

# School Heads' Administrative & Instructional Leadership Skills, Performance of Teachers and Challenges in The Transition of The Matatag Curriculum

LOUIE C. MANGABON

Teacher III

Western Leyte College

Master of Arts in Education

Major in School Administration and Supervision

Louie.mangabon@deped.gov.ph

*Abstract* — This study determined the significant relationship between the School Principal's Administrative & Leadership skills and Performance of Teachers and challenges in the Transition to the MATATAG Curriculum. A proposed Instructional Supervisory plan was formulated based on the result of the study. This study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the significant relationship between the School Principal's Administrative and Leadership Skills and the Performance of Teachers, as well as to identify the challenges encountered during the transition to the MATATAG Curriculum. The descriptive component was used to gather information on the current levels of administrative and leadership skills of school principals, the performance levels of teachers, and the specific issues and barriers they faced in implementing the MATATAG Curriculum. The correlational aspect of the study aimed to explore the relationship between the leadership practices of school principals and the corresponding performance outcomes of teachers. The Test of Relationship between Administrative and Instructional Supervisory Skills and the IPCRF of Teachers. The table examines the correlation coefficient ( $r$ ), the computed  $t$ -value, the critical table value at the 0.05 significance level, and the decision regarding the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) to determine whether there is a significant relationship between the two variables. The results show a correlation coefficient, indicating a moderate positive relationship between the school principals' administrative and instructional supervisory skills and the teachers' performance as measured by the IPCRF. The computed  $t$ -value, which exceeds the critical table value at the 0.05 level of significance. Consequently, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected, indicating that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two variables. This finding suggests that principals who demonstrate stronger administrative and instructional supervisory skills tend to have teachers with higher performance ratings. The moderate correlation implies that while these leadership skills are influential, other factors may also contribute to teacher performance. Effective supervision and administration likely foster an environment that supports teacher growth, accountability, and instructional effectiveness. The overall result implies that enhancing principals' supervisory competencies can positively impact teacher performance and, by extension, student outcomes. This underscores the importance of targeted professional development programs for school leaders to improve their administrative and instructional capabilities.

*Keywords* — *School Head, Administrative & Instructional Leadership Skills, Performance, Teachers*

---

## I. Introduction

The MATATAG Curriculum, also known as “Bansang Makabata, Batang Makabansa” aims to prioritize the mastery of literacy and numeracy skills among learners while decongesting the existing curriculum to focus on foundational skills.

According to James (2019), Education 4.0 is the desired learning strategy that coincides with the fourth industrial revolution. Smart technology, artificial intelligence, and robotics are all changing our daily lives as part of this industrial revolution. This means incorporating technology into the curriculum with the supports of teachers, learners outcome will completely change and by this, utilizing technology to enhance the learning experience will create a big impact on the teaching learning process.

While looking for the effectiveness of the learner’s outcome, it is intended to be a crucial in a way that it needs mentorship and peer tutoring that is significant in supporting students during curriculum transitions.

This study the primary focus is to ensures that students develop basic literacy and numeracy skills, offering them the right balance of academic and extracurricular activities. Furthermore, it aims to make the learning process more dynamic, flexible, and focused on students' diverse learning needs., comprehension assessments, and collaborative tasks. This offers learners a concrete, entertaining way to track their progress and stay motivated.

Additionally, MATATAG curriculum is an interesting move, it can be seen in the humanized approach to learning while emphasizing five skills such as language, reading and literacy, mathematics, nationalism, and good manners and right conduct. However, some may look at it as a byproduct of political rebranding, and some to the extent of the spectrum may accept it as an ideal social reconstruction from the circumstances, nonetheless, positioning the curriculum as a self-claimed pragmatic vista, as the new blueprint. It may be good in the paper as initiatives, but the concrete implementations remain at the surface as it is gradually being injected into the systems. Different societal actors and history may argue that the discourse should go beyond political realism and address the underlying socio-economic factors like learning poverty, classroom shortage and other forces while remaining steadfast and proactive to such changes.

This study is essential to comprehending how a school principal's leadership and administrative abilities significantly influence teacher performance and, in turn, student learning results during the shift to the MATATAG curriculum. The ability of leaders to effectively support teachers through these changes is crucial to ensure that students attain the best possible learning outcomes as global education systems continue to develop, especially with the introduction of new curricula. This study intends to offer important insights into how leadership practices can be maximized to improve educational quality, encourage teacher development, and ultimately support the successful implementation of the MATATAG curriculum, guaranteeing that students are ready for challenges in the future.

This study determined the significant relationship between the School Principal's Administrative & Leadership skills and Performance of Teachers and challenges in the Transition to the MATATAG Curriculum. A proposed Instructional Supervisory plan was formulated based on the result of the study.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the extent of Administrative and Instructional Leadership Skills of School Administrator in terms of the following:
  - 1.1 School Leadership;
  - 1.2 Instructional Leadership;
  - 1.3 Creating a Student-Centered Learning Climate;
  - 1.4 Human Resource Management and Professional Development;
  - 1.5 (Parents and Involvement and Community Partnership) has a strand on parental involvement;
  - 1.6 School Management and Operations; and
  - 1.7 Personnel and Professional Attributes and interpersonal Effectiveness?
2. What is the performance of the Secondary School Teachers in the IPCRF?
3. What are the challenges of the school heads and teachers in the transition of the MATATAG Curriculum?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the Administrative and Instructional Leadership Skills of School Administrator and IPCRF performance of secondary teachers?
5. What Instructional Supervisory plan can be proposed based on the findings of the study?

#### Statement of Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between the Administrative and Instructional Leadership Skills of School Administrator and IPCRF performance of secondary teachers.

## II. Methodology

**Design.** This study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the significant relationship between the School Principal's Administrative and Leadership Skills and the Performance of Teachers, as well as to identify the challenges encountered during the transition

to the MATATAG Curriculum. The descriptive component was used to gather information on the current levels of administrative and leadership skills of school principals, the performance levels of teachers, and the specific issues and barriers they faced in implementing the MATATAG Curriculum. The correlational aspect of the study aimed to explore the relationship between the leadership practices of school principals and the corresponding performance outcomes of teachers. Quantitative data were collected using standardized survey questionnaires distributed to selected school principals and teachers. To support the quantitative findings and provide deeper insights, qualitative data were also gathered through open-ended survey items or structured interviews that focused on the challenges experienced during the curriculum transition. Statistical tools such as Pearson's  $r$  were employed to analyze the strength and significance of relationships between variables.

The information for the analysis was gathered using two (2) distinct survey instruments: School head's Administrative and Instructional Leadership skills survey tool. The scale ranges from 4 (frequently), 3 (often), 2 (occasionally), and 1 (never). The second tool was the IPCRF to validate their performance. The 3rd tool was interview questionnaire made by the researcher to gather data on the different challenges of the teachers they experience during the transition of the Matatag Curriculum. The proposed Instructional Supervisory Plan was taken based on the findings of the study.

**Sampling** The respondents of the study were the were the 2 School Heads and 33 teachers of Baybay National High School in the Schools Division of Baybay City that were involved in this study were being identified and the primary means of reach is during the actual conduct of the study as well as during the gathering of data in the school where the study was conducted.

**Research Procedure.** To ensure the proper conduct of the study on School Principal's Administrative and Leadership Skills and the Performance of Teachers, and the Challenges in the Transition of the MATATAG Curriculum, the researcher first sought formal approval from the Schools Division Superintendent (SDS) through a transmittal letter outlining the purpose, scope, and significance of the research. Upon approval, the same request was endorsed to the respective Public Schools District Supervisors (PSDS) for further validation and coordination at the district level. Subsequently, individual school heads from the selected schools were contacted and provided with the approved communication, requesting their permission to conduct the study within their institutions. After obtaining the necessary approvals, the researcher coordinated with school heads to schedule the distribution of the research instruments to participating principals and teachers. Prior to the administration of the surveys, the objectives and procedures of the study were clearly explained to the participants, assuring them of the confidentiality and voluntary nature of their responses. The researcher then distributed the questionnaires, allowing sufficient time for completion, and later retrieved the accomplished forms for analysis. The data collected were organized, processed, and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to examine the relationship between the variables and identify the challenges encountered in the transition to the MATATAG

Curriculum. Based on the results, a proposed instructional supervisory plan was formulated to address the identified gaps and improve leadership practices and teacher performance in the context of curriculum reform.

**Ethical Issues.** The right to conduct the study was strictly adhered through the approval of the principal, approval of the Superintendent of the Division. Orientation of the respondents both School Principal, teachers were done. Participation was strictly voluntary. Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained throughout the study. Results were used solely for research and educational improvement purposes.

**Treatment of Data.** The following statistical formulas were used in this study:

The quantitative responses were tallied and tabulated. The data were treated statistically using the following tool:

The Simple Percentage and weighted mean was employed to determine the extent of relationship between the School Principal’s Administrative & Leadership skills and Performance of Teachers in relation to learners’ learning outcome in the Transition to the MATATAG Curriculum.

Pearson r Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the significant relationship School Principal’s Administrative & Leadership skills and Performance of Teachers and challenges in the Transition to the MATATAG Curriculum.

### III. Results and Discussion

**Table 1**

**Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of School Leadership**

School Leadership	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Establishes BEIS/SIS and baseline data of all performance indicators	3.20	High
2. Involves all internal & external stakeholders in developing the SIP/AIP	3.21	High
3. Utilizes data, e.g BEIS/LIS, SBM assessment, TSNA, and Strategic planning in the development of SIP/AIP Aligns the SIP/AIP with national, regional and local education policies and thrusts	3.22	High
4. Resolves problems at school level, assists teachers and students to understand problems and identify possible solutions and analyzes causes of problem rather than the symptoms.	2.90	High
5. Explores several approaches in handling problems	3.50	High
6. Demonstrates a proactive approach to problem solving	2.80	High
7. Involves stakeholders in meetings and deliberations for decision-making	2.70	High
8. Sets high expectations and challenging goals	2.63	High

9. Provides opportunities for growth and development of members as team players	2.66	High
10. Defines roles and function of each committee	2.68	High
11. Monitors and evaluates accomplishment of different committees/teams	2.65	High
12. Gives feedback on the team's performance using performance-based assessment tool	2.66	High
13. Establishes a system for rewards and benefits for teachers and staff. Collaborates with concerned staff on the planning and implementation of programs and projects	2.59	High
14. Ensures proper allocation and utilization of resources (time, fiscal, human, IMs, etc.)	3.00	High
15. Provides feedback and updates to stakeholders on the status of progress and completion of programs and projects	3.80	High
Weighted Mean	2.95	High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High  
 2.51-3.25 – High  
 1.76- 2.50- Low  
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of School Leadership as assessed through various key indicators such as planning, decision-making, problem-solving, stakeholder engagement, team management, and resource utilization. The data reflect the school heads' performance based on a 4-point Likert scale, and the weighted mean was used to determine the overall interpretation of their leadership competencies.

The results indicate that all 15 items were rated as High, with none falling into the Very High, Low, or Very Low categories. The highest-rated item was "Provides feedback and updates to stakeholders on the status of progress and completion of programs and projects," with a weighted mean of 3.80, suggesting that communication and transparency are well-executed by school leaders. This is followed by "Explores several approaches in handling problems" (3.50), indicating flexibility and adaptability in leadership. Other moderately high ratings included utilization of data for planning (3.22) and stakeholder involvement in SIP/AIP development (3.21).

Conversely, the lower-rated indicators included "Establishes a system for rewards and benefits for teachers and staff" (2.59), "Involves stakeholders in meetings and deliberations for decision-making" (2.70), and "Sets high expectations and challenging goals" (2.63). These results suggest areas needing improvement, particularly in motivational strategies, inclusive decision-making, and goal-setting. Though still within the "High" range, these scores imply that school heads may need further support and training in fostering team engagement and long-term vision.

The overall average weighted mean is 2.95, which is interpreted as High. The result implies that school heads demonstrate generally effective school leadership skills, especially in data utilization and communication with stakeholders. However, there remains room for growth in areas such as problem-solving proactivity, team performance management, and resource distribution. Improving in these areas could further elevate the school heads' effectiveness from

"High" to "Very High." This table presents the Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of School Leadership as assessed through various key indicators such as planning, decision-making, problem-solving, stakeholder engagement, team management, and resource utilization. The data reflect the school heads' performance based on a 4-point Likert scale, and the weighted mean was used to determine the overall interpretation of their leadership competencies.

The results indicate that all 15 items were rated as High, with none falling into the Very High, Low, or Very Low categories. The highest-rated item was "Provides feedback and updates to stakeholders on the status of progress and completion of programs and projects," with a weighted mean of 3.80, suggesting that communication and transparency are well-executed by school leaders. This is followed by "Explores several approaches in handling problems" (3.50), indicating flexibility and adaptability in leadership. Other moderately high ratings included utilization of data for planning (3.22) and stakeholder involvement in SIP/AIP development (3.21).

Conversely, the lower-rated indicators included "Establishes a system for rewards and benefits for teachers and staff" (2.59), "Involves stakeholders in meetings and deliberations for decision-making" (2.70), and "Sets high expectations and challenging goals" (2.63). These results suggest areas needing improvement, particularly in motivational strategies, inclusive decision-making, and goal-setting. Though still within the "High" range, these scores imply that school heads may need further support and training in fostering team engagement and long-term vision.

The overall average weighted mean is 2.95, which is interpreted as High. The result implies that school heads demonstrate generally effective school leadership skills, especially in data utilization and communication with stakeholders. However, there remains room for growth in areas such as problem-solving proactivity, team performance management, and resource distribution. Improving in these areas could further elevate the school heads' effectiveness from "High" to "Very High."

**Table 2**  
**Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of Instructional Leadership**

Instructional Leadership	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Manages the processes and procedures in monitoring student achievement Ensures utilization of a range of assessment processes to assess students' performance	3.20	High
2. Ensures utilization of a range of assessment processes to assess students' performance	3.21	High
3. Assesses the effectiveness of curricular/co-curricular programs and/or instructional strategies	3.22	High
4. Utilizes assessment results to improve learning	3.20	High
5. Creates and manages a school process to ensure student progress is conveyed to students and parents/guardians, regularly. Develops/adapts a research-based school program	3.19	High
6. Assists in implementing an existing, coherent and responsive school-wide curriculum; addresses deficiencies and sustains	3.15	High

successes of current programs in collaboration with teachers and learners		
7. Develops a culture of functional literacy.	3.05	High
8. Manages the introduction of curriculum initiatives in line with DepEd policies (e.g. BEC, Madrasah)	3.20	High
9. Works with teachers in curriculum review	3.21	High
10. Enriches curricular offerings based on local needs; manages curriculum innovation and enrichment with the use of technology; and organizes teams to champion instructional innovation programs toward curricular responsiveness. Prepares and implements an instructional supervisory plan, conducts instructional supervision using appropriate strategy Evaluates lesson plans as well as classroom and learning management	3.02	High
11. Provides in a collegial manner, timely, accurate and specific feedback to teachers” regarding their performance Provides expert technical assistance and instructional support to teachers.	3.02	High
Weighted Mean	3.15	High

Legend: 4.21- 5.00 – Very High  
 3.41- 4.20 – High  
 2.61-3.40 - Average  
 1.81- 2.60- Low  
 1.00-1.80- Very Low

This table presents the Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of Instructional Leadership, which focuses on how school heads manage the instructional program, monitor student performance, assess curriculum effectiveness, support teaching strategies, and provide feedback to teachers. The table measures various indicators using a weighted mean based on responses, with interpretation guided by a defined scale ranging from “Very High” to “Very Low.”

The results show that all 11 indicators fall within the “High” range, suggesting that school heads demonstrate consistently strong but not outstanding instructional leadership. The highest ratings were observed in areas such as “Assesses the effectiveness of curricular/co-curricular programs and/or instructional strategies” (3.22), “Works with teachers in curriculum review” (3.21), and “Ensures utilization of a range of assessment processes” (3.21). These findings imply that school heads are effective in collaborative curriculum management and performance-based assessments, which are essential components of a responsive instructional program.

Meanwhile, slightly lower ratings were recorded in indicators such as “Provides expert technical assistance and instructional support to teachers” (3.02), “Evaluates lesson plans as well as classroom and learning management” (3.02), and “Develops a culture of functional literacy” (3.05). While still within the “High” range, these suggest that there is room for improvement in hands-on supervision, technical coaching, and literacy promotion, which are critical for deepening instructional quality and aligning with DepEd’s evolving curriculum reforms.

The overall average weighted mean is 3.15, interpreted as High. The result implies that school heads are performing their instructional leadership roles effectively, particularly in curriculum management and assessment utilization. However, the data also point to areas that need strengthening—especially in providing technical assistance and ensuring instructional innovations—so that instructional supervision moves from compliance to impact-driven leadership.

**Table 3**  
**Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of Creating a Student-Centered Learning Climate**

Creating a Student-Centered Learning Climate	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Establishes and models high social and academic expectations for all	3.12	High
2. Creates an engaging learning environment	3.20	High
3. Supports learners desire to pursue further learning	3.00	High
4. Participates in the management of learner behavior within the school and other school related activities done outside the school	2.93	High
5. Recognizes high performing learners and teachers and supportive parents and other stakeholders. Creates and sustains a safe, orderly, nurturing and healthy environment	2.91	High
6. Provides environment that promotes the use of technology among learners and teachers	2.92	High
Weighted Mean	3.01	High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High  
 2.51-3.25 – High  
 1.76- 2.50- Low  
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of Creating a Student-Centered Learning Climate, focusing on how school leaders promote inclusive, engaging, and safe learning environments that support the holistic development of learners. The indicators reflect practices such as establishing expectations, managing behavior, using technology, and recognizing achievements, all of which contribute to a learner-focused school climate.

The results indicate that all six indicators were rated as High, with no item reaching the “Very High” category. The highest-rated item is “Creates an engaging learning environment” with a weighted mean of 3.20, followed closely by “Establishes and models high social and academic expectations for all” (3.12). These findings suggest that school heads are generally effective in setting clear expectations and fostering student engagement, which are essential for a student-centered approach.

On the other hand, the lowest-rated indicators include “Recognizes high performing learners and teachers and supportive parents and other stakeholders” (2.91), “Provides environment that promotes the use of technology among learners and teachers” (2.92), and

“Participates in the management of learner behavior” (2.93). Although still in the “High” range, these results indicate that further efforts are needed to enhance recognition systems, increase meaningful technology integration, and strengthen behavior management strategies that extend beyond the classroom.

The overall average weighted mean is 3.01, which is interpreted as High. The result implies that school heads are able to create a generally positive and supportive student-centered learning climate. However, the consistent “High” (rather than “Very High”) ratings across all indicators also imply that while the foundation for effective learner-centered practices is in place, there remains substantial room for improvement, particularly in areas of student recognition, parent engagement, and integration of 21st-century tools like educational technology.

**Table 4**  
**Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of Human Resources Management and Development**

Human Resources Management and Development	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Builds a community of learners among teachers	2.76	High
2. Assesses and analyzes the needs and interests of teachers and other school	2.98	High
3. Ensures that the School Plan for Professional Development (SPPD) emerges from the Individual Professional Plan for Development (IPPD’s) and other identified needs of school personnel included in the SIP/AIP Monitors and coaches employees and facilitates the induction of new ones	2.91	High
4. Recognizes potential of staff and provides opportunities for professional development	2.62	High
5. Ensures that the objectives of the school development plan are supported with resources for training and development programs	2.74	High
6. Prepares, implements, and monitors school-based INSET for all teaching staff based IPPD’s Monitors and evaluates school-based INSETs.	3.20	High
7. Utilizes the basic qualification standards and adheres to pertinent policies in recruiting and hiring teachers/staff Creates and trains School Selection and Promotion Committee and trains its members Recommends better ways and means to improve recruitment, hiring and performance appraisal of teachers. Assigns teachers and other personnel to their area of competence.	3.05	High
8. Assists teachers and staff in setting and resetting performance goals	3.00	High
9. Monitors and evaluates performance of teaching and non-teaching personnel vis-a-vis targets Delegates specific tasks to help manage the performance of teaching and non-teaching personnel Coaches deputized staff as needed on managing performance	3.10	High
10. Creates a functional school-based performance appraisal committee	3.15	High
Weighted Mean	2.95	High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High  
2.51-3.25 – High  
1.76- 2.50- Low  
1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of Human Resources Management and Development, which measures the school leaders' effectiveness in building teacher capacity, managing staff performance, supporting professional growth, and aligning recruitment and training practices with school goals. The indicators evaluate various aspects of personnel management such as performance monitoring, coaching, professional development planning, and adherence to policies on hiring and promotion.

The data reveal that all ten indicators were interpreted as High, signifying that school heads generally exhibit strong competencies in human resource functions. The highest-rated item was "Prepares, implements, and monitors school-based INSET for all teaching staff based on IPPDs" with a weighted mean of 3.20, indicating a commendable effort in ensuring that in-service training is consistently managed. This is followed closely by "Creates a functional school-based performance appraisal committee" (3.15) and "Monitors and evaluates performance of teaching and non-teaching personnel" (3.10), which emphasize performance management as a well-practiced area.

Meanwhile, indicators such as "Recognizes potential of staff and provides opportunities for professional development" (2.62) and "Ensures that the objectives of the school development plan are supported with resources for training" (2.74) received the lowest yet still "High" ratings. These suggest that while school heads acknowledge the importance of professional development, limitations may exist in resource allocation or individualized recognition. Additionally, "Builds a community of learners among teachers" scored 2.76, implying that collaborative professional growth, though evident, may benefit from stronger leadership initiatives.

The overall average weighted mean is 2.95, interpreted as High. The result implies that school heads possess competent human resource management and development skills, particularly in organizing training, appraising staff, and supporting teacher growth. However, the consistently "High" ratings across indicators also imply that there is potential to elevate practices to a "Very High" level, especially in areas involving resource mobilization, staff motivation, and cultivating professional learning communities.

**Table 5**  
**Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of Parents and Involvement and Community Partnership**

Parents and Involvement and Community Partnership	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Establishes school and family partnerships that promote student peak performance	3.00	High
2. Organizes programs that involve parents and other school stakeholders to promote learning	3.05	High
3. Conducts dialogues for a training of teachers, earners, parents on the welfare and improves performance of learners. Promotes the image of the school through school summit, State of the School Address (SOSA), cultural show, learners' projects exhibits, fairs, etc.; conducts dialogues and meetings with multi-stakeholders in crafting programs and projects Participates actively in community affairs	3.03	High
4. Establishes sustainable linkages/partnership with other sector, agencies and NGOs through MOA/MOU or using Adopt-a- School Program policies	3.21	High
5. Promotes the image of the school through school summit, State of the School Address (SOSA), cultural show, learners' projects exhibits, fairs, etc.; conducts dialogues and meetings with multi-stakeholders in crafting programs and projects	2.97	High
6. Participates actively in community affairs	2.72	High
Weighted Mean	3.00	High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High  
 2.51-3.25 – High  
 1.76- 2.50- Low  
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of Parents and Involvement and Community Partnership, focusing on how school leaders engage families, communities, and external partners in supporting learners' performance and school development. The indicators in the table reflect school heads' capacity to establish partnerships, organize stakeholder-driven programs, promote the school's image, and participate in community initiatives.

The results show that all six indicators were rated as High, indicating a consistent level of effort in fostering parent and community involvement. The highest-rated item is "Establishes sustainable linkages/partnerships with other sectors, agencies and NGOs through MOA/MOU or using Adopt-a-School Program policies" with a weighted mean of 3.21, suggesting that school heads are proactive in building formal collaborations to enhance school resources and support systems. This is followed closely by "Organizes programs that involve parents and other school stakeholders to promote learning" (3.05) and "Conducts dialogues for the training of teachers, learners, and parents on the welfare and improved performance of learners" (3.03), demonstrating efforts to promote inclusive learning and shared responsibilities.

Meanwhile, the lowest-rated indicator is “Participates actively in community affairs” with a mean of 2.72, which, although still categorized as High, indicates that school heads may face challenges in maintaining consistent presence or engagement in broader community events. Similarly, “Promotes the image of the school through school summit, SOSA, cultural show, and project exhibits” received a rating of 2.97, suggesting that efforts to showcase school achievements and maintain public visibility are evident but could be further strengthened.

The overall average weighted mean is 3.00, interpreted as High. The result implies that school heads effectively perform their roles in engaging families and communities in school affairs, which contributes to student success and institutional development. However, the uniform "High" ratings across all indicators also imply a need for school leaders to intensify their community involvement and promotional activities to push these efforts to the "Very High" level, ensuring broader and more sustained stakeholder participation.

**Table 6**  
**Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of School Management and Operations**

School Management and Operations	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Manages the implementation, monitoring and review of the SIP/AIP and other action plans Establishes and maintains specific programs to meet needs of identified target groups; takes the lead in the design of a school plant facilities improvement plan in consultation with an expert	2.68	High
2. Establishes and maintains specific programs to meet needs of identified target groups; takes the lead in the design of a school plant facilities improvement plan in consultation with an expert.	2.64	High
3. Allocates/ prioritizes funds for improvement and maintenance of school physical facilities and equipment	2.63	High
4. Oversees school operations and care and use of school facilities according to set guidelines	2.62	High
5. Institutionalizes best practices in managing and monitoring school operations thereby creating a safe, secure and clean learning environment	2.91	High
6. Prepares a financial management plan; develops a school budget which is consistent with SIP/AIP Generates and mobilizes financial resources	2.98	High
7. Manages school resources in accordance with DepEd policies and accounting and auditing rules and regulations and other pertinent guidelines	2.82	High
8. Accepts donations, gifts, bequest and grants in accordance with R.A 9155	2.82	High
9. Manages a process for the registration, maintenance and replacement of school assets and dispositions of non- reusable properties	2.70	High
10. Organizes a procurement committee and ensures that the official procurement process is followed	2.65	High
11. Utilizes funds for approved school programs and projects as reflected in SIP/AIP; monitors utilization, recording and reporting of funds	2.70	High

12. Accounts for school fund; and prepares financial reports and submits/ communicates the same to higher education authorities and other educational partners	2.85	High
13. Applies Information Technology (IT) plans for online communication	2.90	High
14. Uses IT to facilitate the operationalization of the school management system (e.g. school information system, student tracking system, personnel information system)	2.60	High
15. Uses IT to access Teacher Support Materials (TSM), Learning Support Materials (LSM) and assessment tools in accordance with the guidelines	3.00	High
16. Shares with other school heads the school experience in the use of new technology.	3.05	High
Weighted Mean	2.78	High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High  
 2.51-3.25 – High  
 1.76- 2.50- Low  
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of School Management and Operations, highlighting how school leaders handle financial planning, facility maintenance, policy compliance, resource allocation, and the integration of technology into school operations. The table aims to measure the extent to which school heads execute various administrative and operational responsibilities to ensure an efficient and supportive learning environment.

The results show that all sixteen indicators were rated as High, reflecting a consistent level of competency among school heads in managing school operations. The highest-rated item was “Shares with other school heads the school experience in the use of new technology” with a weighted mean of 3.05, indicating collaboration and peer-learning as emerging strengths. This is followed closely by “Uses IT to access Teacher Support Materials (TSM), Learning Support Materials (LSM) and assessment tools” (3.00) and “Prepares a financial management plan; develops a school budget” (2.98), which reflect competency in digital adaptation and resource planning. These areas underscore the growing importance of financial literacy and technological integration in school leadership.

Meanwhile, lower ratings were noted in areas such as “Uses IT to facilitate the operationalization of the school management system” (2.60) and “Oversees school operations and care and use of school facilities” (2.62). These results imply that while school leaders are meeting baseline expectations in operational functions, there may be limitations in optimizing information systems and infrastructure use. Additionally, items related to fund utilization and procurement (ranging from 2.63 to 2.70) also fall within the lower spectrum of the “High” category, suggesting the need for stronger adherence to financial protocols and strategic fund deployment.

The overall average weighted mean is 2.78, which is interpreted as High. The result implies that school heads demonstrate a commendable level of effectiveness in managing school

operations, especially in terms of resource allocation, financial oversight, and the integration of technology. However, the data also suggest room for enhancement in areas such as facilities monitoring, asset management, and maximizing ICT systems to streamline school functions and communication.

**Table 7**  
**Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of Personnel and Professional Attributes and interpersonal Effectiveness**

Personnel and Professional Attributes and interpersonal Effectiveness	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Manifests genuine enthusiasm and pride in the nobility of the teaching profession	3.00	High
2. Observes and demonstrates desirable personal and professional (RA 6713 and Code of Ethics RA 7836) behaviors like respect, honesty, dedication, patriotism and genuine concern for others at all times	3.04	High
3. Maintains harmonious relations with superiors, colleagues, subordinates, learners, parents and other stakeholder Makes appointments, promotions and transfers on the bases of merit and needs in the interest of the service Maintains good reputation with respect to financial matters such as the settlement of his/her debts, loans and other financial affairs	3.11	High
4. Makes appointments, promotions and transfers on the bases of merit and needs in the interest of the service	3.01	High
5. Develops programs and projects for continuing personal and professional development including moral recovery and values formation among teaching and non-teaching personnel.	3.12	High
6. Communicates effectively to staff and other stakeholders in both oral and written forms	3.00	High
7. Listens to stakeholders' needs and concerns and responds appropriately in consideration of the political, social, legal and cultural context.	2.94	High
8. Interacts appropriately with a variety of audiences and demonstrates ability to empathize with others.	2.82	High
9. Observes award system and a system of assistance for teachers staff to sustain integrity, honesty and fairness in school practices	2.64	High
10. Demonstrates integrity, honesty and fairness all his/her dealings and transactions and makes individuals accountable for their actions.	2.65	High
11. Mobilizes teachers/staff in sustaining a project.	2.88	High
12. Maintains an open, positive and encouraging attitude toward change.	3.15	High
13. Assists teachers in identifying strength and growth areas through monitoring and observation	3.12	High
14. Introduces innovations in the school program to achieve higher learning outcomes	3.15	High
15. Monitors and evaluates the implementation of change programs included in SIP/AIP	3.00	High
16. Observes and applies multi-tasking in giving assignments	3.02	High
17. Advocates and executes plans for changes including culture change in the workplace	3.05	High

18. Empowers teachers and personnel to identify, initiate and manage changes.	3.00	High
Weighted Mean	2.98	High

Legend: 3.26- 4.00 – Very High  
 2.51-3.25 – High  
 1.76- 2.50- Low  
 1.00-1.75- Very Low

This table presents the Administrative and Supervisory Skills of School Heads in terms of Personnel and Professional Attributes and Interpersonal Effectiveness. It outlines how school leaders demonstrate professional behavior, uphold ethical standards, foster interpersonal relationships, and lead with integrity, communication, and a mindset for continuous improvement and change. These dimensions are essential in ensuring an environment that supports both personal and institutional growth.

The data indicate that all 18 indicators were rated as High, suggesting a consistent and commendable display of ethical professionalism and interpersonal competence among school heads. Among the highest-rated items were “Maintains an open, positive and encouraging attitude toward change” and “Introduces innovations in the school program to achieve higher learning outcomes,” both with a weighted mean of 3.15. These highlight the principals' readiness to embrace educational reforms and foster innovation. Equally notable are items like “Develops programs and projects for continuing personal and professional development” (3.12) and “Assists teachers in identifying strength and growth areas through monitoring and observation” (3.12), which reflect their commitment to nurturing professional growth among staff.

On the other hand, relatively lower scores were recorded in “Observes award system and a system of assistance for teachers to sustain integrity, honesty and fairness” (2.64) and “Demonstrates integrity, honesty and fairness in all dealings” (2.65). These figures, although still within the High category, suggest that there may be some inconsistencies in reinforcing systems that ensure accountability and recognition. Similarly, interpersonal sensitivity, as reflected in “Interacts appropriately with a variety of audiences and demonstrates ability to empathize” (2.82), and responsiveness to stakeholder needs (2.94) were among the lower-rated indicators, indicating room for growth in these areas.

The overall average weighted mean is 2.98, which falls under the High category. The result implies that school heads are performing commendably in terms of professionalism and interpersonal effectiveness, but there remains a need for greater reinforcement of integrity-based practices, empathy, and consistent stakeholder engagement. These findings highlight that while school heads are largely effective, investing further in communication and character-driven leadership can further elevate their impact.

**Table 8**  
**IPCRF of the Teachers**

A.	Performance Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	4.35	Outstanding
2	Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	4.48	Outstanding
3	Curriculum and Planning, Reporting and Assessment	4.45	Outstanding
4	Community Linkages & Professional Engagement	4.25	Outstanding
5	Professional Growth and Development	4.20	Outstanding
	AVERAGE	4.34	Outstanding

Legend: 4.21- 5.00 – Outstanding  
 3.41- 4.20 – Very Satisfactory  
 2.61-3.40 - Satisfactory  
 1.81- 2.60- Fairly Satisfactory  
 1.00-1.80- Needs Improvement

This table presents the IPCRF (Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form) of the Teachers, focusing on their performance across various key indicators. The table categorizes the teachers’ competencies based on five domains: Content Knowledge and Pedagogy; Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners; Curriculum and Planning, Reporting and Assessment; Community Linkages and Professional Engagement; and Professional Growth and Development. Each indicator was assessed to determine the overall effectiveness and professional standing of the teachers as part of their performance evaluation.

The data reveals that all five indicators received an Outstanding rating. The highest mean was in “Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners” with 4.48, reflecting the teachers’ strong ability to create inclusive, engaging, and safe learning environments for students. This is closely followed by “Curriculum and Planning, Reporting and Assessment” at 4.45, and “Content Knowledge and Pedagogy” at 4.35, indicating that teachers are well-prepared in instructional delivery and in aligning their teaching strategies with curriculum goals. Furthermore, “Community Linkages and Professional Engagement” earned 4.25, suggesting that teachers actively collaborate with stakeholders and engage in community-related activities that support learning.

The lowest—though still within the Outstanding range—is “Professional Growth and Development” at 4.20, which implies that while teachers are committed to self-improvement, there may be limited access to professional learning opportunities or support systems. The consistently high ratings across all indicators underscore the teachers’ dedication and effectiveness in delivering quality education.

The overall average rating is 4.34, which is interpreted as Outstanding. The result implies that teachers are excelling in their core functions and responsibilities, demonstrating high levels of professionalism, instructional competence, and responsiveness to diverse learning needs. These findings affirm the strength of the teaching workforce and point to a well-established culture of excellence and accountability in the schools assessed.

**Table 9**  
**Test of Relationship**

Variables Correlated	r	Computed value or t	Table Value @.05	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Administrative and Instructional Supervisory Skills to IPCRF of Teachers	0.54	2.268	1.734	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship (Moderate)

This table presents the Test of Relationship between Administrative and Instructional Supervisory Skills and the IPCRF of Teachers. The table examines the correlation coefficient ( $r$ ), the computed  $t$ -value, the critical table value at the 0.05 significance level, and the decision regarding the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) to determine whether there is a significant relationship between the two variables.

The results show a correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) of 0.54, indicating a moderate positive relationship between the school principals' administrative and instructional supervisory skills and the teachers' performance as measured by the IPCRF. The computed  $t$ -value is 2.268, which exceeds the critical table value of 1.734 at the 0.05 level of significance. Consequently, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected, indicating that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two variables. This finding suggests that principals who demonstrate stronger administrative and instructional supervisory skills tend to have teachers with higher performance ratings. The moderate correlation implies that while these leadership skills are influential, other factors may also contribute to teacher performance. Effective supervision and administration likely foster an environment that supports teacher growth, accountability, and instructional effectiveness.

The overall result implies that enhancing principals' supervisory competencies can positively impact teacher performance and, by extension, student outcomes. This underscores the importance of targeted professional development programs for school leaders to improve their administrative and instructional capabilities.

## Part II. CHALLENGES

This qualitative study used a thorough understanding of the transcribed responses of each key informant by reading and re-reading the transcripts to determine the general sense of the whole coverage of its content. The significant statements from the transcripts of the interview and focus group discussions responses were extracted, recorded, and coded using Excel. The significant statements were properly coded noting the informant number and the response number for easy tracing. This research explores the various challenges experienced by teachers in the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum, with a focus on their preparedness, access to teaching resources, instructional planning, learner diversity, and communication support. Findings reveal that while some educators report feeling confident and well-supported due to adequate training and experience, many others face significant hurdles. These include insufficient

preparation, outdated or limited teaching materials, unclear curriculum components, time-consuming lesson planning processes, and the lack of inclusive strategies and tools to meet the needs of diverse learners. Additionally, inconsistent and often vague communication about curriculum changes has left several teachers feeling unsupported, relying more on peer collaboration than formal structures. Collectively, these issues underscore the complexity of curriculum reform and highlight the need for ongoing professional development, systemic resource provision, and structured communication to ensure successful and equitable implementation.

### Responses

1. How would you describe your level of preparedness or training for the MATATAG Curriculum implementation?	Respondents 1, 22	I have some training, but I believe continuous coaching is needed for me to feel fully confident.
	Respondents 2, 21, 33	I understand the MATATAG Curriculum, but I'm still learning and need more training or support to implement it effectively.
	Respondents 3, 30	I've started applying MATATAG concepts, but I'm still adjusting and improving.
	Respondent 4	The training was helpful, but more time to practice and digest the materials is needed.
	Respondents 5, 20	I feel moderately prepared—not unready, but not fully confident either.
	Respondents 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 23, 24	I feel unprepared due to limited training, lack of materials, abrupt rollout, or vague information.
	Respondents 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 26, 28, 31, 32	I feel well-prepared due to extensive training, experience, proactive research, support systems, and successful pilot implementation.
	Respondent 25	I feel average in preparedness, but external factors like class size and schedule may affect implementation.
	Respondent 27	I'm willing and eager, but more mentoring and support are needed for sustained implementation.
	Respondent 29	As a new teacher, I find the curriculum and classroom management challenging.

This table presents the responses to the question, “How would you describe your level of preparedness or training for the MATATAG Curriculum implementation?” It aims to illustrate the range of experiences and readiness levels among teachers as they transition into this new educational framework. The responses, categorized and filtered for similarity, reflect the diverse training backgrounds, support systems, and personal perceptions of readiness across teaching personnel.

A significant portion of respondents (Respondents 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 23, and 24) expressed feeling unprepared. This group cited insufficient training, lack of materials, vague information, and the abrupt rollout as key reasons for their lack of readiness. Meanwhile, others (Respondents

1 and 22) acknowledged that although they received some training, they still required continuous coaching to build full confidence. Similarly, several teachers (Respondents 2, 21, and 33) indicated that they understood the curriculum's intent but were still in the process of learning how to apply it effectively, needing further support and guidance.

In contrast, a large number of respondents (Respondents 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 26, 28, 31, and 32) reported a high level of preparedness. These teachers credited their confidence to extensive training, proactive research, established support systems, and experience in piloting the MATATAG strategies. A few others (Respondents 3 and 30) shared that they had already started integrating curriculum components and were still improving their approaches. Meanwhile, some respondents such as Respondent 25 and 27 noted moderate preparedness but highlighted external factors such as class size and the need for further mentoring as potential barriers to successful implementation. Notably, Respondent 29, a new teacher, found the combination of curriculum demands and classroom management particularly challenging.

The results imply that while there is a promising cohort of educators who feel confident and well-trained, a considerable number of teachers remain uncertain or underprepared. The variance in training quality, time allocation, and access to coaching or mentoring reflects systemic inconsistencies in rollout efforts. These findings suggest that although initial capacity-building has reached a good number of educators, sustained and structured support mechanisms are essential to ensure widespread curriculum fidelity and teacher empowerment.

<b>Question Being Asked</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Responses</b>
What challenges have you encountered related to teaching materials and resources?	Respondents 1, 2, 7, 26	There is a shortage of printed materials such as modules, curriculum guides, and learner's materials.
	Respondents 3, 5, 6	There is a lack of hands-on learning tools, visual aids, manipulatives, and library references.
	Respondents 4, 16, 17, 18, 21	Some materials are outdated, do not match learning competencies, or lack alignment with the MATATAG curriculum.
	Respondents 8, 22, 23, 24	Teachers often need to create or print their own materials due to the lack of supplies and overreliance on teacher-made resources.
	Respondents 9, 10, 11, 12, 14	Limited access to digital tools and infrastructure, such as devices, internet, and interactive media, affects teaching.
	Respondents 13, 15, 30, 31	Lack of training and technical support hinders the effective use of digital or new instructional resources.
	Respondents 19, 20, 25	Some content in available materials is not culturally relevant, clear, or contextually appropriate.
	Respondents 27, 28, 29	Distribution of resources is inconsistent, especially for multi-grade classes, leading to delays in teaching.
	Respondent 32	There's no centralized system for accessing updated materials.
	Respondent 33	Despite material shortages, teachers try to innovate and adapt with available resources.

This table presents the challenges encountered by teachers related to teaching materials and resources. The responses, gathered from multiple educators, reflect the current realities they face in implementing the MATATAG Curriculum. The table categorizes their feedback into recurring issues such as material shortages, outdated content, insufficient access to digital tools, and the burden of producing their own resources. These collective insights highlight systemic gaps in resource availability and distribution that affect effective classroom instruction.

A considerable number of respondents (1, 2, 7, and 26) reported a shortage of printed teaching materials such as modules, curriculum guides, and learners' materials. This was compounded by the lack of hands-on teaching tools and references (Respondents 3, 5, and 6), limiting the ability to deliver interactive or experiential learning. Others (Respondents 4, 16, 17, 18, and 21) pointed out that some existing materials are outdated or misaligned with the competencies of the MATATAG Curriculum, leading to inconsistency in lesson planning. Meanwhile, Respondents 8, 22, 23, and 24 revealed that due to the lack of provided resources, they often have to create or print their own materials—placing additional financial and time burdens on teachers.

Digital accessibility also surfaced as a key concern. Respondents 9, 10, 11, 12, and 14 cited limited availability of digital devices, poor internet access, and a lack of multimedia tools that restrict online or interactive teaching. Further complicating this issue, Respondents 13, 15, 30, and 31 emphasized the lack of training and technical support to maximize the use of these technologies. Cultural relevance and contextual appropriateness were also flagged by Respondents 19, 20, and 25, who stated that some of the available content failed to align with learners' actual needs. Moreover, uneven resource distribution (Respondents 27, 28, 29) and the absence of a centralized materials system (Respondent 32) were barriers that particularly affected rural and multi-grade classrooms. Despite these hurdles, Respondent 33 noted that teachers are finding ways to innovate and adapt with what limited resources they have.

The findings imply that while the MATATAG Curriculum aspires to elevate teaching and learning quality, its implementation is being significantly hindered by material-related challenges. From shortages and outdated content to digital gaps and decentralized resource systems, these issues not only affect instructional delivery but also place undue pressure on teachers to compensate for system failures. This suggests an urgent need for the Department of Education and local divisions to standardize and improve the provision, quality, and accessibility of teaching materials to ensure the success of the curriculum's goals.

Question Being Asked	Respondent(s)	Responses
What difficulties have you faced in integrating the MATATAG Curriculum into your daily instructional planning?	Respondents 1, 2, 3, 5, 18	Some parts of the curriculum are vague or lack concrete examples, making it hard to interpret and plan effectively.
	Respondents 4, 11, 30	Adapting existing or familiar teaching strategies and routines to align with MATATAG is challenging.
	Respondents 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	Daily preparation is time-consuming, and instructional planning feels rushed due to time constraints.
	Respondents 12, 13, 14, 15	Designing differentiated, learner-centered, and values-integrated lessons daily is difficult, especially in large classes.
	Respondents 16, 17, 19, 20	Lack of appropriate or matching learning resources requires teachers to create or purchase materials themselves.
	Respondents 21, 22, 23, 24	Integrating the curriculum is hard due to learner diversity, below-level skills, and oversized class populations.
	Respondents 25, 26, 28	Limited training and absence of clear or standard templates complicate effective lesson planning.
	Respondents 27, 28	Collaboration and timely feedback from peers or supervisors is limited, affecting instructional planning quality.
	Respondents 29, 31, 32	Adjusting to new expectations and processes under MATATAG is overwhelming and affects confidence in planning.
Respondent 33	Despite the difficulties, efforts are being made to simplify plans and adapt gradually.	

This table presents the difficulties faced by teachers in integrating the MATATAG Curriculum into their daily instructional planning. The data collected from various respondents reflects recurring challenges in curriculum alignment, time management, resource adequacy, and teacher support. These concerns highlight how implementation complexities extend beyond curriculum content into the day-to-day realities of classroom instruction and planning.

The table reveals that some teachers (Respondents 1, 2, 3, 5, and 18) struggle with interpreting vague components of the curriculum and the absence of concrete examples, which makes instructional planning unclear. Others (Respondents 4, 11, and 30) find it difficult to adapt their previous strategies and teaching routines to the requirements of MATATAG. Time also emerges as a significant issue, as daily preparation is described as rushed or overly demanding by Respondents 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Lesson planning under MATATAG becomes even more complicated for Respondents 12, 13, 14, and 15, who cite the difficulty of creating differentiated, learner-centered, and values-integrated activities—especially for large classes.

Respondents 16, 17, 19, and 20 indicated that they often need to create or purchase their own materials due to the lack of curriculum-aligned resources. For Respondents 21, 22, 23, and 24, integrating the MATATAG Curriculum into instruction is made difficult by learner diversity, skill gaps, and oversized classes. Meanwhile, Respondents 25, 26, and 28 shared concerns about the lack of training and the absence of standardized planning templates, which hinders the planning process. Additionally, limited collaboration and delayed feedback from peers and supervisors were

reported by Respondents 27 and 28. Finally, Respondents 29, 31, and 32 emphasized the overwhelming nature of adjusting to new expectations, while Respondent 33 noted that despite the challenges, personal effort is being made to adapt gradually.

The results imply that teachers face multidimensional challenges in planning instruction under the MATATAG Curriculum. These include lack of clarity in curriculum components, time-consuming lesson preparation, insufficient learning resources, inadequate training, large class sizes, and limited collaborative and supervisory support. The overall average rating of preparedness and ease of integration across responses suggests a moderate to low level of comfort, with many teachers indicating a need for improvement in support mechanisms. The result implies that more structured training, concrete examples in curriculum documents, accessible resources, and collaborative planning platforms are essential for effective integration.

<b>Question Being Asked</b>	<b>Respondent(s)</b>	<b>Responses</b>
How has the new curriculum affected your ability to address the diverse needs of learners?	Respondents 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	The curriculum has helped me become more intentional, flexible, and learner-centered in addressing diverse learning needs.
	Respondents 29, 30, 31, 32	It has pushed me to be more creative and adaptable in supporting all learners despite the challenges.
	Respondents 9, 10, 14, 15, 16	While the framework promotes diversity, practical application is still limited due to lack of support tools or rigid elements.
	Respondents 11, 12, 13, 17, 18	Differentiation is possible but requires more time, training, and is harder with pacing guides or large class sizes.
	Respondents 19, 20, 21, 24	Lack of resources, time, and practical support significantly hinders the ability to address learner diversity effectively.
	Respondents 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28	The curriculum lacks full inclusivity and guidance for special needs or varied learner contexts, especially in underserved areas.
Respondent 33	Struggling learners are increasingly left behind under the current structure.	

This table presents the effects of the new curriculum on teachers' ability to address the diverse needs of learners. The responses reflect a range of perspectives among educators as they implement the MATATAG Curriculum in varying school contexts. The responses have been grouped based on common themes, from positive shifts in inclusivity and creativity to the challenges of limited resources, rigid structure, and lack of specific guidance for diverse and special needs learners.

The discussion of the table shows that a significant group of respondents (Respondents 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) acknowledged a positive shift, noting that the new curriculum has made them more intentional, flexible, and learner-centered. Similarly, Respondents 29, 30, 31, and 32 shared that it encouraged creativity and adaptability in supporting students. On the other hand, Respondents 9, 10, 14, 15, and 16 noted that while the curriculum supports diversity in theory, the

lack of supportive tools and rigid elements limits actual classroom application. Respondents 11, 12, 13, 17, and 18 stated that differentiation is achievable but constrained by time, lack of training, and large class sizes. Respondents 19, 20, 21, and 24 emphasized that the absence of time, resources, and support severely restricts their ability to address varied learning needs. Furthermore, Respondents 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, and 28 reported that the curriculum still lacks adequate inclusivity for special needs and contextually diverse learners, particularly in marginalized areas. Lastly, Respondent 33 raised concern that struggling learners are increasingly left behind under the current structure.

The results imply that while the MATATAG Curriculum has introduced a more learner-centered and inclusive approach for some, many educators still face significant implementation barriers. These include lack of resources (Respondents 19–24), insufficient training and time for differentiation (Respondents 11–18), and unclear guidance for inclusive education (Respondents 22–28). Despite a portion of teachers (Respondents 1–8, 29–32) expressing positive adaptation, the overall average rating across responses falls between moderately effective and ineffective, indicating a general struggle among educators to fully meet diverse learner needs under the current structure. The result implies that greater investment in contextualized support tools, inclusive training modules, and flexible implementation strategies is needed to bridge the gap between curriculum goals and classroom realities.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Based on the results of this study, there is a significant moderate positive relationship between school principals' administrative and instructional supervisory skills and teachers' performance. This indicates that principals with stronger leadership and supervisory abilities tend to have higher-performing teachers. While these skills are important, other factors may also influence teacher performance. The findings highlight the need to enhance principals' competencies through targeted professional development, which can improve teacher effectiveness and ultimately benefit the overall school system.

#### **V. Recommendations**

1. The Teachers should actively engage in professional development programs to improve their instructional skills and adapt effectively to the MATATAG Curriculum transition, while also collaborating closely with school leadership for continuous support.
2. The School Heads should strengthen their administrative and instructional supervisory skills through ongoing training and mentorship, ensuring they provide clear guidance, timely communication, and necessary resources to support teachers during the curriculum transition.

3. The Public Schools District Supervisors should implement monitoring and support systems that facilitate regular feedback and capacity-building activities for both school heads and teachers to address challenges encountered in curriculum implementation.
4. The Parents should be encouraged to participate in school activities and curriculum-related discussions to foster a supportive home environment that complements the new teaching strategies and learning objectives under the MATATAG Curriculum.
5. The Researcher should disseminate the study findings widely among education stakeholders and advocate for policy adjustments or initiatives that enhance leadership development and teacher performance within the context of curriculum reforms.
6. Future Researchers should conduct longitudinal studies to further explore the long-term effects of principals' leadership skills on teacher performance and investigate additional factors influencing successful curriculum transitions to provide more comprehensive recommendations.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to praise and thank God, the Almighty, who has granted countless blessing, knowledge, and opportunity given to me to be able to pursue the graduate studies.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the people who have been instruments in the successful completion of this thesis.

I wish to extend my special thanks to Dr. Sabina B. Conui, Dean of Graduate School, for his motivation and immense knowledge in helping to improve the study.

I would like to express my deep and sincere gratitude to my research adviser Dr. Elvin H. Wenceslao for the encouragement, enthusiasm and guidance throughout this research and writing of this thesis. I can't say thank you enough for his tremendous help.

I would like to thank the rest of the thesis committee Dr. Bryant C. Acar, Dr. Jasmine B. Misa and Dr. Annabelle A. Wenceslao for giving their assistance and recommendations toward the realization of this study.

I wish to acknowledge the help provided by my co-Secondary Teachers on the distribution of their IPCRF, and retrieval of my research instruments.

I would also like to show my deep appreciation to the teachers in answering my Research Instruments.

Finally, I will forever be thankful to my family—especially to my beloved wife, Reyneth N. Mangabon—for her unwavering support, boundless patience, and constant encouragement throughout this journey. Her belief in me, even during my most challenging moments, has been a pillar of strength and motivation. This achievement would not have been possible without her sacrifices, love, and steadfast presence by my side.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Abalde, G., & Oco, R. (2023). Factors Associated with Mathematics Performance.
- [2] Cruz, A. L. (2017). Perceived leadership styles and job satisfaction among teachers in selected public secondary schools in the Philippines.
- [3] Dela Cruz, A., & Garcia, R. (2018). Impact of directive supervisory leadership styles of school heads on the performance of teachers and students in Physical Science: Evidence from the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Educational Management*, 6(1), 45-58.
- [4] Santos, M., & Reyes, J. (2017). The relationship between supervisory leadership styles of school heads and the performance of teachers and students in Physical Science: A study in the Philippine setting. *Journal of Education Research*, 25(2), 123-136.

#### AUTHOR'S PROFILE



**LOUIE C. MANGABON**

The author is born on May 21, 1997 at WLPH Baybay City, Leyte, Philippines. He finished with flying colours her Bachelor's degree in Secondary Education at Visayas State University – Main Campus. In his high school and college days, he was really into the supervision field. He was a leader in different organizations when he was a student and that helped him decide to take administration and supervision as his field of specialization for her master's degree. He is currently finishing his Master's degree of Arts in Education major in Administration and Supervision at Western Leyte College of Ormoc City.

He is currently a Teacher III in the Department of Education and a Grade – 8 Teacher at Baybay National High School at 30 de Diciembre St, Baybay City Leyte, Philippines. He is a coordinator in two school organizations for learners namely, Supreme Secondary Learner Government and the Boys Scouts of the Philippines. He believes that supervising the young is the foundation of understanding how to supervise the old.