used primarily for compliance reporting rather than as tools for professional dialogue and development. Improvement of calibration sessions for school heads and instructional leaders in consistent use of classroom observation tools can further promote objectivity and reliability of observation results.

Professional and ethical adherence during observation may also reflect teachers' expectations for clearer communication, confidentiality, and supportive supervisory presence throughout the observation process. In classroom settings, improvement might include more structured pre-observation briefings, transparent note-taking procedures and more robust post-observation conferences clarifying how observation results support teacher growth rather than solely evaluation. Likewise, allowing teachers appropriate autonomy during observation, such as flexibility in lesson delivery without the sense of pressure to adhere strictly to scripted approaches, could further bolster teachers' confidence and instructional creativity.

The combination of highly practiced and practiced indicators proposes that classroom observation processes are functional and supportive but still developing toward full integration as a consistently reflective and developmental supervisory practice. Strengthening the consistent use of observation tools, ensuring adequate observation time, and reinforcing professional and ethical supervisory practices will further enhance the effectiveness of classroom observation in the teaching–learning environment. These improvements will help ensure that classroom observation serves not only as a monitoring mechanism but also as a collaborative process that supports teachers in refining instructional practices and responding effectively to diverse learner needs in contemporary classroom settings.

Table 9

Extent of Instructional Supervision Practices as to Post-Observation

Indicators		Mean	SD	VI
1.	My supervisor conducts post-observation conference shortly after the classroom observation.	4.50	0.55	HP
2.	My supervisor discuss specific strategies for improvement.	4.54	0.53	HP
3.	My supervisor supports me through follow-up mentoring or coaching sessions.	4.51	0.53	HP
Overall		4.52	0.54	HP

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Practiced at all (NPA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Practiced (SP); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Practiced (MP); 3.50-4.49 Practiced (P); 4.50-5.00 Highly Practiced (HP)

Table 9 shows how the respondents perceive the instructional supervision practices as to actual observation. The overall result of 4.52 states that this supervision was highly practiced. All indicators were high-ratings which means that supervisors consistently conduct meaningful post-observation activities that strengthen and support teachers' instructional improvement through timely feedback, reflective dialogue, and follow-up mentoring or coaching. Post-observation conferences are effectively implemented as an essential component of the instructional supervision cycle within the teaching–learning environment.

Supervisors conduct post-observation conferences shortly after classroom observations, demonstrating that feedback is provided while classroom experiences are still fresh and relevant. In actual classroom situations, this may involve a supervisor meeting with a teacher immediately after observing a lesson on learner-centered activities to discuss strengths such as student engagement strategies and areas for improvement such as pacing or assessment techniques. This practice supports the implementation of structured classroom observation processes aligned with the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS), where timely feedback is essential in strengthening instructional effectiveness and supporting teachers' professional growth.

Similarly, supervisors discuss specific strategies for instructional improvement suggests that post-observation conferences are not limited to general comments but include targeted recommendations that enhance teaching practices. For example, after observing a lesson where learners demonstrate varied levels of participation, a supervisor may recommend differentiated questioning strategies, use of cooperative learning techniques, or integration of formative assessment tools to improve learner engagement and understanding. Such strategy-focused discussions help teachers translate feedback into practical classroom actions that directly benefit the teaching-learning process.

Furthermore, supervisors that support teachers through follow-up mentoring or coaching sessions, extends beyond one-time feedback toward continuous professional support. In classroom environments, this may be reflected when supervisors schedule follow-up classroom visits, demonstration teaching sessions, or collaborative lesson planning activities to assist teachers in applying recommended instructional strategies. These practices are often reinforced through professional learning structures such as Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions and peer mentoring initiatives that strengthen collaborative professional development. Also, in the teaching-learning environment, strong post-observation processes help ensure that classroom observation results lead to meaningful professional reflection, targeted instructional adjustments, and sustained mentoring support. These practices play a vital role in developing teachers as capable classroom executives who continuously refine their teaching strategies and respond effectively to learners' diverse needs through guided supervisory support.

Table 10*Extent of Innovative Pedagogy Utilization as to Technology Integration*

	Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1.	As a teacher, I use digital tools (e.g., LMS, presentations, educational apps) to enhance instruction.	4.48	0.57	U
2.	As a teacher, I integrate technology into both content delivery and assessment.	4.54	0.57	HU
3.	As a teacher, I encourage learners to use technology for research and learning activities.	4.37	0.64	U
4.	As a teacher, I address different learning styles and needs through the help of technology.	4.47	0.59	U
5.	As a teacher, I am supported with school ICT training and technical assistance.	4.41	0.60	U
6.	As a teacher, I am confident in using technology to support innovative teaching strategies.	4.48	0.59	U
	Overall	4.46	0.59	U

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Utilized at all (NUA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Utilized (SU); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Utilized (MU); 3.50-4.49 Utilized (U); 4.50-5.00 Highly Utilized (HU)

Table 10 shows how the respondents perceive innovative pedagogy utilization as to technology integration. The overall result of 4.46 states that this pedagogy was utilized. Teachers generally integrate technology into their instructional practices; however, the utilization is not yet consistently at a highly utilized level across all indicators. Even though digital tools are already present in the teaching-learning environment, limited ICT resources became a challenge for some schools because it creates specific barriers such as insufficient equipment, limited internet connectivity, outdated technology, lack of technical support, and irregular power supply specifically those upland and small schools.

The teachers integrate technology into both content delivery and assessment was the only indicator under highly utilized, indicating that technology plays an important role in facilitating lesson presentation and

evaluating learner performance. It involves teachers using presentation software, interactive quizzes, digital worksheets, or learning management systems to present lessons and monitor learner progress. For instance, teachers can administer formative assessments using online tools or employ multimedia presentations to strengthen conceptual understanding. This means that teachers are becoming more adept in blending instructional content and digital assessment strategies to boost DepEd's push for 21st century teaching skills.

On the other hand, several indicators under practiced maybe experiencing challenges in school environments such as limited access to devices, unstable internet connectivity, insufficient ICT infrastructure, or limited opportunities for sustained technology-focused professional development. For instance, teachers may rely primarily on presentation slides or videos due to limited availability of computer laboratories, tablets, or reliable connectivity for learners' independent digital research activities.

Similarly, encouraging learners to use technology for research and learning activities obtained the lowest mean among the indicators, even though teachers recognize the value of learner-centered technology integration, classroom realities such as shared devices, time constraints, or varying digital literacy levels among learners may affect implementation. Improvement in this area may include increasing access to digital learning resources, strengthening school-based ICT support systems and increasing opportunities for learners to engage in technology-supported collaborative learning experiences.

Overall, Technology integration is usually widely used, but is still moving to higher levels of innovative pedagogical usage. Increasing infrastructure support, access to ICT training and learner-centered digital engagement opportunities will further improve teachers' ability to implement technology-driven instructional strategies. These improvements will help develop capable classroom executives who can effectively respond to the demands of 21st-century learning environments and support learners through innovative and technology-enhanced teaching practices.

Table 11*Extent of Innovative Pedagogy Utilization as to Differentiated Instruction*

Indicators		Mean	SD	VI
1.	As a teacher, I design learning activities that cater to varying learning styles and abilities.	4.50	0.54	HU
2.	As a teacher, I provide alternative tasks or projects to match learner readiness and interests.	4.49	0.56	U
3.	As a teacher, I use flexible grouping strategies during instruction.	4.53	0.51	HU
4.	As a teacher, I improve learner engagement and achievement using differentiated instruction.	4.50	0.55	HU
5.	As a teacher, I regularly monitor learner progress to guide instructional differentiation.	4.51	0.54	HU
Overall		4.51	0.54	HU

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Utilized at all (NUA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Utilized (SU); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Utilized (MU); 3.50-4.49 Utilized (U); 4.50-5.00 Highly Utilized (HU)

Table 11 shows how the respondents perceive innovative pedagogy utilization as to differentiated instruction. The overall result of 4.51 states that this pedagogy was highly utilized, which means the teachers consistently implement differentiated instructional strategies to address learners' diverse needs, abilities, and interests within the teaching-learning environment. Differentiated instruction was strongly utilized as part of classroom pedagogy and contributes significantly to improving learner engagement, participation, and achievement. These practices show the teachers' sensitivity to the diversity of learners and their commitment to inclusive and learner-centered instruction, which are the key priorities in the Department of Education (DepEd) curriculum framework.

Teacher's evidence designing learning activities that fit different learning styles and abilities and implementing flexible grouping tactics throughout instruction. This means that teachers are personalizing instruction to meet the needs of individual learners. In practice, the teacher would group learners based on their level of readiness, interests or learning styles for collaborative problem-solving tasks, reading workshops or project-based learning. Such strategies enable teachers to offer targeted support to struggling learners and enrichment for advanced learners further increasing classroom engagement and learning outcomes.

Similarly, the teachers improve learner engagement and achievement through differentiated instruction and regularly monitor learner progress to guide instructional differentiation. For example, teachers may use formative assessments such as quizzes, performance tasks, or observation checklists to determine learners' understanding and modify instructional activities to address identified learning gaps. This aligns with ongoing assessment practices that support mastery-based learning and ensure that instructional delivery responds to learners' evolving academic needs.

Moreover, the indicator stating that teachers provide alternative tasks or projects to match learner readiness and interests was only utilized. This slight variation may reflect practical classroom challenges such as limited instructional time, large class sizes, or resource constraints that sometimes affect teachers' ability to consistently prepare multiple versions of tasks or project options for learners. In some teaching-learning environments, teachers may prioritize whole-class activities due to time limitations associated with curriculum coverage requirements. Strengthening access to instructional materials, collaborative lesson planning through Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, and increased availability of contextualized learning resources may further enhance teachers' ability to implement alternative learning tasks more consistently.

Differentiated instruction was largely embraced as an innovative approach to teaching in the school setting. Teachers are highly dedicated to modifying instructional strategies, tracking the progress of learners, and fostering engagement through flexible learning experiences. With the assistance of the teaching-learning environment, with classrooms characterized by different levels of learner readiness, interests, and learning styles, the efficient implementation of differentiated instruction has an important role to play in strengthening inclusive education practices and in developing capable classroom executives who are able to respond effectively to the different academic needs of learners through adaptive and responsive teaching strategies.

Table 12

Extent of Innovative Pedagogy Utilization as to Contextualized and Localized Learning

	Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1.	As a teacher, I use examples, materials, or scenarios drawn from local experiences and culture.	4.51	0.51	HU
2.	As a teacher, I relate lessons into concepts to real-life community situations.	4.50	0.52	HU
3.	As a teacher, I utilized indigenous knowledge or local resources in the learning process.	4.45	0.55	U
4.	As a teacher, I increase learners' interest in lessons through contextualized teaching.	4.47	0.52	U
	Overall	4.48	0.52	U

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Utilized at all (NUA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Utilized (SU); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Utilized (MU); 3.50-4.49 Utilized (U); 4.50-5.00 Highly Utilized (HU)

Table 12 shows how the respondents perceive innovative pedagogy utilization as to localized learning. The overall result of 4.48 states that this pedagogy was utilized, which shows that teachers generally incorporate contextualized and localized instructional strategies in their teaching practices; however,

implementation is not yet consistently at a highly utilized level across all indicators which means that even though teachers recognize the value of connecting lessons to learners' local experiences and real-life contexts, some schools struggle to utilize local resources and contextualized materials primarily due to heavy workload and time constraints, inadequate teacher training, and over-reliance on standardized textbooks. To overcome these, schools may encourage to form community partnerships and conduct regular Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions to collaboratively develop and monitor the quality of local materials.

Indicators under highly utilized indicates that teachers effectively connect classroom instruction with learners' daily experiences, making lessons more meaningful and relevant. For instance, a teacher teaching about environmental conservation can relate the lesson to practices in the local community that students are familiar with such as waste segregation, coastal protection or agricultural activities. This is consistent with curriculum standards that promote contextualization and localization as important strategies to improve learner understanding and to strengthen links to community-based learning.

On the other hand, indicators under utilized suggest that while contextualized instruction is present, deeper integration of indigenous knowledge systems and structured use of local learning resources may still be developing in classroom practice. Some teaching-learning environments may pose challenges to teachers, such as limited access to documented indigenous learning materials, lack of training on culturally responsive teaching approaches, or limited opportunities to collaborate with community knowledge holders who can contribute to enrich classroom instruction through local expertise.

For example, teachers may relate lessons to the experiences of their communities, but may not always be able to incorporate indigenous problem-solving approaches, traditional ecological knowledge, or locally produced instructional materials due to time constraints, the need to cover curriculum content, or a lack of institutional support.

Contextualized and localized learning strategies are common, but are still being developed for higher levels of implementation. Improving teachers' access to culturally relevant instructional resources, strengthening professional development on localization strategies, and increasing community engagement in instructional planning can further improve the effectiveness of contextualized teaching practices. These improvements will support teachers in creating more meaningful learning experiences and strengthen their role as capable classroom executives who can deliver instruction that is responsive to learners' cultural backgrounds, community contexts, and real-life learning needs.

Table 13

Extent of Innovative Pedagogy Utilization as to Collaborative and Inquiry-based Learning

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. As a teacher, I organize learners into cooperative groups for collaborative tasks.	4.50	0.53	HU
2. As a teacher, I encouraged learners to ask questions and explore solutions independently.	4.46	0.54	U
3. As a teacher, I act as a facilitator who guides students' discovery and investigation processes.	4.39	0.59	U
4. As a teacher, I let my learners become independent thinkers through Inquiry-based learning.	4.47	0.50	U
Overall	4.46	0.54	U

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Utilized at all (NUA); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Utilized (SU); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Utilized (MU); 3.50-4.49 Utilized (U); 4.50-5.00 Highly Utilized (HU)

Table 13 shows how the respondents perceive innovative pedagogy utilization as to localized learning. The overall result of 4.46 states that this pedagogy was utilized which means that teachers generally implement collaborative and inquiry-based strategies in the classroom, where learners are encouraged to work together, ask questions, and actively participate in the learning process. However, compared to other

pedagogical approaches, this practice is applied with slightly less consistency, suggesting that while elements of collaboration and inquiry are present, they may not yet be fully maximized in all teaching-learning situations.

Notably, one indicator was rated as highly used and three indicators were rated as used indicating variability in practice. The practice of placing learners into cooperative groups appears to be common but deeper aspects of inquiry-based learning such as enabling independent thinking, facilitating discovery and encouraging student led questioning may not be universally practiced. Possible reasons for this may include time constraints, large class sizes, limited training in inquiry-based strategies and the pressure to meet curriculum requirements which can limit teachers' ability to fully engage learners in sustained inquiry and collaborative exploration. To address this, schools may consider improving professional development programs, providing instructional support and encouraging learner-centered strategies through collaborative planning and mentoring. Teachers organize learners into cooperative groups for collaborative tasks was the only indicator that is highly utilized, which tells us that teachers consistently implement group-based instructional strategies to promote learner interaction, shared responsibility, and teamwork during learning activities. In classroom situations, this may be observed when teachers assign learners to small groups to work on problem-solving activities, science investigations, role-playing exercises, or project-based learning tasks that require cooperation and shared decision-making. The high utilization of cooperative grouping reflects teachers' recognition of the importance of peer interaction in improving engagement and participation in the teaching-learning process.

On the other hand, the indicators under utilized needs further improvement and development. Teachers are trained to encourage questioning approaches based on inquiry, but learners are expected to ask their own questions and find their own answers. Some learners may lack the confidence to express their own ideas in an autonomous way, or they may be limited by the time available in lessons with regard to the breadth of inquiry activities, which may account for the slightly lower score. Teachers can facilitate question and answer sessions during lessons, although at times the pace of the curriculum may not allow for learners to embark on deeper investigations. Improving inquiry-based questioning techniques and providing more structured opportunities for exploration can further strengthen this teaching aspect.

Similarly, indicator stating that teachers act as facilitators who guide students' discovery and investigation processes, obtained the lowest mean, while teachers attempt to shift toward learner-centered facilitation roles, traditional teacher-directed instructional approaches may still be present in some classroom situations. For example, teachers may still provide direct explanations of lesson concepts before allowing learners to explore ideas independently, especially when addressing complex topics or preparing learners for assessments. Also, indicator stating that teachers help learners become independent thinkers through inquiry-based learning support development of learners' critical thinking skills, although opportunities for independent investigation may still be expanding. In classroom situations teachers may encourage learners to analyze case studies, interpret data from experiments, or propose solutions to real-world problems; however, structured inquiry cycles such as hypothesis testing, extended research activities, or independent learning projects may not always be consistently implemented due to time constraints or limited access to research resources.

Furthermore, Johnson and Johnson (2009) reported that cooperative learning significantly enhances students' achievement, interpersonal skills, and motivation when it is properly structured. Conversely, inquiry-based learning allows learners to think critically, pose meaningful questions, and acquire problem-solving skills that are vital for lifelong learning.

Moreover, this finding is consistent with the Department of Education's thrust towards learner-centered and constructivist approaches as embedded in the K to 12 curriculums. Teachers are encouraged to use strategies that promote collaboration, inquiry, and active learning to increase learner engagement and achievement. In the context of public-school teaching-learning environments, strengthening collaborative and inquiry-based learning can help develop independent, critical, and socially responsible learners.

Table 14
Capability of Classroom Executives as to Instructional Competence

	Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1.	I plan my lessons with clear and measurable learning objectives.	4.50	0.50	HC
2.	I use a variety of instructional strategies to address diverse learners.	4.49	0.55	C
3.	I align learning objectives, activities, and assessments.	4.45	0.55	C
4.	I integrate appropriate instructional materials and resources in my lessons.	4.50	0.51	HC
5.	I adjust my teaching strategies based on learners' understanding.	4.55	0.51	HC
6.	I present lesson content clearly and systematically.	4.51	0.50	HC
7.	I use assessment results to improve my instructional practices.	4.53	0.51	HC
8.	I deliver lessons that promote active learning.	4.57	0.50	HC
	Overall	4.51	0.52	HC

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Capable (NC); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Capable (SC); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Capable (MC); 3.50-4.49 Capable (C); 4.50-5.00 Highly Capable (HC)

Table 14 shows how the respondents perceive their capability as classroom executives as to instructional competence. The overall result of 4.51 states that teachers were highly capable and has strong instructional competence in planning, delivering, and assessing instruction aligned with learner needs and curriculum standards. The high level of competence suggests a high level of proficiency in the delivery of lessons and the presentation of content; however, the competent ratings in the alignment of assessment and the use of varied strategies suggest the need for further professional development that is specific to these technical areas. Classroom executives in the Department of Education (DepEd) classroom environment effectively utilize learner-centered strategies that are aligned with the goals of the K to 12 curriculum, especially in fostering active participation, differentiated instruction and assessment-based teaching practices. This also suggests that teachers are generally well prepared to teach in the classroom in ways which provide meaningful learning experiences and improve learner outcomes.

Teachers demonstrated high capability in instructional planning and delivery, as reflected in consistently strong ratings across all indicators. They effectively prepare their lesson with clear and measurable objectives based on MELCs so that lessons are well organized and focused on a specific outcome. Teachers integrate the use of appropriate instructional materials and resources such as visual, digital and contextualized resources to enhance learner's understanding even with limited resources.

Similarly, teachers are knowledgeable in adapting their teaching methods to the needs of learners, providing remediation, scaffolding, and enrichment activities to suit the different levels of learning. In addition, lesson content is presented in a logical and coherent way, which helps students to understand the progression of the lesson and to remember important concepts. Teachers regularly use assessment outcomes to improve their teaching, to identify areas where students are struggling and to put in place targeted support.

Notably, the highest rating was noted in encouraging active learning, which means that teachers typically use collaborative, performance, and interactive strategies that enhance the learners' engagement, participation, and critical thinking. All in all, these results indicate consistent, responsive, and learner-centered teaching practices according to DepEd standards.

Generally, classroom executives demonstrate strong instructional competence, particularly in lesson

planning, resource integration, adaptive teaching strategies, assessment utilization, and active learning facilitation. However, strengthening teachers' capacity to consistently implement diverse instructional strategies and maintain full alignment among objectives, activities, and assessments can further enhance instructional effectiveness. In the teaching-learning environment, continuous participation in Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, instructional coaching, and professional development programs can support teachers in sustaining and further improving their instructional competence, thereby reinforcing their role as capable classroom executives who effectively facilitate meaningful learning experiences.

Table 15.*Capability of Classroom Executives as to Classroom Management*

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I establish clear classroom rules and expectations for learners.	4.53	0.50	HC
2. I maintain a positive and respectful learning environment.	4.55	0.51	HC
3. I manage learner behavior effectively and fairly.	4.54	0.0	HC
4. I maximize instructional time by minimizing classroom disruptions.	4.57	0.51	HC
5. I use classroom routines that support smooth lesson flow.	4.54	0.51	HC
6. I apply consistent consequences for inappropriate behavior.	4.51	0.54	HC
7. I promote learner engagement and participation in class activities.	4.54	0.53	HC
8. I handle classroom challenges calmly and professionally.	4.53	0.52	HC
Overall	4.54	0.51	HC

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Capable (NC); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Capable (SC); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Capable (MC); 3.50-4.49 Capable (C); 4.50-5.00 Highly Capable (HC)

Table 15 shows how the respondents perceive their capability as classroom executives as to classroom management. The overall result of 4.54 indicates that teachers were highly capable, showing strong competence in maintaining structured, organized, and learner-centered classroom environments that foster effective teaching and learning. Effective classroom management is crucial in maximizing instructional time and keeping the learners actively engaged in meaningful learning activities. Consistent use of management strategies that promote discipline, cooperation, participation, and respect among the learners, thereby contributing to a positive classroom climate conducive to academic success (DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012).

Teachers demonstrated high capability in classroom management practices across all indicators, reflecting their effectiveness in maintaining structured, respectful, and learner-centered learning environments. They consistently establish clear classroom rules and expectations, helping learners understand responsibilities and behavioral standards aligned with Department of Education policies. Also, teachers foster positive and respectful classroom environments, promoting inclusive participation through fairness, empathy, and supportive teacher-learner relationships. Strong competence was observed in managing learner behavior effectively and fairly, ensuring smooth lesson implementation even in diverse classroom settings.

Notably, the highest-rated indicator showed teachers are highly capable of maximizing instructional time by minimizing disruptions, demonstrating efficient routines, organized transitions, and sustained learner engagement. Teachers further support learning continuity by implementing structured classroom routines and applying consistent, constructive consequences for inappropriate behavior, reinforcing accountability while maintaining supportive discipline practices.

Additionally, teachers effectively promote learner participation through interactive and collaborative activities, strengthening engagement and responsibility for learning. They also demonstrate professionalism by handling classroom challenges calmly and effectively, ensuring stable and productive learning environments. Overall, the findings highlight teachers' strong classroom leadership and their ability to maintain organized, respectful, and engaging instructional settings.

Table 16.*Capability of Classroom Executives as to Reflective Practice and Decision Making*

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I reflect on my teaching practices to identify areas for improvement.	4.49	0.57	C
2. I analyze the effectiveness of my lessons after implementation.	4.52	0.50	HC
3. I use feedback from supervisors and peers to improve my teaching.	4.50	0.51	HC
4. I make instructional decisions based in evidence and reflection.	4.57	0.50	HC
5. I identify teaching strategies that work well and continue to refine them.	4.55	0.57	HC
6. I modify my teaching based on learner outcomes.	4.52	0.51	HC
7. I consider alternative solutions when instructional challenges arise.	4.58	0.51	HC
8. I make better decisions in managing my classroom through reflection.	4.54	0.50	HC
Overall	4.53	0.52	HC

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Capable (NC); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Capable (SC); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Capable (MC); 3.50-4.49 Capable (C); 4.50-5.00 Highly Capable (HC)

Table 16 shows how the respondents perceive their capability as classroom executives as to reflective practice and decision making. The overall result of 4.53 states that teachers were highly capable, consistently demonstrate the ability to evaluate their instructional practices, utilize feedback, and make informed decisions that improve teaching effectiveness and learner outcomes. Teaching–learning environment, reflective practice plays a critical role in strengthening instructional quality, supporting continuous professional growth, and ensuring that teaching strategies remain responsive to learners' needs.

Teachers reflect on their teaching practices to identify areas for improvement was practiced rather than highly practiced. Although teachers demonstrate regular engagement in reflective activities, the slightly lower mean suggests that reflection may sometimes occur informally rather than through structured documentation such as reflective journals, lesson study participation, or systematic post-lesson analysis. In classroom situations, teachers may recognize challenges encountered during lesson delivery—such as learners' difficulty understanding a concept—but may not always have sufficient time to formally document reflections due to workload demands, multiple teaching preparations, and administrative responsibilities common in school settings.

Teachers demonstrated high capability in reflective teaching and evidence-based instructional decision-making, highlighting their commitment to continuous professional improvement. They consistently analyze lesson effectiveness after implementation, using learner performance, participation, and assessment results to guide reteaching or enrichment strategies. Also, teachers effectively use feedback from supervisors and peers to enhance instructional practices, classroom management, and assessment approaches within the

teaching–learning environment. Notably, one of the highest-rated indicators showed that teachers make instructional decisions based on evidence and reflection, demonstrating strong use of assessment data and classroom observations to adjust lesson pacing, materials, and strategies.

In addition, teachers actively identify and refine effective teaching strategies, sustain approaches that improve learner engagement, and modify instruction based on learner outcomes through remediation, enrichment, and differentiated activities. The highest mean rating highlighted teachers' strong ability to consider alternative solutions when instructional challenges arise, reflecting adaptability despite resource or time constraints.

Finally, teachers consistently use reflective practices to improve classroom management decisions, resulting in more organized, responsive, and learner-centered learning environments. instructional planning, problem-solving, and improved learner achievement.

Overall, the findings indicate that classroom executives demonstrate strong reflective practice and decision-making competence, particularly in analyzing lesson effectiveness, using supervisory feedback, modifying instruction based on learner outcomes, and applying evidence-based strategies. However, strengthening structured and documented reflective practices can further enhance teachers' professional growth and instructional effectiveness. Encouraging participation in collaborative reflection activities such as mentoring programs, and lesson study initiatives within schools can help sustain reflective teaching practices and reinforce teachers' roles as capable classroom executives committed to continuous instructional improvement.

Table 17
Capability of Classroom Executives as to Pedagogical Knowledge

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I understand appropriate teaching strategies for my subject area.	4.54	0.50	HC
2. I apply theories of learning to improve instructional delivery.	4.52	0.50	HC
3. I use learner-centered approaches in my teaching.	4.53	0.50	HC
4. I understand how learners acquire knowledge and skills.	4.47	0.51	C
5. I adapt my teaching methods to different learning styles.	4.52	0.50	HC
6. I integrate current pedagogical trends into my teaching practice.	4.50	0.50	HC
7. I select instructional strategies that support higher-order thinking skills.	4.50	0.50	HC
Overall	4.51	0.50	HC

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Capable (NC); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Capable (SC); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Capable (MC); 3.50-4.49 Capable (C); 4.50-5.00 Highly Capable (HC)

Table 17 shows how the respondents perceive their capability as classroom executives as to pedagogical knowledge. The overall result of 4.51 states that teachers were highly capable, possessing strong knowledge of teaching principles, instructional strategies, and learner-centered approaches necessary for effective lesson delivery. In the teaching–learning environment, pedagogical knowledge plays a vital role in ensuring that instruction aligns with curriculum standards, learner diversity, and 21st-century educational goals. This suggest that teachers demonstrate competence in applying appropriate teaching strategies, integrating learning theories, and promoting higher-order thinking skills that support the development of capable classroom executives.

Teachers demonstrated high capability in applying subject-specific pedagogical strategies and

learner-centered approaches, reflecting strong alignment between instructional methods, content requirements, and learner needs. They effectively apply learning theories such as constructivism, experiential learning, and differentiated instruction to improve lesson delivery and learner engagement. Teachers also consistently implement learner-centered strategies, including group work, project-based activities, and performance tasks. In addition, they show strong competence in adapting teaching methods to diverse learning styles, integrating current pedagogical trends and technology, and selecting strategies that promote higher-order thinking skills, supporting learners' critical thinking and problem-solving abilities.

However, teachers were rated capable in understanding how learners acquire knowledge and skills, indicating that while they recognize learner differences, further strengthening in applying cognitive development principles and individualized learning pathways is still needed.

Classroom executives demonstrate strong pedagogical knowledge competence, particularly in applying teaching strategies, integrating learning theories, implementing learner-centered approaches, adapting instruction to learner diversity, and promoting higher-order thinking skills. However, strengthening teachers' deeper understanding of how learners acquire knowledge and skills—especially through continuous professional development programs such as instructional coaching, and training on learning sciences—can further enhance instructional effectiveness. These improvements will reinforce teachers' roles as capable classroom executives who can effectively respond to diverse learner needs within their own dynamic teaching–learning environments.

Table 18
Capability of Classroom Executives as to Professional Commitment

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I demonstrate dedication to my teaching responsibilities.	4.50	0.52	HC
2. I participate in professional development activities.	4.53	0.51	HC
3. I improve my teaching competence.	4.54	0.50	HC
4. I uphold ethical standards in my professional practice.	4.51	0.50	HC
5. I collaborate with colleagues to improve teaching and learning.	4.49	0.52	HC
6. I take responsibility for my learners' academic progress.	4.49	0.56	HC
7. I show enthusiasm and motivation in performing my teaching duties.	4.55	0.51	HC
8. I commit to the goals and vision of my school.	4.59	0.49	HC
Overall	4.53	0.51	HC

Legend: 1.00-1.49 Not Capable (NC); 1.50-2.49 Slightly Capable (SC); 2.50-3.49 Moderately Capable (MC); 3.50-4.49 Capable (C); 4.50-5.00 Highly Capable (HC)

Table 18 shows how the respondents perceive their capability as classroom executives as to professional commitment. The overall result of 4.53 states that teachers were highly capable, demonstrating strong dedication to their professional responsibilities, continuous improvement, ethical practice, and collaboration within the school community. Teachers actively uphold professional standards and align their practices with institutional goals, which strengthens their role as capable classroom executives who contribute positively to school improvement and learner achievement.

Teachers demonstrated high capability in professional responsibility, commitment, and ethical practice, reflecting strong dedication to instructional duties and alignment with school goals. They consistently fulfill teaching responsibilities, prepare lessons aligned with MELCs, and maintain active class

engagement, ensuring continuity of instruction in line with expectations of the Department of Education. Also, teachers actively participate in professional development activities such as Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, seminars, and instructional coaching, supporting continuous improvement of teaching competence. They demonstrate strong professional ethics, maintaining fairness, confidentiality, and respectful relationships with learners, parents, and colleagues.

In addition, teachers show strong commitment through collaboration with colleagues and accountability for learners' academic progress, although structured collaboration opportunities may still be further strengthened due to workload and time constraints. Teachers likewise exhibit enthusiasm and motivation in performing teaching duties, contributing to engaging and supportive learning environments.

Classroom executives demonstrate strong professional commitment competence, particularly in maintaining ethical standards, participating in professional development activities, supporting learners' academic progress, collaborating with colleagues, and aligning with school goals and vision. Sustaining these practices through continued engagement in professional learning communities, mentoring programs, and instructional supervision support can further strengthen teachers' professional commitment and reinforce their effectiveness as capable classroom executives in dynamic DepEd teaching–learning environments.

Table 19*Instructional Supervision Practices and Capability of Classroom Executives*

Instructional Supervision	Capability of Classroom Executives				
	Instructional Competence	Classroom Management	Reflective Practice and Decision Making	Pedagogical Knowledge	Professional Commitment
Supervisory Models					
Clinical Supervision	0.054	-0.08	-0.099	0.027	-0.034
Developmental Supervision	0.059	-0.068	-0.054	0.013	-0.001
Differentiated Supervision	0.172*	0.068	0.016	-0.048	-0.099
Scientific Supervision	0.042	-0.018	-0.073	-0.043	-0.151*
Humanistic Supervision	0.391***	0.251***	0.143*	0.061	-0.062
Integrated Supervision	0.480***	0.247***	0.163*	0.054	-0.127
Classroom Observation					
Pre- Observation	0.552***	0.302***	0.269***	0.156*	-0.047
Actual Observation	0.635***	0.393***	0.339***	0.211**	0.067
Post Observation	0.626***	0.376***	0.318***	0.232***	0.13

****Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). Verbal Interpretation of r-value: +1.0 Perfect positive +/- association +0.8 to +1.0 Very strong +/- association +0.6 to +0.8 Strong +/- association +0.4 to +0.6 Moderate +/- association +0.2 to +0.4 Weak +/- association 0.0 to +0.2 Very weak +/- or no association**

Table 19 shows that there is no significant relationship between instructional supervision and the capability of classroom executives except for differentiated supervision, humanistic supervision and integrated supervision as to Instructional Competence (IC), Classroom Management (CM), and Reflective Practice and Decision Making (RPDM).

However, there is a significant relationship between classroom observation except for Professional Commitment (PC).

Among the supervisory models, clinical supervision showed weak correlations with all capability of classroom executive domain, indicating that its influence on teachers' capability may be limited when implemented without consistent follow-through activities such as mentoring or coaching. In classroom situations, clinical supervision may occur through occasional lesson observations; however, if these are not supported by structured feedback conferences or collaborative reflection, their impact on teachers' professional competence may remain minimal.

Similarly, developmental supervision also demonstrated weak relationships across capability domains. This suggests that although developmental supervision aims to support teachers according to their professional growth stages, its effectiveness may vary depending on the availability of individualized mentoring support. In DepEd classrooms, teachers often manage large classes and administrative tasks, which may limit opportunities for sustained developmental coaching despite its intended benefits.

In contrast, differentiated supervision showed a significant positive relationship with instructional competence suggesting that supervision tailored to teachers' needs contributes to improving instructional planning and delivery. For example, teachers who receive targeted guidance on differentiated instruction strategies may become more effective in addressing diverse learner needs through flexible grouping, varied assessment approaches, and contextualized lesson activities.

Scientific supervision demonstrated mostly weak relationships, except for a significant negative weak relationship with professional commitment. This may indicate that when supervision is heavily focused on procedural compliance or documentation requirements rather than instructional support, teachers may perceive it as evaluative rather than developmental. This finding suggests that as the use of highly structured, data-driven, and performance-focused supervision increases, there may be a corresponding decrease in teachers' sense of professional commitment. This inverse relationship implies that overly rigid or technical supervisory approaches may unintentionally reduce teachers' motivation, autonomy, or emotional engagement in their profession. In actual teaching-learning environments, particularly in public schools, this may be observed when supervision heavily emphasizes performance metrics, documentation, and compliance requirements, such as strict adherence to observation tools, reports, and measurable outcomes. While these are essential for accountability, excessive focus on quantitative indicators may lead teachers to feel pressured, monitored, or evaluated rather than supported. As a result, teachers may comply with requirements but experience reduced intrinsic motivation, sense of ownership, or professional satisfaction. This negative relationship may also be influenced by contextual factors such as heavy workload, time constraints, and administrative demands commonly experienced in public school settings. When teachers are required to continuously produce data, reports, and measurable outputs without sufficient emotional or professional support, supervision may be perceived as a compliance-driven process rather than a developmental one. This can affect teachers' commitment, as they may feel that their professional growth is secondary to meeting institutional requirements.

In contrast, humanistic supervision showed moderate significant relationships with instructional competence, weak significant relationships with classroom management, and reflective practice and decision making. This finding suggests that supportive supervisory approaches emphasizing trust, encouragement, and collaboration positively influence teachers' professional growth. In classroom situations, teachers who receive constructive feedback and emotional support from school heads are more confident in implementing learner-centered strategies, managing classroom behavior effectively, and reflecting on instructional practices.

Similarly, integrated supervision demonstrated the strongest relationships among supervisory models, showing moderate significant correlations with instructional competence, classroom management, and reflective practice and decision making. This implies that combining multiple supervisory approaches—such as mentoring, observation, collaboration, and feedback—creates a more comprehensive support system for teachers. In teaching-learning environments, integrated supervision may involve classroom observations

followed by coaching sessions and participation in Learning Action Cell (LAC) discussions, which strengthen teachers' instructional capabilities.

Classroom observation practices, particularly the pre-observation, despite being rated as highly practiced in Table 7, showed moderate significant positive relationships with instructional competence, classroom management, reflective practice and decision making, but a weak significant relationship with pedagogical knowledge and a negative correlation with professional commitment. This indicates that although pre-observation conferences are consistently conducted, they may not necessarily lead to improved teacher capability. This inverse relationship suggests that the frequency of implementation does not always equate to effectiveness, particularly when the process becomes procedural rather than developmental.

One possible explanation is that pre-observation practices may be carried out as part of compliance requirements, focusing primarily on discussing lesson objectives, observation criteria, and documentation, rather than engaging teachers in deep reflective thinking and instructional problem-solving. In actual public-school settings, pre-observation conferences are sometimes conducted within limited time frames due to heavy workload and scheduling constraints, which may result in surface-level discussions that do not significantly influence classroom practice.

Furthermore, there may be a misalignment between the focus of pre-observation and the actual instructional needs of teachers. While objectives and expectations are clarified, the process may not always address specific classroom challenges such as learner diversity, engagement strategies, or instructional difficulties. As a result, teachers may enter the observation phase with clear expectations but without meaningful guidance that enhances their teaching competence.

Similarly, actual observation practices demonstrated the strongest correlations among all supervision components, particularly with instructional competence, classroom management, reflective practice and decision making, and pedagogical knowledge. These results suggest that direct classroom observation provides valuable opportunities for supervisors to identify strengths and areas for improvement in teaching practices. In DepEd classroom environments, supervisors who observe instructional delivery using standardized observation tools can provide targeted feedback that enhances lesson implementation, learner engagement, and classroom organization.

Likewise, post-observation practices showed moderate significant relationships with instructional competence, classroom management, reflective practice and decision making, and pedagogical knowledge. This finding highlights the importance of post-observation conferences in strengthening teachers' reflective skills and instructional adjustments. In classroom situations, teachers who participate in structured feedback sessions after observations are more likely to refine lesson strategies, improve classroom routines, and modify instructional approaches based on supervisor recommendations.

However, classroom observation practices showed no significant relationship with professional commitment, suggesting that teachers' dedication to their profession may be influenced more by personal motivation, institutional culture, and professional values rather than supervisory observation alone. In DepEd settings, professional commitment is often shaped by teachers' intrinsic motivation, participation in school programs, and alignment with institutional goals rather than solely by observation-based supervision.

Overall, the findings indicate that classroom observation practices are stronger predictors of teacher capability than supervisory models alone, particularly in enhancing instructional competence, classroom management, reflective practice, and pedagogical knowledge. This suggests that structured observation processes—especially when implemented through pre-observation planning, actual observation, and post-observation feedback—play a critical role in building capable classroom executives.

The variation in correlation strengths among supervisory models may be attributed to differences in implementation consistency, availability of mentoring support, workload constraints, and school leadership practices within DepEd teaching-learning environments. Supervisory approaches that emphasize collaboration, feedback, and professional support—such as humanistic and integrated supervision—tend to produce stronger positive relationships with teacher capability domains compared with more compliance-

oriented approaches.

These results imply that strengthening structured classroom observation systems and promoting supportive supervisory practices can significantly enhance teachers' instructional competence and professional growth. Encouraging collaborative supervision through mentoring, coaching, and Learning Action Cell (LAC) participation can further reinforce teachers' roles as capable classroom executives who effectively manage dynamic teaching–learning environments and support improved learner outcomes.

Table 20

Innovative Pedagogy and Capability of Classroom Executives

Innovative Pedagogy	Capability of Classroom Executives				
	Instructional Competence	Classroom Management	Reflective Practice and Decision Making	Pedagogical Knowledge	Professional Commitment
Technology Integration	0.563***	0.321***	0.298***	0.154*	0.019
Differentiated Instruction	0.722***	0.486***	0.389***	0.250***	0.097
Contextualized and Localized Learning	0.734***	0.480***	0.421***	0.290***	0.097
Collaborative and Inquiry- Based Learning	0.835***	0.549***	0.421***	0.289***	0.194**

***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). Verbal Interpretation of r-value: +1.0 Perfect positive +/- association +0.8 to +1.0 Very strong +/- association +0.6 to +0.8 Strong +/- association +0.4 to +0.6 Moderate +/- association +0.2 to +0.4 Weak +/- association 0.0 to +0.2 Very weak +/- or no association*

Table 20 presents the relationship between innovative pedagogy and the capability of classroom executives. It indicates that there is a significant relationship between innovative pedagogy and the capability of classroom executives except for Professional Commitment (PC).

The results revealed moderate to very strong significant positive correlations between innovative pedagogy components and most capability domains, particularly instructional competence, classroom management, reflective practice, and pedagogical knowledge. These findings indicate that the more teachers utilize innovative pedagogical approaches, the higher their capability as classroom executives becomes. As supported by the policies and frameworks from the Department of Education, particularly the Results-Based Performance Management System aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers, highlight that effective teaching involves the use of varied and responsive pedagogical strategies to address learners' diverse needs. As teachers increasingly apply innovative approaches, they become more adept at organizing instruction, facilitating engagement, and making real-time adjustments in the classroom. This strengthens their overall instructional leadership and management capacity. However, the relationship between innovative pedagogy and professional commitment appears weaker, suggesting that commitment may be influenced more by intrinsic motivation, institutional culture, and professional values rather than instructional strategies alone.

Instructional Competence shows a strong positive correlation with innovative pedagogy, particularly under collaborative and inquiry-based learning, contextualized and localized learning, and differentiated instruction. This indicates that teachers who actively implement innovative teaching strategies are more effective in planning, delivering, and evaluating instruction.

This strong relationship exists because innovative pedagogy requires teachers to design lessons that are learner-centered, adaptive, and engaging, which directly enhances instructional skills. In classroom

situations, teachers who use inquiry-based tasks, real-life contextual examples, and differentiated activities demonstrate stronger mastery of content delivery and instructional design. These practices align closely with instructional competence, making the relationship highly significant.

This finding is supported by Sagun (2025), who found that innovative pedagogical strategies significantly improve teachers' instructional competence by enhancing lesson delivery, clarity, and learner engagement. This confirms that the strong correlation observed in this study is consistent with existing evidence that learner-centered pedagogy strengthens teaching performance.

Classroom Management shows a moderate positive correlation with innovative pedagogy, particularly with the highest relationship observed in collaborative and inquiry-based learning and differentiated instruction. This relationship can be explained by the fact that innovative pedagogical approaches require structured classroom organization and active learner engagement. For example, group work, collaborative tasks, and differentiated activities demand clear routines, effective time management, and strong facilitation skills. In real teaching-learning environments, teachers who implement these strategies must manage transitions, monitor group dynamics, and maintain discipline, thereby strengthening their classroom management capabilities.

This finding is supported by recent studies on learner-centered pedagogy, which indicate that innovative teaching approaches improve student engagement and participation, contributing to better classroom organization and management. However, the relationship remains moderate because classroom management is also influenced by other factors such as teacher experience, discipline strategies, and classroom conditions.

Reflective Practice and Decision Making show a moderate significant relationship with innovative pedagogy, particularly in contextualized and localized learning, collaborative and inquiry-based learning, and differentiated instruction. This correlation exists because innovative teaching encourages teachers to continuously evaluate the effectiveness of their strategies and adjust instruction based on learner responses. In classroom situations, teachers engaged in inquiry-based and contextualized teaching often reflect on student outcomes, analyze learning gaps, and modify approaches accordingly. This ongoing process strengthens their ability to make informed instructional decisions, leading to improved teaching practices.

As supported by Pedaste et al. (2015), who emphasized that inquiry-based learning promotes reflective thinking and systematic decision-making among educators. Their study explains that teachers engaged in inquiry processes are more likely to analyze instructional effectiveness and make informed teaching decisions, supporting the moderate correlation observed in this study.

Pedagogical Knowledge shows a weak to moderate positive correlation with innovative pedagogy. This suggests that while innovative pedagogy contributes to teachers' understanding of teaching strategies, the relationship is less pronounced because pedagogical knowledge may also be influenced by formal training, experience, and professional development beyond classroom practices alone. In teaching-learning environments, teachers who apply contextualized and inquiry-based approaches demonstrate an understanding of how students learn, but technology use alone may not fully deepen pedagogical knowledge unless it is integrated meaningfully into instruction.

Guerrero (2023), found that pedagogical knowledge develops through a combination of teaching experience, professional training, and engagement in research-based practices. While innovative strategies expose teachers to new methods, deeper pedagogical understanding requires structured learning opportunities, explaining the weaker correlation.

In contrast, innovative pedagogy shows no significant relationship with professional commitment, except for a weak correlation under collaborative and inquiry-based learning.

This indicates that the use of innovative teaching strategies does not necessarily influence teachers' level of dedication, motivation, or professional responsibility. Professional commitment is more closely associated with intrinsic motivation, leadership support, work environment, and organizational culture rather than instructional practices alone. This finding is supported by Day and Gu (2010), who emphasized that

teacher commitment is shaped by factors such as school leadership, workload, professional identity, and emotional resilience, rather than teaching strategies alone. This explains why innovative pedagogy, although effective in improving teaching competence, does not significantly affect professional commitment.

However, the slight relationship observed in collaborative and inquiry-based learning may suggest that teachers who engage students actively and meaningfully may experience greater professional satisfaction, which can indirectly influence commitment. In classroom settings, teachers who see positive learner engagement and outcomes from collaborative activities may feel more fulfilled, although this effect is not strong enough to establish a consistent relationship.

Overall, the findings indicate that innovative pedagogy plays a significant role in enhancing the instructional and cognitive capabilities of classroom executives, particularly in instructional competence, classroom management, and reflective decision-making. The strongest relationships are observed in collaborative and inquiry-based learning, highlighting the importance of active, learner-centered approaches in developing effective teaching practices.

The absence of a strong relationship with professional commitment suggests that while innovative pedagogy improves how teachers teach, it does not necessarily influence why they remain committed to the profession. This highlights the need for schools to complement instructional innovation with supportive leadership, motivation systems, and professional development opportunities to fully develop capable and committed classroom executives.

5. Conclusions

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

(1) The null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between instructional supervision and the capability of classroom executives is partially sustained, as significant relationships were found in differentiated, humanistic, integrated supervision, and classroom observation, while other areas showed no significant relationship in terms of clinical, developmental, and scientific.

(2) The null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between innovative pedagogy and the capability of classroom executives is partially not sustained, as most dimensions; technology integration, differentiated instruction, contextualized and localized learning, and collaborative and inquiry-based learning showed significant relationships, except for professional commitment.

References

- Aguinaldo, M., & Torres, F. (2023). Evolving perspectives on instructional supervision in Philippine basic education. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 12(1), 34–47.
- Ally, M. (2020). Mobile learning and the integration of technology in education. *Routledge*.
- Andaya, R. (2024). Transformational supervision practices of school heads and their impact on teacher innovation. *Asian Education Research Forum*, 18(2), 101–115.
- Auman, E., & Asuncion, M. (2023). The impact of feedback conferences on teachers' instructional practices and professional growth in Philippine public schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Practice*, 15(2), 45–58.
- Bayer, R. P., Blanco, C. T., Alferez, E. C., Alipio, A. C., Suligan, J. K. A., & Cayogyog, A. O. (2024). Phenomenology of clinical supervision: Examining pre-observation to post-observation in teacher development. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*

(IJRISS), 8(10), 2232–2243. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8100192>

Cagayan de Oro Division. (2025). Instructional supervision and teachers' efficacy: Basis for professional growth program. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*.

Comighud, S., Futralan, K., & Cordevilla, A. (2022). Instructional Supervision and Performance Evaluation: A Correlation of Factors. *GN Publication*.

Danielson, C. (2013). The framework for teaching: Evaluation instrument. *Danielson Group*.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Palo Alto, CA: *Learning Policy Institute*.
<https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-prof-dev-report>

Day, C., & Gu, Q. (2010). *The new lives of teachers*. London, UK: Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203858709>

Department of Education. (2015). Guidelines on the establishment and implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education (*DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015*). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/DO_s2015_02.pdf

Department of Education. (2016). The Learning Action Cell as a K to 12 basic education program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning (*DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016*). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/DO_s2016_035.pdf

Department of Education. (2017). Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) (*DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017*). www.deped.gov.ph

Department of Education. (2017). National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) (*DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017*). www.deped.gov.ph

Department of Education. (2019). *Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) manual for teachers and school heads*. Bureau of Human Resource and Organizational Development. <http://deped.in/RPMSManualver2019>

Department of Education. (2020). DepEd ICT strategic plan 2020–2023. *DepEd Philippines*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/>

Department of Education. (2020). National adoption and implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads (PPSSH) (*DepEd Order No. 24, s. 2020*). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/DO_s2020_024-.pdf

DepEd (2019). Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST).

Department of Education. (2016). The Learning Action Cell as a K to 12 Basic Education Program school-based continuing professional development strategy for the improvement of teaching and learning (*DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016*). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp->

content/uploads/2016/06/DO_s2016_035.pdf

Department of Education. (2019). Coaching and mentoring framework. *Bureau of Human Resource and Organizational Development*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/>

Department of Education. (2021). Guidelines on the implementation of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) for School Year 2020-2021 (DM-PHROD-2021-0010). *Bureau of Human Resource and Organizational Development*. www.deped.gov.ph

Department of Education. (2024). Policy guidelines on the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum (*DepEd Order No. 010, s. 2024*). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DO_s2024_010.pdf

Dooley, M. (2020). Telecollaboration and online collaborative learning: Teachers' beliefs and practices. *Springer*.

Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fayo, R., & Hilario, A. (2023). Teacher perceptions on the classroom observation process: A developmental approach to supervision. *International Journal of Educational Development Studies*, 8(1), 112–125. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/583613-effectiveness-of-classroom-observation-o-562f096f.pdf>

Fullan, M. (2020). The new meaning of educational change (5th ed.). *Teachers College Press*.

Garcia, P., & Morales, L. (2024). Instructional coaching and supervision as predictors of teacher motivation and classroom management. *Journal of Teacher Development Studies*, 9(1), 75–90.

Glanz, J. (2003). Instructional supervision: *Perspectives, issues, and controversies*. Corwin Press.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach (10th ed.). *Pearson*.

Hargreaves, A., & O'Connor, M. T. (2018). Collaborative professionalism: When teaching together means learning for all. *Corwin Press*.

Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2017). Problem-based and inquiry-based learning: Insights from research on learning and instruction. *Springer*.

Impasugong I District. (2024). Instructional supervision practices and efficacy of teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*.

Laguna Division. (2025). Instructional supervisory practices of school heads and teachers' performance. *MSEUF Research Journal*.

Lazaro, A., & Dela Cruz, J. (2022). Differentiated supervision and its impact on instructional performance

- among public school teachers. *Philippine Educational Review*, 60(4), 56–72.
- Lazo, M. (2022). Instructional supervision and accountability mechanisms in the Philippine public school system. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Administration*, 14(3), 130–145.
- Magno, J., & Cabansag, G. (2023). Developmental supervision and mentoring in promoting innovative pedagogy in DepEd schools. *Journal of Educational Innovations and Practices*, 11(2), 84–99.
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2019). Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK): A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 121(10), 1–40.
- OECD. (2021). Innovating education and educating for innovation: The power of digital technologies and skills. *OECD Publishing*.
- Paulite, G. (2020). Challenges and prospects in classroom observation practices among public school teachers. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 4(2), 22–35.
- Pedaste, M., Mäeots, M., Siiman, L. A., de Jong, T., van Riesen, S. A. N., Kamp, E. T., Manoli, C. C., Zacharia, Z. C., & Tsourlidaki, E. (2015). Phases of inquiry-based learning: Definitions and the inquiry cycle. *Educational Research Review*, 14, 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.02.003>
- Pineda, L., Dela Cruz, J., & Ramos, K. (2024). Collaborative pre-observation conferences and their influence on teacher confidence and preparedness. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Research*, 10(1), 55–68.
- Plopino, J. & Carbonell, M. (2025). Assessment of Instructional Supervision Level of Pre-Service Teachers in Learning Delivery. *RSIS International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*.
- Ramos, J. M. (2020). Innovative teaching strategies for the 21st century learners. *Philippine Normal University Press*.
- Reños, M., & Pontillas, E. (2023). Redefining classroom observation: The role of collaboration in instructional supervision. *Philippine Educational Review*, 61(3), 89–102.
- Reyes, A., & Ballesteros, C. (2023). Supervisory practices and teacher professional growth in Philippine public schools. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 6(1), 44–61.
- RSIS International Journal (2025). Assessment of Instructional Supervision Level of Pre-Service Teachers in Learning Delivery.
- Santangelo, T., & Tomlinson, C. A. (2019). Teacher educators' perceptions and use of differentiated instruction practices. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 46(3), 56–80.
- Santos, J., & Daguio, E. (2023). Reflective supervision and its influence on teacher performance and

- instructional innovation. *Educational Research and Policy Journal*, 8(2), 115–127.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. *Basic Books*.
- SEAMEO-INNOTECH. (2022). Teacher professional development in Southeast Asia: Trends, challenges, and best practices. *SEAMEO-INNOTECH Publications*.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2007). *Supervision: A redefinition* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Sevilla, M., & Magsambol, B. (2021). Contextualization and localization in Philippine basic education: Challenges and opportunities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 41(4), 532–548.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411>
- Stronge, J. H. (2018). Qualities of effective teachers (3rd ed.). *ASCD*.
- Suhardi. (2025). HUMANISTIC SUPERVISION MODEL IN IMPROVING THE PROFESSIONALISM OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE ERA OF INDEPENDENT LEARNING. *radjapublika.com*. <https://doi.org/10.54443/ijerlas.v5i3.3832>
- Sumoroy Agro-Industrial School. (2024). Post-observation feedback as a driver for teacher development in the RPMS-PPST context. *ResearchGate Preprint*.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms (3rd ed.). *ASCD*.
- Villanueva, K. (2023). Instructional supervision as a catalyst for teacher motivation and learner engagement in basic education. *Philippine Journal of Instructional Management*, 7(1), 59–70.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. *Harvard University Press*.