



ASSESSMENT OF PRINCIPAL'S INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP IN SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOLS: BASIS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Oleh

**Gilbert S. Arrieta¹, Inero V. Ancho², Marianne D. Pineda³,
Helen A. Carandang⁴, Kadek Aria Prima Dewi PF⁵**

¹Philippine Normal University Manila, Philippines

³Air Force City Elementary School Angeles City, Pampanga, Philippines,

⁴Trace College Los Banos, Laguna, Philippines

⁵Universitas Hindu Negeri I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia

¹arrieta.gs@pnu.edu.ph, ²ancho.iv@pnu.edu.ph, ³pinedamarianne@yahoo.com,

⁴hcarandangtclb@gmail.com, ⁵primadewipf@uhnsugriwa.ac.id

diterima 16 Maret 2020, direvisi 8 Agustus 2020, diterbitkan 31 Agustus 2020

Abstract

By heart, a principal will remain a classroom teacher. His/Her appointment was not only based on educational qualifications but more importantly on experience and expertise as a classroom teacher. As a teacher rises from the ranks, he/she continues to teach but with lesser teaching loads. Being the principal, he/she primarily the instructional leader of the school despite the more administrative responsibilities on his/her shoulders. Educational leadership experts believed that principals must their role as instructional leader is 70 % and as administrator is 30 %. However, it has been observed that with the demanding administrative work, lesser attention is given to his/her role as an instructional leader. To find out how principals fulfill their role as instructional leaders, this study assessed the instructional leadership of principals in selected public schools in Metro Manila, Philippines. There were 150 elementary teachers who participated in the study. Using the contextualized Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) by Hallinger (1982), it found out that the principals are fulfilling their roles as instructional leaders in terms of communicating the department's development plans, promoting professional development, supervising and evaluating instruction, and providing incentives for teachers. However, they need to enhance their instructional leadership roles in three areas namely maintaining high visibility, monitoring student progress, and framing the department's development plan.

**Keywords: Instructional Leadership, Supervision Of Instruction,
Development Plan**

I. INTRODUCTION

The most important and recognizable authority in school is no other than the principal. With the school's success largely depending on his leadership, his duties and responsibilities are great and demanding. Timperley (2006) indicated that creating a professional learning context within the school that simultaneously addresses knowledge, skills, and expectations is a demanding task for the most competent and experienced leader. On his shoulders rest the effective delivery of instruction and learning of students. As an educational leader, he is both an instructional and administrative manager that makes the job more challenging.

With instruction as the core and heart of any effective school, instructional leadership is therefore the most crucial variable. Bago (2008) pointed out that it is the thread that binds all the other variables. Effective instruction becomes possible through the synergy of all the correlates under a skill full leader. Instructional leadership is a basic concept that insures effective. However, it is not exercised in isolation because it is all-encompassing. It involves tasks such as setting goals, allocating resources for instruction, managing the curriculum, evaluating teachers, and establishing healthy and viable home-school relations, among others.

The role of school leaders to bring the focus on the most important role of teachers on instruction is crucial and important. This argument is further strengthened in the study of Wallace Foundation (2013). It stated that improving school leadership ranks high on the list of priorities for school reform and school principals must become leaders of learning who can develop a team delivering effective instruction. In addition, this research work since 2000 suggests that it entails five key responsibilities which include improving instruction to enable teachers to teach at their best and students to learn to their utmost.

In the Philippine education system, Department of Education Order 32, series 2010 is the existing mandate that describes the competency standards of school heads. DepEd Order 32, s. 2010 known as "National Adoption and Implementation of the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads" indicated that school heads are competent, committed and accountable in providing access to quality and relevant education for all through transformational leadership and high degree of professionalism. The National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads (NCBS – SH) identified several domains and competency strands and one of them is on instructional leadership which covers assessment for learning, developing programs and/or adopting existing programs, implementing programs for instructional improvement, and instructional supervision. This is one of the areas where principals are reviewed for the National Qualifying Examinations for School Heads (NQESH). The PNU NQESH Reviewer stated that the most important role of a school principal is to provide a learning environment that makes effective teaching and maximal learning possible. The time spent for instructional supervision is 70% while for administrative supervision is 30%. It is imperative that principal prioritizes his instructional tasks and supervises instruction among other roles and functions.

Principals, with the assistance of the assistant principals and the learning area heads must closely monitor and assist teachers. Supervision will provide guidance and evaluation of how teachers effectively integrate technology in teaching. For a teacher to develop, he/she must be mentored. It entails openness and trust. This is what Sergiovanni and Starrat (2007) pointed out on the moral importance of supervision. If supervision is to be a moral action, it must respect the moral integrity of the supervisor and the supervised.

Thus, the exchange between the supervisor and the teacher must be trusting, open, and flexible to allow both persons to speak from their own sense of integrity and to encourage each person to respect the other's integrity. The exchange must begin with an honest discussion of what will be helpful for the teacher and the students. For this to happen, supervisors need to explore those conditions necessary to establish and maintain trust, honesty, and open communication. This means that supervisors need to discuss the purposes and objectives of supervision to establish the terms of references. Hence, supervisors need to explore with teachers the procedures, mechanisms and policies

Beyond setting the parameters and guidelines, there is the exchange itself, an engagement of another person in all his/her complexity, fragility, and ambiguity. Embedded in the process of making contact with that other person are the moral imperatives of acceptance, honesty, respect, and care. These constitute the moral activity of empowerment, the willingness to let people be who they are, and beyond that willingness, an appreciation of what they have to contribute.

Once openness, trust, and honesty are established, supervision can honestly take place. Sergiovanni and Starrat (2007) added that general and clinical supervision are, of course, interdependent. Meaningful classroom interventions are built upon healthy organizational climates, facilitated by credible leadership, and premised on a reasoned educational program. Although general supervision is an important and necessary component of effective supervision, without clinical supervision and other forms of coaching, it is not sufficient. In an evaluation for quality control, the process should be formal and documented; criteria should be explicit, and standards should be legally defensible as being central to basic teaching competence; the emphasis should be on teachers meeting requirements of minimum acceptability; and responsibility for evaluation should be in the hands of administrators and other designated officials.

When the purpose of teacher evaluation is professional improvement, the process should be informal; criteria should be tailored to the needs and capabilities of individual teachers before they are included in the evaluation; the emphasis should be on helping teachers reach agreed-upon professional development goals; and teachers should assume major responsibility for the process of engaging in self-evaluation and peer evaluation, and by obtaining evaluation information from students.

Bago (2008) added that the primary objective of supervision of instruction is the improvement of teaching and learning. In order to accomplish this, instructional leaders should help teachers especially the neophytes, discharge or perform their assigned tasks optimally. This can be achieved by providing the necessary guidance and assistance through a variety of intervention strategies such as clinical supervision, mentoring, coaching, and other assisting strategies, designed to improve the pedagogical skills of teachers, and to enhance their self-confidence. Supervisors should address the needs and concerns especially of novice teachers so that their adjustment period becomes smooth and less traumatic. Intervention measures, when and where appropriately used, can transform many new teachers and marginal teachers into effective ones.

Several studies revealed that the instructional tasks of the principals are important but not given priority as perceived by teachers. In the study of Sebastian and Allensworth (2012), it was found out that if the primary mechanism for improving student achievement comes through the school learning climate, then this implies that principals need to make school climate the priority in their school improvement efforts. This also implies that training programs that prepare principals to lead urban schools need to recognize learning climate as a priority. At the same time, this does not mean that other aspects of principals' roles are unimportant. When we consider the relationship of principal leadership and instruction within schools—comparing one teacher to another—

several mediating factors, including the quality of professional development, professional community, and partnerships with parents, have significant associations with instructional quality. The quality of professional development has the strongest relationship. This suggests that principal leadership is important for assisting individual teachers to improve their performance, perhaps where principals feel help is most needed or where they prioritize school efforts and resources. However, because these efforts affect only individual teachers or subsets of teachers in a school, their overall influence on instruction and student achievement across the entire school are small. This is similar to the findings of Le Fevre and Robinson (2015) in their study on the interpersonal challenges of instructional leadership. They identified that the barriers to improving the quantity and quality of instructional leadership are considerable. Much of the discussion has focused on the administrative tasks that distract principals from the core business of improving teaching and learning. While the relative amount of time spent on instructional and administrative tasks varies by country, school size, school context, and methods used to assess time expenditure, increased time on instructional leadership has been a commonly expressed aspiration of both leadership researchers and practitioners.

Considering the big and demanding responsibilities of the principals in leading the school, it is important that priority must be on instructional leadership. However, the administrative tasks may prevent the principals from fulfilling their role as an instructional leader which subsequently as their primary task. This study aims to find out the perception of public school teachers in terms of the instructional leadership of the principal. Thus, this will allow the principals to gain understanding and plan actions and programs that will lead their teachers more effectively and efficiently in the area of management and supervision of instruction.

The following are the research questions for this study :

1. As perceived by the teachers, to what extent does the principal fulfill his/her role as instructional leader in terms of the following:
 - a. framing and communicating school goals;
 - b. supervising and evaluating instruction;
 - c. coordinating the curriculum;
 - d. monitoring student progress;
 - e. protecting instructional time;
 - f. maintaining high visibility;
 - g. providing incentives for teachers and students; and
 - h. promoting professional development ?
2. Based on the findings, what areas in instructional leadership should principals focus which will enhance his/her instructional leadership skills ?

This study provided data that will assist the principals in enhancing their instructional leadership skills. In particular, this study aims to:

1. guide the principals in identifying their strengths and weaknesses in the supervision of instruction;
2. enable the principals to critically reflect on programs and actions that will improve management and supervision of instruction; and
3. create instructional development programs to enhance the leadership and instructional skills of principals and teachers.

The study focused only on the instructional leadership of the principal based on Hallinger's (1982) Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale. Only 150 public elementary school teachers from two public schools in one of the cities in Metro Manila. were involved in the study.

II. METHODOLOGY

The descriptive method of research was used as the principal means in assessing the information and communications technology integration in teaching selected high school subjects. According to Best et al. (1998), a descriptive study describes and interprets

what is. It is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that going on, effects that are evident or trends that are developing. Gay (1976) defines descriptive research as involving collection of data in order to test hypotheses or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. A descriptive study determines and reports the way things are. Just as historical research has no control over what was, descriptive research has no control over what is, and it can only measure what already exists. Sevilla et al (1992) claims that descriptive research particularly surveys are employed to measure the existing phenomenon without inquiring into why it exists. In such studies, you do not take into account the relationships between variables.

The participants in this study were selected elementary teachers from two public schools in one of the cities in Metro Manila who have rendered service for at least one year and must have been under the leadership and supervision of the principal for at least one year. There were one hundred fifty (150) teachers who participated in this study.

The research instrument that was used in this study is the Principal Instructional

Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) by Hallinger (1982) which was adapted and contextualized by Salva (2011) in his thesis “Human Relations and Instructional Leadership Behavior of the Subject Area Coordinators of the High School department in a Private Sectarian University.” The instrument was validated by local experts and subjected to reliability test. The researchers were able to get the permission of the author of the PIMRS in using the instrument for this study.

In conducting the study, the researchers discussed sought permission from the principals of the two public schools. After getting the permission, they questionnaires were fielded to the teachers. After five days, the researchers were able to retrieve all survey questionnaires. No personal information was asked from the participants and everything was held in confidentiality.

In this study, the mean or average in every indicator and in every area of instructional leadership including the overall mean in the survey were computed. Analysis and interpretation were made. The scale used to define the mean range is presented below. This scale facilitated the interpretation of results.

Table 1. Scale, mean range and its interpretation

Scale	Range	Descriptive Rating
4	3.50 – 4.00	Always
3	2.50 – 3.49	Often
2	1.50 – 2.49	Rarely
1	1.00 – 1.49	Never

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. As perceived by the teachers, to what extent does the principal fulfill his/her role as instructional leader in terms of the following:

1.1. Framing the Department’s Development Plan

Table 2 reflects that the principal often demonstrated leadership behavior in framing the department’s development plan. This was shown

by the obtained average weighted mean of 3.37. This means that the principal did his tasks in planning and presenting the department’s development plan. As Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) pointed out that meaningful interventions are built upon healthy organizational climate, premised on reasoned educational program having a development plan. Standards were identified and

explained for quality output. Participating in framing the department development plan based on school's vision and mission and using data on academic performance of students when formulating department development plan both obtained a weighted mean of 3.68 which both ranked first. As observed and experienced, the principal considers the mission and vision of his school in formulating the school's development plan. Last in rank are developing learning competencies that can be translated

into classroom objectives by teachers and continuing to benchmark with other schools through the help of the administration to improve the standards of the department that both got a weighted mean of 2.97, both performed often. This could be due to the fact that the principal considered the learning competencies expected by grade level and subject area to help the teachers meet the standards. There is continuous benchmarking with other schools so as to maintain linkages.

Table 2. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the Principal in Framing the Department's Development Plan

No.	Leadership Behavior	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
1	Participates in framing the department development plan based on school's vision and mission	3.68	Always	1.5
2	Uses needs assessment or other systematic methods to secure faculty input when formatting department development plan	3.53	Always	3
3	Uses data on academic performance of students when formulating department development plan	3.68	Always	1.5
4	Develops learning competencies that can be translated into classroom objectives by teachers	2.97	Often	4.5
5	Continues to benchmark with other schools through the help of the administration to improve the standards of the department	2.97	Often	4.5
Overall Average		3.37	Often	

1.2. Communicating the Department's Development Plan

Table 3 presents the instructional leadership of the principal in communicating the department's development plan. The principal always performed leadership behavior in communicating the department's development plan as evidenced by the computed average weighted mean of 3.66. The principal emphasized clearly the agreed-upon development goals of

the school to the teachers. Foremost in rank was that he discussed the department development plan with teachers at general faculty and/or department meetings that garnered a weighted mean of 3.70. This practice was done during staff meetings with teachers. As explained by Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007), principals need to discuss the purposes and objectives of supervision to establish the terms of references. Last in rank is leading

the department in evaluating the department development plan with a weighted mean of 3.63 which was also done always. He guided the

teachers in evaluating the development plan by giving comments and suggestions based on experiences.

Table 3. Instructional Leadership of the Principal in Communicating the Department’s Development Plan

No	Leadership Behavior	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
6	Communicates the department development plan effectively to the members of the school community	3.65	Always	2
7	Discusses the department development plan with teachers at general faculty and /or department meetings	3.70	Always	1
8	Refers to the department development plan when making curricular decisions with teachers	3.64	Always	3
9	Leads the department in evaluating the department development plan	3.63	Always	4
Overall Average		3.66	Always	

1.3. Supervising and Evaluating Instruction

Table 4 shows the instructional leadership of the principal in supervising and evaluating instruction. The principal always performed instructional leadership behavior in supervising and evaluating instruction always as proven by the average weighted mean of 3.54. This finding conforms with the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads. He is aware that instructional leadership covers several domains and competency strands like assessment for learning, implementing programs for instructional improvement and instructional supervision. He ensures always that the classroom priorities of teachers were consistent with the stated department development plan rated as the first in

rank for it obtained a weighted mean of 3.61. He provided learning environment that made effective teaching and maximal learning possible. The time spent for instructional supervision was 70 percent while 30 percent for administrative supervision. This was evident when he always checked if the activities being done by the teachers were congruent with the school’s development plan. Last in rank is that he reviewed students’ work products when evaluating classroom instruction often which obtained a weighted mean of 3.44. This goes to show that the principal showed concern to students’ welfare so that he could be sure that the students were able to achieve desired outcomes in teaching and learning. This was demonstrated by having criteria tailored to the needs and capabilities of teachers and students.

Table 4. Instructional Leadership of the Principal in Supervising and Evaluating Instruction

No.	Leadership Behavior	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
10	Ensures that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the stated department development plan	3.61	Always	1
11	Reviews students' work products when evaluating classroom instruction	3.44	Often	5
12	Conducts observation of class activities	3.59	Always	2
13	Points out specific strengths in teachers' instructional practices in post observation feedback (e.g. in conferences or written evaluations).	3.58	Always	3
14	Leads teachers to recognize specific weaknesses during post-observation	3.47	Often	4
	Overall Average	3.54	Always	

1.4. Monitoring Student Progress

Table 5 shows the instructional leadership of the principal in monitoring student progress. The principal's instructional leadership behavior in monitoring student progress was done often as evidenced by the obtained average weighted mean of 3.38. First in rank is checking the class records of the teachers often to monitor student progress that obtained a weighted mean of 3.37. This was shown in his regular inspection of class records of teachers every grading period. If

there were points for clarification, regular faculty meetings were conducted. Last in rank is meeting teachers individually to discuss students' academic progress often which gained a weighted mean of 3.28, often performed. There were instances when the principal talked with the teachers personally regarding salient points in giving grades. This finding is similar to that of Le Fevre which disclosed that the principals spent time to improve teaching and learning that was evident on student achievement.

Table 5. Instructional Leadership of the Principal in Monitoring Student Progress

No.	Leadership Behavior	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
15	Meets teachers individually to discuss students' academic progress	3.28	Often	3
16	Discusses the item analysis of tests with the teacher/group of teachers to identify both curricular/instructional strengths and weaknesses	3.31	Often	2
17	Checks the class records of the teachers to monitor student progress	3.37	Often	1

Overall Average	3.32	Often
-----------------	------	-------

1.5 Maintaining High Visibility

It can be gleaned in Table 6 the instructional leadership of the principal in maintaining high visibility. The principal showed the instructional leadership behavior in maintaining high visibility often as supported by the average weighted mean of 3.29. The principal showed leadership by assisting individual teachers to improve their performance especially when he felt that teachers needed him most. First in rank is that he always assisted teachers who needed help for better classroom management which obtained a weighted mean of 3.84. Knowing that one of the roles of a principal is to provide guidance and assistance to teachers, he always assured his teachers that he is always

present to lend a helping hand to them. This finding relates to what Sebastian and Allensworth (2012) found out in their study which revealed that the principal provided the primary mechanism for improving student achievement through the school learning climate. Training programs were provided to recognize learning climate as a priority. Last in rank was that he often attended and/or participated in extra and co-curricular activities of the department that got a weighted mean of 2.81. He always supported the teachers in the implementation of extra-curricular activities such as Girl and Boy Scouting, Brigada Eskwela, Athletic Meets, and other activities.

Table 5. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the Principal in Maintaining High Visibility

No.	Leadership Behavior	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
18	Takes time to talk with students and/or teachers during recess and breaks	3.24	Often	3
19	Attends and/or participates in extra and co-curricular activities of the department	2.81	Often	5
20	Substitutes classes if the teacher is absent or late	2.96	Often	4
21	Assists teachers who need help for better classroom management	3.84	Always	1
22	Makes rounds during classes	3.59	Always	2
	Overall Average	3.29	Often	

1.6 Providing Incentives for Teachers.

It can be seen in Table 7 the instructional leadership behavior of the principal in providing incentives for teachers. The principal showed instructional leadership behavior of the principal in providing incentives for teachers always as shown by the average weighted mean of 3.53. Foremost in rank with a weighted

mean of 3.66 is complimenting teachers for their efforts or performance always. As stressed by Wallace (2000), one of the principal's key responsibilities is providing incentives to improve instruction to enable teachers to teach at their best and students learn to their utmost. Feedbacks were given to teachers regarding their performance.

Incentives were given to deserving teachers. This was shown through openness, trust, and respect which are all moral aspects of supervision as pointed out by Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007). Praises were given especially during staff meetings. Last

in rank is acknowledging teacher's exceptional performance by writing memos or writing their names in board that got a weighted mean of 3.39. The principal sent memorandum to teachers on matters not announced in staff meetings.

Table 7. Instructional Leadership of the Principal in Providing Incentives for Teachers

No.	Leadership Behavior	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
23	Compliments teachers for their efforts or performance	3.66	Always	1
24	Acknowledges teacher's exceptional performance by writing memos or writing their names in board	3.39	Often	4
25	Shows fairness in affirming teachers	3.53	Always	2
26	Explains clearly the result of the teachers' evaluation for midyear and/or year-end	3.52	Always	3
Overall Average		3.53	Always	

1.7 Promoting Professional Development. Table 8 shows the instructional leadership of the principal in promoting professional development. The principal's instructional leadership in promoting professional development was always practiced as proven by the garnered average weighted mean of 3.62. First in rank with the same weighted mean of 3.67 are ensuring that in-service activities attended by teachers are consistent with the school's vision-mission and/or department development plan and requiring the participation of the teachers in important in-service activities. This finding agrees with that of Sebastian and Allensworth (2012) that the relationship of

principal leadership and instruction included the quality of professional development, professional community, and partnership with parents. This practice was evident because regular monitoring was done. Attendance during in-service trainings and seminars was checked. Last in rank is setting aside time at faculty/departmental meeting for teachers to share ideas or information from in-service activities always with a weighted mean of 3.54. During staff meetings, teachers were given time to share their own ideas regarding topics being talked about. Their opinions and suggestions were sought to resolve important issues.

Table 8. Instructional Leadership Behavior of the Principal in Promoting Professional Development

No.	Leadership Behavior	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
27	Ensures that in-service activities attended by teachers are consistent with the school's vision-mission and/or department development plan	3.67	Always	1.5

28	Actively supports the use of skills acquired during in-service training in the classroom	3.59	Always	4
29	Requires the participation of the teachers in important in-service activities	3.67	Always	1.5
30	Leads or attends teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction	3.64	Always	3
31	Sets aside time at faculty/departmental meeting for teachers to share ideas or information from in-service activities	3.54	Always	5
Overall Average		3.62	Always	

1.8. Summary Table on Instructional Leadership of the Principal

Table 9 shows the summary table on instructional leadership of the principal. The instructional leadership of the principal was practiced often as revealed by the average weighted mean of 3.48. This finding is congruent with what Timperly (2006) indicated that creating professional learning context within the school that addresses knowledge, skills, and expectations is a demanding task for the most competent and experienced leader. As assessed by the teachers, the principal performed best in the foremost in rank behavior which was communicating the department's development plan that got a weighted

mean of 3.66, always practiced. This was displayed in all classrooms, special rooms. Last in rank is maintaining high visibility with a weighted mean of 3.29 often practiced. Although this leadership behavior is last in rank, it was observed by the principal and saw to it that he was always present for assistance when needed. Beyond setting the guidelines, the principal showed engagement with teachers imbued with the moral imperatives of acceptance, honesty, respect, and care. These constituted the moral activity for empowerment, the willingness to let teachers be who they are, and an appreciation of what they have to contribute.

Table 9. Summary Table on Instructional Leadership of the Principal

No.	Leadership Behavior	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
A	Framing the department's development plan	3.37	Often	5
B	Communicating the department's development plan	3.66	Always	1
C	Supervising and evaluating instruction	3.54	Always	3
D	Monitoring student progress	3.32	Often	6
E	Maintaining high visibility	3.29	Often	7
F	Providing incentives for teachers	3.53	Always	4
G	Promoting professional development	3.62	Always	2
OVERALL AVERAGE		3.48	Often	

2. Based on the findings, what areas in instructional leadership should principals focus which will enhance his/her instructional leadership skills ?

Though the results showed that the principals manifested good instructional leadership in all areas, it can be gleaned from the summary table that the principals must

focus on the areas of framing the department's development plan, monitoring student progress, and maintaining high visibility. As stated in The National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads (NCBS –SH), it identified several domains and competency strands and one of them is on instructional leadership which covers assessment for learning, developing programs and/or adopting existing programs, implementing programs for instructional improvement, and instructional supervision. This is also pointed out by Bago (2008). She said that it is the thread that binds all the other variables. Effective instruction becomes possible through the synergy of all the correlates under a skill full leader. Instructional leadership is a basic concept that insures effective. However, it is not exercised in isolation because it is all-encompassing. It involves tasks such as setting goals, allocating resources for instruction, managing the curriculum, evaluating teachers, and establishing healthy and viable home-school relations, among others.

Summary Of Findings

Guided by the statement of the problem, the findings of the study are hereby summarized.

Instructional Leadership of the Principal

1. Framing the Department's Development Plan

Teachers perceive that the principals often demonstrated leadership behavior in framing the department's development plan based on the school's vision and mission. The teachers also believe that the principals use data on academic performance of students when formulating the development plan of the school.

2. Communicating the Department's Development Plan

Teachers perceive that the principals always perform leadership behavior in communicating the department's development plan. They discuss this plan during faculty meetings and refer to the

said plan when making curricular decisions with teachers.

3. Supervising and Evaluating Instruction

Teachers perceive that the principals always perform leadership behavior in supervising and evaluating instruction. It was revealed that principals ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the stated department development plan through class observations and post observation feedback.

4. Monitoring Student Progress

Teachers believe that principals often monitor student progress by checking the class records of the teachers, discussing the item analysis of tests and meeting the teachers to discuss students' academic progress.

5. Maintaining High Visibility

Teachers revealed that the principals often maintain high visibility in schools. They assist teachers who need help in classroom management, make rounds during class hours and take time to talk to students and teachers.

6. Providing Incentives for Teachers

Teachers perceive that the principals always display instructional leadership behavior in providing incentives for teachers by explaining clearly the result of the teachers' evaluation, affirming teachers, complimenting teachers for their efforts and performance and acknowledging their exceptional performance.

7. Promoting Professional Development

Teachers believe that the principals always promote professional development by providing in-service trainings and time for sharing of ideas or information from in-service activities.

IV CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that:

1. The principals are generally doing their role as instructional leaders.
2. The principals are doing better as instructional leaders in terms of communicating the department's development plans, promoting professional development, supervising and evaluating instruction, and providing incentives for teachers.
3. The principals need to enhance their instructional leadership roles in maintaining high visibility, monitoring student progress, and framing the department's development plan.
4. The many tasks of principals are affecting their role as instructional leaders.
5. The supervision of instruction must be enhanced in order for principals to fulfill their role as instructional leaders more effectively.

REFERENCES

A Reviewer for the National Qualifying Examination for School Heads: 2nd edition (2015). Manila: Philippine Normal University.

Bago, Adelaida L. (2008). *Supervision of Instruction: The Philippine Perspective*. Quezon City: De La Salle University Press.

Bilbao, P. et al. (2008). *Curriculum Development*. Quezon City: LORIMAR Publishing Co.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to Great*. New York: HarperCollines Publishers, Inc.

Department of Education Order 32, s. 2010 - National Adoption and Implementation of the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads..

<http://www.deped.gov.ph/orders/do-32-s-2010>

Le Fevre, D. M., & Robinson, V. M. (2015). The interpersonal challenges of instructional leadership: Principals' effectiveness in conversations about performance issues. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 51(1), 58-95.
<http://eaq.sagepub.com/content/51/1/58.full.pdf+html>

Salva, R.V. (2011). *Human Relations and Instructional Leadership Behavior of the Subject Area Coordinators of the High School department in a Private Sectarian University*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Philippine Normal University-Manila.

Sebastian, J. and Allensworth, E. (2012). "The Influence of Principal Leadership on Classroom Instruction and Student Learning: A Study of Mediated Pathways to Learning." *Educational Administration Quarterly*. pp. 626-623. Retrieved on October 24, 2016, from <http://eaq.sagepub.com/content/48/4/626.full.pdf+html>

Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R. . (2007). *Supervision: A Redefinition*. 8th edition. New York: McGraw-Hills Co.

Sevilla, Consuelo G. (1992). *Research Methods*. Manila: Rex Bookstore.

Timperley, H., S. (2005). "Instructional Leadership Challenges: The Case of Using Student Achievement Information for Instructional Improvement" . *Leadership and Policy in Schools*.
www.wallacefoundation.org
DOI: 10.1080/15700760590924591