

Professional Development, School-Based Management Implementation, and Organizational Support on Instructional Supervisory Practice of School Administrators

Archie P. Baltazar¹, Raul C. Orongan²

¹Graduate Student, College of Education, Central Mindanao University

²Professor, College of Education, Central Mindanao University

ABSTRACT

The study developed a structural model on the professional development, school-based management practices, and organizational support on level of competence in instructional supervision of school administrators. Descriptive-correlational and structural-comparative research design were used in this study. Five hundred one (501) school administrators in Divisions of Region X were chosen as participants of the study in the school year 2023-2024. Data were analyzed using frequency counts, percentage, means, correlation, and multiple linear regression analyses, and structural equation model.

Professional development, school-based management practices, and organizational support in the context of educational administration. The indicators examined include professional development activities such as trainings/seminars, self-efficacy, and attainment of advance degrees. Additionally, school-based management practices encompass leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, accountability, continuous improvement, and management of resources. Lastly, organizational support is evaluated through aspects such as training and development opportunities, performance review and appraisal systems, merit-based promotion schemes, and incentives and awards systems.

The best predictor on the instructional supervision of school administrators is organizational support for training and development significantly predicts the outcome variable. Higher levels of organizational support are associated with increased training and development opportunities, highlighting the importance of supportive organizational practices in facilitating employee growth and development.

KEYWORDS: Instructional Supervisory Practice, professional development, School-Based Management Implementation, Organizational Support

1. INTRODUCTION

Instructional supervision conducted by school administrators involves a structured approach to overseeing and supporting teachers' instructional methods with the aim of improving teaching and learning outcomes within an educational institution. This process encompasses various activities aimed at ensuring that teaching aligns with educational objectives, curriculum standards, and effective teaching strategies.

Aligsao (2016) highlights the Department of Education's emphasis on school administrators as crucial agents of change, with a focus on enhancing school performance and learning achievements. In an era

marked by accountability and standardized tests, administrators are tasked with possessing a range of skills to lead their schools towards educational excellence. Among these skills, instructional leadership stands out as pivotal.

In essence, public schools often face resource constraints, impacting the quality of education provided to students. Administrators must delicately balance these limitations while striving to deliver quality education. According to Ross and Gray, as cited by Palapar (2013), school leadership significantly influences student achievement. School leaders are responsible for fostering conducive conditions for effective instruction and maintaining positive community relations, as mandated by the Basic Education Act of 2001 (RA 9155).

This study explores how professional development, school-based management practices, and organizational support affect the instructional supervision capabilities of school administrators. The findings aim to shed light on theories and evidence, offering insights and recommendations for future practices.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Haramain & Sumapal (2023), while instructional supervision practices like guiding, supporting, and assessing teachers are observable, they are not fully implemented. This underscores the urgent need to strengthen these practices to better aid teachers, who are crucial in fostering student learning outcomes. The study suggests various measures, including comprehensive training for school administrators to improve their supervisory skills, promoting a collaborative culture among educators, ensuring adequate resources for supervision, and providing continuous professional development for teachers. Additionally, regular evaluations are recommended to refine supervisory practices, aiming to deliver quality education locally and globally.

In the Philippine context, School-Based Management (SBM) represents a strategic initiative by the Department of Education to decentralize decision-making to individual schools, empowering them to address their specific challenges. The SBM grant, detailed in DepEd Order No. 45 of 2015, is one-way schools are empowered.

Rewarding exceptional performance can spur ongoing development and learning among teachers, fostering a positive environment. This notion is supported by Din et al. (2021) and further emphasized by Gumus et al. (2018), highlighting the pivotal role of school administrators in promoting effective teaching and learning environments.

An analysis by Hallinger, Gümüş, and Bellibaş (2020) spanning from 1940 to 2018 shows that a significant portion of instructional leadership research originated from countries like the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and continental Europe. This underscores the collaborative efforts between principals and educators to enhance teaching methodologies (Brolund, 2016).

Studies by Ahmad and Ali (2021) affirm the positive influence of instructional leadership on teachers' competence, work engagement, efficacy, and student outcomes globally. Providing organizational support through training and development initiatives is vital for enhancing the leadership capabilities of school administrators, as noted by Şenol (2020).

Investing in the training and development of school administrators is crucial for effective school management (Agung, 2018), ensuring alignment with evolving educational paradigms (Prastiawan et al., 2020).

While instructional leadership is a key aspect highlighted in the DepEd's National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads, certain tasks like procurement decisions may not explicitly align with this framework. Teachers require adequate training, materials, and support to optimize student performance (Daing, 2015).

Instructional leadership involves collaborative efforts to improve teaching and learning quality, encompassing strategic direction setting, professional growth nurturing, collaboration fostering, and data utilization for instructional effectiveness assessment (Balena, 2013; Day et al., 2007). Effective instructional leadership by school administrators is crucial for school improvement and effectiveness by ensuring conducive learning environments and supporting curriculum, assessment, and instructional enhancements that positively impact teacher performance and efficacy.

Statement of the Problem

Generally, this study aimed to develop a structural model of school administrators in relation to professional development, school-based management implementation, and organizational support on instructional supervisory practice of school administration in the Department of Education, Region X. Specifically, it sought to find the answers to the following questions:

- 1. What is the level of professional development of school administrators in terms of:**
 - a. training/seminars
 - b. self-efficacy; and
 - c. advance degree?
- 2. What is the level of implementation in school-based management do school administrators in the following areas:**
 - a. Leadership and governance;
 - b. curriculum and instruction;
 - c. accountability and continuous improvement; and
 - d. management of resources?
- 3. What is the level of organizational support do school administrators engage in the following aspects:**
 - a. training and development;
 - b. performance, review and appraisal;
 - c. merits and promotion; and
 - d. incentives and awards systems?
- 4. What is the level of instructional supervisory do school administrators practice:**
 - a. pre-observation;
 - b. observation;
 - c. post-observation; and
 - d. post-conference analysis
- 5. What relationship exist between instructional supervisory practice and;**
 - a. Professional development;
 - b. School-based management implementation; and
 - c. Organizational support?
- 6. Which of the variables, singly or in combination, best predict the instructional supervisory practice of school administrators?**

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study employed descriptive-correlational and causal comparative research designs in coming up with the analysis of the data to answer the problems. It is descriptive because it investigated professional development, school-based management implementation, and organizational support on instructional supervisory practice of school administrators. Its correlational can be traced attempt to find relationship among variables developed.

3.2 Respondents and Locale of the Study

The respondents of the study were five hundred one (501) school administrators of the six (6) divisions of Region X. The school administrators rated themselves regarding their professional development, school-based management implementation, and organizational support on instructional supervisory practice. The respondents of the study determined using stratified random sampling with proportional allocation, in which the study selected a proportionate number of respondents from each division to form a sample and perform random sampling proportionate to the size of that sample in the population, giving the chosen respondents an equal chance of being include in the sample.

3.3 Research Instruments and Procedures

An adapted survey questionnaire composed of four (4) parts were distributed to the respondents to collect the data for the study. Author's consent to utilize the questionnaires were requested. Validity and reliability test of the instruments were executed and the necessary permits were secured from the Institutional Ethics Review Committee (IERC), DepED Region X office, and from the seven (7) chosen divisions. Participation of the respondents were voluntary and they were assured of their anonymity. Informed consent was given before they answer the survey questionnaires. They were also given ample time to answer the questionnaires to obtain accurate and valid results. The professional development, school-based management implementation, and organizational support on instructional supervisory practice of school administrators was measured in this study. Each of the variables has a distinct instrument.

3.4 Statistical Techniques

Descriptive statistics such as frequency count, weighted means, and arithmetic means to calculate the data that has been collected. Those statistical techniques applied to measure the level of professional development, school-based management implementation, and organizational support on instructional supervisory of school administrators.

Pearson correlation coefficient (r) were used in inferential statistics to determine the significant relationship between the variables and the step wise multiple regression was used in determining the variable that best predicts instructional supervisory of school administrators.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Professional Development of School Administrators

Table 1 summarizes the measures of professional development of school administrators. the mean ratings for various indicators related to professional development, including "Advanced Degree," "Self-efficacy," and "Trainings/Seminars," alongside the overall mean rating. Notably, the two highest mean ratings are associated with activities related to acquiring advanced degrees and fostering self-efficacy, with mean ratings of 4.46 and 4.43, respectively. These high ratings suggest a strong agreement among respondents, indicating that the pursuit of advanced degrees and the cultivation of self-efficacy are perceived as highly developed aspects of professional development.

Table 1 Level of the professional development of school administrators

INDICATOR	MEAN	QUALITATIVE DESCRIPTION	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Advanced Degree	4.46	Agree	Highly developed
Self-efficacy	4.43	Agree	Highly developed
Trainings/Seminars	4.39	Agree	Highly developed
AVERAGE	4.41	Agree	Highly developed

The average mean rating across all indicators is 4.41, indicating a general consensus among respondents that professional development initiatives, including acquiring advanced degrees, fostering self-efficacy, and participating in trainings and seminars, are highly valued and regarded as highly developed within the context of professional growth and enhancement.

According to Haramain & Sumapal (2023), while instructional supervision practices like guiding, supporting, and assessing teachers are observable, they are not fully implemented. This underscores the urgent need to strengthen these practices to better aid teachers, who are crucial in fostering student learning outcomes. The study suggests various measures, including comprehensive training for school administrators to improve their supervisory skills, promoting a collaborative culture among educators, ensuring adequate resources for supervision, and providing continuous professional development for teachers. Additionally, regular evaluations are recommended to refine supervisory practices, aiming to deliver quality education locally and globally.

4.2 School-Based Management Practices of School Administrators

Table 2 Level of school-based management of School Administrators

INDICATOR	MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Leadership and Governance	4.46	Most of the time	Practiced
Curriculum and Instruction	4.41	Most of the time	Practiced
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	4.43	Most of the time	Practiced
Management of Resources	4.38	Most of the time	Practiced
AVERAGE	4.42	Most of the time	Practiced

summarizes school-based management implementation which specify the top two with highest mean, Among the indicators assessed, "Leadership and Governance" received the highest mean rating of 4.46, indicating that it is mostly practiced within the context being evaluated. This suggests a strong commitment to effective leadership and governance practices within the organization or system under study. Following closely behind, "Accountability and Continuous Improvement" garnered a mean rating of 4.43, reflecting a similarly high level of implementation and adherence to accountability measures and processes aimed at fostering continuous enhancement.

The implementation of School-Based Management (SBM) garners significant attention among education administrators and experts, particularly within the Philippines. Here, educational leaders strive to achieve various positive outcomes, including increased student participation, enhanced school attendance, improved retention and completion rates, and most importantly, elevated student learning outcomes In the Philippine context, School-Based Management (SBM) represents a strategic initiative by the Department

of Education to decentralize decision-making to individual schools, empowering them to address their specific challenges. The SBM grant, detailed in DepEd Order No. 45 of 2015, is one-way schools are empowered.

4.3 Organizational Support of School Administrators

Table 3 Level of organizational support of School Administrators

INDICATOR	MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Performance Review and Appraisal	4.58	Very Frequent	Very High Support
Merits and Promotion	4.56	Very Frequent	Very High Support
Incentives and Awards System	4.52	Very Frequent	Very High Support
Training and Development	4.50	Very Frequent	Very High Support
AVERAGE	4.54	Very Frequent	Very High Support

Organizational support of school administrators which specify the top two highest mean, were observed in the areas of Performance Review and Appraisal, as well as Merits and Promotion, both receiving a rating of 4.58 and 4.56 respectively. These ratings indicate a very frequent and very high level of support provided in these domains, signifying strong systems in place for evaluating and recognizing the contributions of educators and staff, as well as facilitating career advancement opportunities.

Rewarding exceptional performance can spur ongoing development and learning among teachers, fostering a positive environment. This notion is supported by Din et al. (2021) and further emphasized by Gumus et al. (2018), highlighting the pivotal role of school administrators in promoting effective teaching and learning environments.

4.4 Instructional Supervisory Practice of School Administrators

Level of Instructional Supervisory of School Administrators

INDICATOR	MEAN	DESCRIPTIVE RATING	QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION
Pre-observation	3.29	Agree	Practiced
Post-Conference Analysis	3.25	Agree	Practiced
Observation	3.21	Agree	Practiced
Post-Observation	3.18	Agree	Practiced
Analysis and Strategy	3.10	Agree	Practiced
AVERAGE	3.21	Agree	Practiced

instructional supervisory practice of school administrators in terms of: pre-observation, observation, post-observation, and post-conference analysis. instructional supervision, the pre-observation phase stands out with the highest mean score of 3.29, indicating a widely agreed-upon and well-implemented practice. Following closely is the post-conference analysis, garnering a mean score of 3.25, reflecting a similarly strong consensus and practiced execution.

4.5 Relationship between Professional Development, School-Based Management Implementation, and Organizational Support on Instructional Supervisory Practice on School administrators

Table 5 Relationship between the independent variables and performance of school administrators.

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	p-value
Professional Development	.066	.138ns
Trainings/Seminars	.058	.197ns
Self-efficacy	.035	.433ns
Advanced Degree	.091	.042*
School-Based Management Practices	.103	.021*
Leadership and Governance	.079	.078ns
Curriculum and Instruction	.115	.010**
Accountability and Continuous Improvement	.105	.018*
Management of Resources	.077	.083ns
Organizational Support	.100	.025*
Training and Development	.127	.005**
Performance Review and Appraisal	.076	.091ns
Merits and Promotion	.094	.036*
Incentives and Awards System	.085	.057ns

The above findings reveal that among the variables of this study, under the professional development advanced degree ($r=0.91^*$, $p< 0.42$) have the correlation coefficient that is significant at $p< 0.05$ level. Hence, this implies that instructional supervisory practice of school administrators is related to advanced degree of professional development. Thus, the null hypothesis of the study which states that “There is no significant relationship existing between instructional supervisory practice of school administrators and advanced degree” is rejected. environments.

An analysis by Hallinger, Gümüş, and Bellibaş (2020) spanning from 1940 to 2018 shows that a significant portion of instructional leadership research originated from countries like the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and continental Europe. This underscores the collaborative efforts between principals and educators to enhance teaching methodologies (Brolund, 2016).

Studies by Ahmad and Ali (2021) affirm the positive influence of instructional leadership on teachers' competence, work engagement, efficacy, and student outcomes globally. Providing organizational support through training and development initiatives is vital for enhancing the leadership capabilities of school administrators, as noted by Şenol (2020).

reveals that the majority of instructional leadership research, approximately 75%, emanated from countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and continental European nations. In contrast, regions including Asia, Africa, and Latin America accounted for 25% of the scholarly contributions during the same period.

Furthermore, in curriculum and instruction, and accountability ($r=.115^*$, $p<.010$), and accountability and continuous improvement ($r=.105^*$, $p<.018$) have the correlation coefficients that are significant at $p< 0.05$ level. This implies that instructional supervisory of school administrators is correlated to the curriculum and instruction and accountability and continuous improvement. Thus, the null hypothesis of the study

which states that “There is no significant relationship existing between instructional supervisory practice of school administrators and curriculum and instruction and accountability and continuous improvement” is rejected. This finding can be linked to the study of delineate instructional leadership as an approach that prioritizes the advancement of teaching and learning within schools. This model underscores the collaborative efforts of principals and educators to cultivate optimal teaching methodologies (Brolund, 2016).

However, in the level of instructional supervisory practice in training and development, merits and promotion ($r=.127^* p<.005$), and merits and promotion ($r=.094^* p<.036$), indicates that the instructional supervisory practice of school administrators is associated to the organizational support in training and development and merits and promotion. Thus, the null hypothesis of the study which states that that “There is no significant relationship existing between instructional supervisory practice of school administrators practice in training and development and merits and promotion” is rejected. Studies by Ahmad and Ali (2021), attest to its positive influence on teachers' competence, work engagement, efficacy, and student outcomes globally.

4.6 Predictor Variable of Instructional Supervisory of School Administrators

Table 6. Predictor variable of instructional supervisory practice of school administrators

Predictors Variables	Unstandardized Coefficient	Std Error	Standardized Coefficient Beta	T-Value	Probability
Constant	2.167	.341		6.350	.000
Organizational Support on Training and Development	.233	.075	.148	-3.112	.002
R=.0.298 R ² = .089F= 16.857 Probability=.000					

Among the independent variables, the level of in instructional supervisory practice in terms of training and development were found to be predictive of instructional supervisory of school administrators, Thus, R² coefficient of determination is .0.089 Therefore, the effect of these variables is significant at 0.05 level ($p<0.000$).

The data indicates that if school administrators have high level of training and development, this will lead to better instructional supervisory practice of school administrators. This can be supported providing organizational support through training and development initiatives is vital for enhancing the leadership capabilities of school administrators, enabling them to stay abreast of educational advancements and ultimately bolster school performance (Şenol, 2020). Various strategies can be employed to offer this support, including conducting needs assessments through interviews and surveys, forging partnerships with universities and professional bodies to establish sustainable training programs, and rigorously evaluating the effectiveness of professional development efforts.

Likewise, investing in the training and development of school administrators is paramount for effective school management (Agung, 2018). Such support is indispensable for equipping administrators with the necessary leadership skills and ensuring alignment with evolving educational paradigms (Prastiawan et al., 2020).

Hence, while instructional leadership, as described by Hallinger (2008) and cited by Balena (2015) and Daing (2015), is a key aspect highlighted in the DepEd's National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads, it's notable that certain tasks, such as procurement decisions, are not explicitly categorized under instructional leadership. This suggests that while school administrators fulfill such responsibilities as part of their role, they may not necessarily align with the instructional leadership framework. Teachers, according to Daing (2015) citing Downey et al. (2009), require adequate training, teaching materials, and support to facilitate optimal student performance. This includes access to curriculum resources, targeted training linked to curriculum objectives, and guidance on utilizing assessment data to address learning gaps.

This finding is supported by the study Instructional leadership, as characterized by Balena (2013) referencing Day et al. (2007), involves collaborative efforts to enhance teaching and learning quality. It encompasses setting strategic directions, nurturing professional growth, fostering collaboration, and utilizing data to gauge instructional effectiveness. Effective instructional leadership by school administrators plays a pivotal role in school improvement initiatives and overall effectiveness by ensuring a conducive learning environment and supporting curriculum, assessment, and instructional enhancements that positively influence teacher performance and efficacy.

5. CONCLUSION

The study provides compelling evidence supporting a strong structural model for effective instructional supervisory practices within educational institutions. By emphasizing the importance of post-observation and post-conference analyses, the study underscores the significance of continuous improvement processes in enhancing instructional supervision. Furthermore, the findings highlight the critical role of organizational elements such as training and development, performance review, and merit-based promotion in facilitating these practices.

The study also emphasizes the vital contributions of leadership, governance, curriculum design, and accountability mechanisms in successfully implementing school-based management initiatives. Moreover, it emphasizes the transformative impact of collaborative professional development endeavors and advanced degree pursuits on enhancing instructional supervision. By rejecting the null hypothesis, the study confirms the existence of a significant and comprehensive model that aligns with effective instructional supervisory practices, providing valuable insights for improving educational leadership and administration.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

School administrators may adopt leadership training, governance structures, and accountability frameworks to support effective implementation of school-based management. Additionally, fostering collaborative professional development initiatives and supporting administrators in pursuing advanced degrees can significantly enhance instructional supervision and overall educational leadership and administration. Future study is recommended to capture all the variables on professional development, school-based management implementation and instructional supervisory practice on school administrators.

REFERENCES

1. Agravante, M. B., Digo, G. S., & Janer, S. S. (2023). Upskilling of the School Heads in the New

- Normal. East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2(6), 2509–2524. <https://doi.org/10.55927/eajmr.v2i6.4257>
2. Agung, I. (2018, October 28). Improvement of Teacher Competence and Professionalism and School Management Development in Indonesia. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-6-10-8>
 3. Ahmad, M. and Ahmad, M. F. (2021). Influence of leadership approaches of head teachers on discipline: teachers' perspective. Pakistan. Retrieved from <http://www.researchgate.net/publication.2023>
 4. Alemayehu, E. (2021). Does Continuous Professional Development Improve Teachers' Performance? Evidence from Public Schools in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Research & Reviews: Journal of Educational Studies*, 7, 1-17.
 5. Aligsao, M.G. T. (2016). Instructional Leadership, Negotiation Competence and Productivity on Administrators' Performance: A Structural Model. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Bukidnon.
 6. Alvarez, C., & Delavin, E., (2022). Career stages of professional development along Philippine professional standards for school heads. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 11(13). 55-66. DOI: 10.5861/ijrse.2022.342
 7. Balena V (2015). "Instructional Leadership Skills of Grade Level Chairpersons and Teaching Performance of Faculty Members in Selected Elementary School: Towards a Proposed Leadership Training Program", MAEd. Thesis, Quezon City,
 8. Brolund, L. (2016). Student success through instructional leadership. *BU Journal of Graduate Studies in Education*, 8(8), 16-20. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1230490.pdf>. 2023
 9. Daing C(2015). "Harmonization of Instructional Leadership Skills of Department Heads and Teachers' Rating of a Public School Based on Results-Based Performance Management System," MAEd.Thesis, Quezon City,.
 10. DepEd Order No. 45, s. 2015. (2015). Guidelines on School-Based Management (SBM) Grants Retrieved 01 September 2019 from <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/10/28/school-basedmanagement-grant/>
 11. Gumus, S., Bellibas, M. S., Esen, M. & Gumus, E. (2018). A systematic review of studies on leadership models in educational research from 1980 to 2014, *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 46(1), pp. 25-48
 12. Hallinger, P., Gümüş, S. & Bellibaş, M. (2020). 'Are principals' instructional leaders yet?' A science map of the knowledge base on instructional leadership, 1940–2018. *Scientometrics*, 122, 1629- 1650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03360-5>
 13. Haramain, J. & Sumapal, L. (2023). Descriptive study on the instructional supervision practices of Bangsamoro school heads: Evaluating their impact on educational improvement. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 2023, 18(03), pp 1518–1532. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.18.3.1251>
 14. Palapar L.M. (2013). School administrators' transformational leadership practices and learning environment; a causal model on performance. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, CMU, Musuan, Bukidnon.
 15. Prastiawan, A., Gunawan, I., Putra, A P., Dewantoro, D A., Cholifah, P S., Nuraini, N L S., Rini, T A., Pradipta, R F., Raharjo, K M., Prestiadi, D., & Surahman, E. (2020, January 1). School Leadership Skills in Educational Institutions. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201204.085>

16. Şenol, H. (2020, March 18). Professional Development of Educational Leaders. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.89260>