

Extent of Implementation of Traditional and Collaborative Supervision Models in Trinidad District

Criza S. Apale
Rachelle Mae B. Danduan
Aive P. Ayenza

Abstract— This study explored the extent of implementation of both traditional and collaborative supervision models in the Trinidad District of the Department of Education (DepEd), Schools Division of Bohol during the School Year 2025–2026. Utilizing a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design, the study analyzed data gathered through validated survey instruments administered to school administrators and teaching personnel. The findings revealed that the profiles of both school heads and teachers such as age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, designation, teaching experience, and training had no statistically significant relationship with their perceptions of supervision practices. Despite the insignificance of these demographic variables, the data showed that teachers perceived collaborative supervision as more effective in fostering professional growth, encouraging autonomy, and improving student performance compared to the more hierarchical and evaluative traditional model. Correlation analyses also indicated strong positive relationships between various indicators of collaborative supervision such as teacher participation, shared goal setting, professional development integration, and student performance impact.

The study underscores the evolving role of school supervision from a control-focused approach to a more collegial and supportive framework that emphasizes teacher development, shared leadership, and continuous learning. Findings imply a need to shift supervisory practices toward more participatory and context-sensitive models that consider the dynamics of modern teaching and learning. Furthermore, the study proposes a localized hybrid supervision model that integrates the strengths of both traditional and collaborative approaches. This proposed model aims

to address the unique needs of schools, particularly in fostering a supportive environment where teachers feel valued and empowered. It also reveals the need for policy reforms, professional development, and leadership training to ensure the effective implementation of inclusive and growth-oriented supervision practices.

Keywords: Collaborative Supervision, Traditional Supervision, Teacher Development, Educational Leadership, Supervision Practices

I. INTRODUCTION

The introduction of a thesis provides the research context, outlining the main problem, its significance, and the study's objectives. It briefly reviews relevant theories or literature gaps, establishing the study's purpose and potential contributions. This section guides readers on what to expect, setting a foundation for the research's scope and impact. Learning achievement has emerged as a crucial criterion in educational advancement. Numerous research findings indicate that student learning outcomes remain suboptimal (Argina et al., 2017; Fenanlampir et al., 2019; Stacey, 2011; Wulandari & Jailani, 2015). From certain perspectives, pupils' learning outcomes also lack complete results. Some are solely accentuated in the domain of knowledge, rather than in the realms of attitudes, abilities, or other personality traits. A primary factor influencing student learning outcomes is the quality of education, which is deemed subpar.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to investigate the extent of implementation of the traditional and collaborative supervision models of Trinidad District, DepEd Schools Division of Bohol during the School Year 2025-2026 with the end view of proposing a localized supervision model.

Specifically, the study seeks answers to the following questions.

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:

1.1 School Heads;

1.1.1 Age;

1.1.2 Gender;

1.1.3 Civil Status;

1.1.4 Educational Attainment;

1.1.5 Position/Designation;

1.1.5 Length of Administrative Experience; and

1.1.6 Relevant Seminars and Trainings Attended?

1.2 Teachers;

1.2.1 Age;

1.2.2 Gender;

1.2.3 Civil Status;

1.2.4 Educational Attainment;

1.2.5 Length of Teaching Experience; and

1.2.6 Relevant Seminars and Trainings Attended?

2. What is the extent of implementation of the traditional supervision model in terms of:

2.1 Supervision Intensity;

2.2 Feedback Quality;

2.3 Teacher Autonomy;

2.4 Professional Development;

2.5 Goal Alignment; and

2.6 Stakeholder Engagement

3. What is the extent of collaborative supervision model in terms of:

3.1 Frequency of Collaborative Meetings;

3.2 Teacher Participation Rate;

3.3 Shared Goal Setting;

3.4 Feedback Quality;

3.5 Professional Development Integration; and

3.6 Student Performance Impact?

4. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and the extent of implementation of the traditional supervision model?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and the extent of collaborative supervision model?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of implementation of the traditional supervision model and the extent of collaborative supervision model?

7. Based on the findings of the study, what localized supervision model can be proposed?

Null Hypotheses

H₀₁. There is no significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and the extent of implementation of the traditional supervision model.

H₀₂. There is no significant relationship between the profile of the respondent groups and the extent of collaborative supervision model.

H₀₃. There is no significant relationship between the extent of implementation of the traditional supervision model and the extent of collaborative supervision model.

II. METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the research approach employed in this study. This will include details on how the sample size was determined, the criteria for selecting survey locations and timing, and the methodology for choosing respondents. This chapter also explains the rationale behind the research strategy, the selection of research instruments, the data collection methods, and the statistical analysis techniques used to derive meaningful insights from the collected data.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Age. The age group with the highest representation among school heads is 42–48 years, accounting for 42.9% of the total. Two age groups 49–55 and 56–62 both comprise 21.4% of the respondents. This reflects a significant presence of late-career professionals in school leadership roles. Only 14.3% of the respondents fall within the youngest bracket of 35–41 years. Overall, 85.7% of the school heads are aged 42 and above, emphasizing a mature leadership demographic. A diversified age profile could offer more comprehensive insights and balanced leadership styles.

Sex. The sex distribution among the school heads is perfectly balanced, with 50% male and 50% female representation. This indicates that gender equity is currently achieved in leadership roles

within the schools surveyed. Such balance is commendable and reflects inclusive recruitment or promotion policies. It also shows that both men and women have equal access to administrative advancement in this context. This equilibrium can have positive implications for decision-making diversity and institutional culture.

Civil Status. The majority of school heads (64.3%) are married, indicating a high prevalence of family-oriented individuals in leadership roles. Single school heads comprise 21.4% of the group, indicating that a significant number of leaders are not married. Only one school head is widowed (7.1%) and one is separated (7.1%). These categories show that leadership roles are accessible regardless of changes in personal circumstances.

Highest Educational Attainment. The data shows that 100% of the school heads have obtained graduate-level education, indicating a strong academic qualification among leadership. The highest percentage, 35.7%, hold a completed Master's degree, which remains the standard minimum for many leadership positions in education. Interestingly, 21.4% of school heads have completed a Doctorate Degree, showcasing a deep commitment to academic excellence. Another 42.8% of school heads are either Doctorate Degree - CAR (Candidate for Academic Requirements) or have taken doctorate units, indicating ongoing academic engagement. This shows a trend toward continuous learning and ambition among school leaders.

Position/ Designation. The majority of the school heads hold mid-level leadership positions, with 35.7% serving as Head Teacher I–III. Another 28.6% serve as Teachers-In-Charge. Only 7.1% hold the position of Principal III–IV, the highest designation listed, reflecting the limited availability or exclusivity of such roles. Similarly, only 14.3% are Principal I–II. The remaining 14.3% serve as Head Teachers IV–VI, indicating that a good portion of school heads are in upper mid-management positions.

Length of Administrative Experience. The majority of school heads (42.9%) have 10–19 years of administrative experience, suggesting a highly experienced leadership core. Interestingly, both the most experienced group (20+ years) and the least experienced group (<10 years) each account for 28.6% of the total. This balance indicates a mix of veteran and emerging school leaders. The data shows that nearly 71.5% of school heads have at least 10 years of experience, demonstrating

sustained commitment to school administration. This also points to a system where leadership is earned over time rather than quickly granted.

Seminars and Trainings Attended. An equal percentage of school heads (42.9%) have attended international and national trainings, showing strong engagement with professional development at higher levels. Only 14.3% of school heads reported attending regional seminars and trainings, which may point to fewer local opportunities or a preference for broader-scale events. It may also suggest that regional seminars are less valued or that funding/support is limited at this level. A balanced exposure at all levels is ideal for comprehensive development.

TABLE 1: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON THE DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE SCHOOL HEADS.

Age	Frequency	Percent
56-62	3	21.4%
49-55	3	21.4%
42-48	6	42.9%
35-41	2	14.3%
Total	14	100.0%
Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	7	50.0%
Female	7	50.0%
Total	14	100.0%
Civil Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	3	21.4%
Married	9	64.3%
Widowed	1	7.1%
Separated	1	7.1%
Total	14	100.0%
Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
Doctorate Degree	3	21.4%
Doctorate Degree-CAR	3	21.4%
Doctorate Degree-Units	3	21.4%
Master's Degree	5	35.7%
Total	14	100.0%
Position/ Designation	Frequency	Percent
Principal III-IV	1	7.1%

Principal I-II	2	14.3%
Head Teacher IV-VI	2	14.3%
Head Teacher I-III	5	35.7%
Teacher In-Charge	4	28.6%
Total	14	100.0%
Length of Administrative Experience	Frequency	Percent
20>	4	28.6%
10-19	6	42.9%
<10	4	28.6%
Total	14	100.0%
Number of Relevant Seminars and Trainings Attended	Frequency	Percent
International	6	42.9%
National	6	42.9%
Region	2	14.3%
Total	14	100.0%

Age. The largest group of teachers is aged 42–48, representing 31% of the total. The next largest age group is 49–55 years, comprising 27.1% of the teachers. Teachers aged 35–41 make up 18.6% of the workforce, indicating the presence of early mid-career professionals. The youngest group, aged 28–34, accounts for 17.1% of the teaching staff. The oldest group, aged 56–62, comprises only 6.2% of teachers, indicating that most older educators may have already retired or moved into non-teaching roles.

Sex. The sex distribution among teachers is heavily skewed toward females, who make up 68.2% of the total teaching population. This is a common trend in many educational systems, especially at the elementary and secondary. Male teachers constitute only 31.8% of the teaching force, highlighting a significant gender imbalance. The sex distribution indicates that while females dominate the teaching profession, collaborative supervision must promote inclusive strategies that consider gender-based needs and communication styles..

Civil Status. A significant majority of the teachers are married, representing 70.5% of the total. This reflects a mature workforce that may value stability, work-life balance, and long-term professional. Single teachers make up 24%, which is likely to include many early-career

professionals. Widowed and separated teachers make up a combined 5.4% of the workforce, a relatively small but important segment.

Highest Educational Attainment. The majority of teachers (35.7%) have completed Master's degree units, showing that a large portion is actively pursuing graduate studies. Teachers with a Master's Degree – CAR (Candidate for Academic Requirements) make up 24.8%, suggesting they have completed coursework but are likely still working on a thesis or dissertation. Those who have completed a full Master's Degree represent 21.7%, forming a well-qualified segment of the faculty. Teachers holding only a Bachelor's Degree make up 17.8%, which is the smallest group.

Length of Teaching Experience. The largest portion of teachers (41.9%) have 10–19 years of teaching experience. Teachers with less than 10 years of experience account for 39.5%, indicating a sizable group of early-career professionals. Those with more than 20 years of experience comprise 18.6%, forming a veteran group with deep institutional knowledge. This diverse distribution in teaching experience is highly beneficial for collaborative models of supervision.

Seminars/ Trainings Attended. The majority of teachers have attended regional seminars (42.6%), indicating that most training occurs at the intermediate level. Division-level seminars account for 33.3%, suggesting strong participation in school district-led training programs. National-level training has reached only 18.6% of teachers, which may be due to limited slots, funding constraints, or selection biases. Only 5.4% of teachers have attended international seminars, indicating minimal exposure to global educational trends.

TABLE 2. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION ON THE DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF THE TEACHERS.

Age	Frequency	Percent
56-62	8	6.2%
49-55	35	27.1%
42-48	40	31.0%
35-41	24	18.6%
28-34	22	17.1%
Total	129	100.0%
Sex	Frequency	Percent
Male	41	31.8%
Female	88	68.2%
Total	129	100.0%
Civil Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	31	24.0%
Married	91	70.5%
Widowed	4	3.1%
Separated	3	2.3%
Total	129	100.0%
Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
Master's Degree	28	21.7%
Master's Degree-CAR	32	24.8%
Master's Degree-Units	46	35.7%
Bachelor's Degree	23	17.8%
Total	129	100.0%
Length of Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percent
20>	24	18.6%
10-19	54	41.9%
<10	51	39.5%
Total	129	100.0%
Number of Relevant Seminars and Trainings Attended	Frequency	Percent
International	7	5.4
National	24	18.6
Region	55	42.6
Division	43	33.3
Total	129	100.0%

Summary of Findings

The data in Table 3 reveals that traditional supervision is moderately implemented in terms of intensity, with a sub-mean of 3.29. Two indicators were interpreted as highly implemented: the consistency of practices contributing to long-term educational development (M=3.50) and the emphasis on compliance (M=3.43). This suggests that school heads recognize traditional supervision’s procedural strengths but also imply its focus on control rather than instructional enhancement. The remaining three indicators, with means ranging from 3.07 to 3.29, point to moderate levels of guidance, monitoring, and impact on student performance. The highest standard deviation (1.44) in the fifth item reflects inconsistent experiences in how supervision influences teaching, implying a need for more structured and equitable supervision practices.

TABLE 3. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON SCHOOL HEADS’ PERCEIVED LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TRADITIONAL SUPERVISION MODEL IN TERMS OF SUPERVISION INTENSITY

Indicator	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
1. The consistency of traditional supervisory practices contributes to long-term educational development in the school.	14	3.50	0.85	Highly Implemented
2. Traditional supervision emphasizes compliance more than instructional improvement.	14	3.43	0.76	Highly Implemented
3. Teachers receive sufficient guidance through regular traditional supervisory visits.	14	3.29	0.73	Moderately Implemented
4. The level of intensity in traditional supervision leads to measurable improvements in student academic outcomes.	14	3.14	0.86	Moderately Implemented
5. The traditional supervision model provides frequent monitoring that positively impacts teaching performance.	14	3.07	1.44	Moderately Implemented
Sub- Mean	14	3.29	0.93	Moderately Implemented

<i>Legend</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>
	4.21-5.00	<i>Very Highly Implemented</i>
	3.41-4.20	<i>Highly Implemented</i>
	2.61-3.40	<i>Moderately Implemented</i>
	1.81-2.60	<i>Slighted Implemented</i>

Summary of Findings

The results in Table 4 indicate that the feedback quality under the traditional supervision model is perceived to be highly implemented, with a sub-mean of 3.83. One item (Item 1) reported an unusually high mean of 6.21 and a standard deviation of 10.61, likely due to a data entry error, and should be treated with caution. Disregarding the outlier, the rest of the indicators fall within high to moderate implementation, suggesting that feedback is generally timely and specific. However, only two items are rated highly implemented (Items 1 and 2), while the remaining three are merely moderately implemented, indicating that feedback is not always constructive, actionable, or reflective. The results imply that although feedback is present, its depth and follow-through require enhancement to truly influence instructional improvement. Feedback that is not followed up with resources or support can feel incomplete or superficial to teachers. The moderate ratings for Items 3 to 5 suggest that while school heads provide feedback, it may lack focus on student outcomes, ongoing support, and reflection opportunities.

TABLE 4: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON SCHOOL HEADS’ PERCEIVED LEVEL OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TRADITIONAL SUPERVISION MODEL IN TERMS OF TEACHER AUTONOMY

Indicator	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
1. Traditional supervision practices often prioritize compliance over teacher professional judgment.	14	3.71	0.73	Highly Implemented
2. Teacher autonomy is undervalued in traditional supervision, which negatively affects student learning outcomes.	14	3.57	0.85	Highly Implemented
3. Increased teacher autonomy under alternative supervision models would likely lead to improved educational outcomes compared to traditional supervision.	14	3.57	0.85	Highly Implemented
4. Teachers have limited freedom to innovate instructional strategies due to the prescriptive nature of traditional supervision.	14	3.43	0.94	Highly Implemented
5. The traditional supervision model restricts teachers from making independent decisions that address specific student needs.	14	3.43	0.85	Highly Implemented
Sub- Mean	14	3.54	0.84	Highly Implemented

Legend

Range

Description

- 4.21-5.00 *Very Highly Implemented*
- 3.41-4.20 *Highly Implemented*
- 2.61-3.40 *Moderately Implemented*
- 1.81-2.60 *Slightly Implemented*
- 1.00-1.80 *Not Implemented*

Summary of Findings

The findings from Table 5 reveal that professional development (PD) integration within collaborative supervision is moderate (Sub-Mean = 2.79, SD = 0.62). The highest-rated indicator (Mean = 2.99) shows teachers acknowledge that PD activities address instructional needs, yet the lowest (Mean = 2.58) highlights a lack of school-wide collaboration in PD sessions. The low score in linking supervision feedback to PD planning (Mean = 2.69) indicates this alignment is weak. Schools need to establish feedback-to-PD pipelines. In the framework of Industry 4.0, PD must equip teachers with future-ready skills such as digital fluency, blended instruction, and adaptive learning strategies. The data also shows that the culture of shared responsibility and continuous improvement is still developing (Mean = 2.82), suggesting that PD is viewed more as an individual obligation than a collective endeavor.

TABLE 5. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON TEACHERS’ PERCEIVED LEVEL OF COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION MODEL IN TERMS OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT INTEGRATION

Indicator	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
1. Professional development activities integrated into the collaborative supervision model effectively address the specific instructional needs of our teaching staff.	129	2.99	0.58	Moderate
2. Collaborative supervision promotes ongoing professional learning that leads to improved student academic performance.	129	2.88	0.52	Moderate
3. The integration of professional development in supervision fosters a culture of shared responsibility and continuous improvement among teachers.	129	2.82	0.55	Moderate
4. Feedback from collaborative supervision sessions directly informs and enhances future professional development initiatives.	129	2.69	0.70	Moderate
5. School-wide collaboration during professional development sessions increases the relevance and applicability of new strategies in classroom instruction.	129	2.58	0.73	Moderate
Sub- Mean	129	2.79	0.62	Moderate

<i>Legend</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>
	4.21-5.00	Very High
	3.41-4.20	High
	2.61-3.40	Moderate
	1.81-2.60	Low
	1.00-1.80	Very Low

Summary of Findings:

Table 41 presents the lowest sub-mean among the domains (Mean = 2.53, SD = 0.69), indicating that teachers see only a moderate to low impact of collaborative supervision on student performance. The item with the highest mean (2.62) still falls in the lower half of the moderate range, revealing a perception that supervision has not yet significantly translated into improved learning outcomes. This may reflect skepticism about the link between supervision and student achievement, or that improvements in teaching practices are not yet sustained. Teachers appear to lack evidence or confidence that supervision leads to better instructional quality or student learning. The lowest items (2.45) on joint planning and student-centered learning further emphasize the limited instructional influence of the current model.

TABLE 6. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON TEACHERS’ PERCEIVED LEVEL OF COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION MODEL IN TERMS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE IMPACT

Indicator	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
1. Regular, cooperative monitoring enhances teacher effectiveness, thereby improving student learning outcomes.	129	2.62	0.65	Moderate
2. The collaborative supervision model has led to noticeable improvements in students' academic performance.	129	2.58	0.80	Moderate
3. I believe that involving teachers in the supervision process contributes to sustained student academic success.	129	2.53	0.73	Moderate
4. Joint planning and feedback sessions between supervisors and teachers positively influence instructional quality.	129	2.45	0.73	Moderate
5. Collaborative supervision fosters a school culture that supports student-centered learning.	129	2.45	0.56	Moderate
Sub- Mean	129	2.53	0.69	Moderate

<i>Legend</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>
	4-21-5.00	Very High
	3.41-4.20	High
	2.61-3.40	Moderate
	1.81-2.60	Low
	1.00-1.80	Very Low

Summary of Findings

Table 42 summarizes the data across all domains, with a Grand Mean of 2.84 (Moderate), indicating that teachers see collaborative supervision as present but not fully optimized. The highest-rated domain is Feedback Quality (3.07), while the lowest is Student Performance Impact (2.53). This gap highlights a key issue: teachers may feel supported in their professional growth, but do not see a direct impact on their students. This suggests that collaborative supervision is functioning more as a developmental tool for teachers than a driver of instructional transformation. The uniformity of moderate ratings across all domains suggests a stable but underdeveloped implementation.

TABLE 7. SUMMARY RESULTS ON TEACHERS’ PERCEIVED LEVEL OF COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION MODEL

Indicators	N	Mean	SD	interpretation
Feedback Quality	129	3.07	0.69	Moderate
Frequency of Collaborative Meetings	129	3.00	0.81	Moderate
Teacher Participation Rate	129	2.91	0.59	Moderate
Professional Development Integration	129	2.79	0.62	Moderate
Shared Goal Setting	129	2.74	0.65	Moderate
Student Performance Impact	129	2.53	0.69	Moderate
Grand Mean	129	2.84	0.68	Moderate

<i>Legend</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>
	4-21-5.00	Very High
	3.41-4.20	High
	2.61-3.40	Moderate
	1.81-2.60	Low
	1.00-1.80	Very Low

Discussion

The findings of the study reveal that while traditional supervision remains a central part of school management practices, its perceived effectiveness is significantly enhanced when blended with collaborative elements. Traditional approaches, often characterized by structured observations, top-down feedback, and formal evaluations, still hold value in establishing standards and ensuring compliance. However, the data indicate that when supervision focuses solely on hierarchical practices, it fails to capture the nuances of teacher development and engagement. Teachers today require more than evaluation they need mentorship, support, and professional dialogue to grow. Therefore, the implication is that supervision must evolve from being strictly evaluative to becoming a developmental process that actively involves the teacher in decision-making and reflection.

The study also brings attention to the emotional and psychological dimensions of supervision. Effective supervision is not only about improving instruction but also about caring for teachers as individuals. The literature supports the notion that stress, burnout, and emotional fatigue are prevalent in teaching, especially in systems focused heavily on accountability. When supervision includes components of wellness, emotional support, and empathetic leadership, it promotes teacher retention, morale, and performance. This insight urges educational leaders to rethink supervision policies to include teacher well-being as a legitimate and essential goal.

Summary of Findings

Student performance, although not directly influenced by supervision in a linear fashion, is ultimately impacted through improved teaching practices. The indirect effects of supervision when well-implemented ripple into the classroom through more motivated teachers, better instructional planning, and targeted interventions. The findings imply that the effectiveness of supervision should be evaluated not just through teacher compliance or checklists, but through the degree to which it supports student learning. This necessitates the use of data-informed supervision practices that connect teacher development goals with student achievement data. It also calls for more robust mechanisms to monitor and reflect on the long-term effects of supervisory interventions.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The study underscores the necessity of shifting from a predominantly traditional supervision model toward a more localized, collaborative, and development-focused approach in schools. While traditional supervision provides structure and accountability, its effectiveness is significantly enhanced when combined with practices that prioritize teacher autonomy, meaningful feedback, shared goal-setting, and professional growth. Both school heads and teachers benefit from supervision models that foster trust, participation, and continuous learning, ultimately leading to improved instructional practices and student outcomes. The findings advocate for a supervision framework that is not merely evaluative but also supportive, inclusive, and responsive to the evolving needs of educators. Embracing such a model can lead to more empowered teachers, engaged school communities, and a stronger culture of educational excellence.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the drawn conclusions, the following recommendations are forwarded:

1. Schools should integrate both traditional and collaborative supervision practices, ensuring accountability while fostering teacher growth and engagement.
2. Establish regular, structured collaborative meetings among teachers and school heads to promote shared decision-making, professional dialogue, and mutual support.
3. Encourage teacher participation in setting goals, selecting instructional strategies, and designing assessment tools to foster a sense of ownership and professionalism.
4. Provide sustained, relevant, and teacher-driven professional development opportunities that align with both individual teacher needs and school goals.
5. Develop a feedback system that is timely, specific, constructive, and geared toward improvement rather than mere evaluation.
6. Involve teachers in supervision-related decision-making processes to cultivate leadership capacity and build a more democratic school environment.

7. Customize supervision models to reflect the unique contexts, challenges, and cultures of each school community, rather than relying solely on standardized protocols.
8. Involve parents, community members, and local stakeholders in the supervisory process to create a broader support system for educational quality.
9. Establish regular assessments of the effectiveness of supervision models to ensure they meet the intended goals and adjust strategies accordingly.
10. Provide school heads and supervisors with continuous training focused on collaborative leadership, emotional intelligence, and instructional coaching to enhance their supervisory competence.

REFERENCES

- [1.] “Luque, M. (2020) Evaluating the Global Efficiency of Teachers Through a Multi-Criteria Approach Socio-Economic Planning Sciences Volume 70, June 2020, 100676
- [2.] Achieng, O.(2019) Influence Of Headteachers’ Motivational Practices On Teachers’ Performance In Public Primary Schools In Kisumu West Sub County, Kenya
- [3.] Anderson, E., & Pounder, D. G. (2019). Shaping the school-wide learning environment through supervisory leadership. In S. J. Zepeda & J. A. Ponticell (Eds.). *The Wiley handbook of educational supervision* (pp. 533-554). Wiley Blackwell.
- [4.] Anderson, K. J. (2020) Family- School Collaboration and Positive Behavior.
- [5.] Andriani, S. et al (2018) The Influence of The Transformational Leadership and Work Motivation on Teachers Performance July 2018 *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research* 7(7):19-29
- [6.] Argina, A. W., Mitra, D., Ijabah, N., & Setiawan, R. (2017). Indonesian PISA result: What factors and what should be fixed? *Proceedings Education and Language International Conference*, 1(1), 69–79. <http://jurnal.unissula.ac.id/index.php/ELIC/article/view/1212>
- [7.] Bhadoriya, P. (2018) A Study of Teaching Efficiency of Higher Secondary School Teachers
- [8.] Bicer, D. (2014). The effect of students and instructors’ learning styles on achievement of foreign language preparatory school students. *Procedia —Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 382–386. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.067>
- [9.] Bond, M. (2020). Facilitating student engagement through the flipped learning approach in K-12: A systematic review. *Computers & Education*, 151, Article 103819. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103819>
- [10.] Bora, S. F. (2020). Performative didactics: Tapping into learners’ attitudes towards text and performance-based approaches in foreign language learning. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14, 150–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1538225>
- [11.] Canales, A., & Maldonado, L. (2018). Teacher quality and student achievement in Chile: Linking teachers’ contribution and observable characteristics. *International Journal of Education Development*, 60, 33–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.09.009>
- [12.] Cordero, J. M., & Gil-Izquierdo, M. (2018). The effect of teaching strategies on student achievement: An analysis using TALIS-PISA-link. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 40(6), 1313–1331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpolmod.2018.04.003>
- [13.] Cox, J. S., & Mullen, C. A. (2023). Impacting student achievement: Principals’ instructional leadership practice in two Title I rural schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 33(1), 3- 25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/10526846221133996>
- [14.] Endedijk, H. M., Breeman, L. D., van Lissa, C. J., Hendrickx, M. M. H. G., den Boer, L., & Mainhard, T. (2022). The teacher’s invisible hand: A meta-analysis of the relevance of teacher-student relationship quality for peer relationships and the contribution of student behavior. *Review of Educational Research*, 92(3), 370-412 <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543211051428>
- [15.] Enright, E. A., & Wieczorek, D. (2021). Advancing a democratic pedagogy and supervision framework: An illustrative case of teacher questioning in secondary mathematics instruction. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.4.3.4>

- [16.] Ereje B.R. et.al. (2020) Teachers' Performance and Students' Learning Outcome in the Division of Cavite Province, Philippines International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education Vol. 2, No. 2, October 2020, pp. 143-158
- [17.] Fenanlampir, A., Batlolona, J. R., & Imelda, I. (2019). The struggle of Indonesian students in the context of TIMSS and PISA has not ended. International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology (IJCIET), 10(2), 393–406.
<http://www.iaeme.com/ijciyet/issues.asp?JType=IJCIET&VType=10&IType=02>
- [18.] Gepila, E. C. (2020). Assessing teachers using Philippines standards for teachers. *Univers. J. Educ. Res.* 2020, 8, 739–746. 2018, 28, 103–108. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- [19.] Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (10th ed.). Pearson.
- [20.] Goddard, Y. L., Goddard, R. D., Bailes, L. P., & Nichols, R. (2019). From school leadership to differentiated instruction: A pathway to student learning in schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 120(2), 197-219. <https://doi.org/10.1086/705827>
- [21.] Goodrich, A. (2018). Peer mentoring and peer tutoring among K-12 students: A literature review. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 36(2), 13-21.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/8755123317708765>
- [22.] Gordon, M. F., & Hart, H. (2022). How strong principals succeed: Improving student achievement in high-poverty urban schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 60(3), 288-302. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEA-03-2021-0063>
- [23.] Gordon, S. P. (2022). *Developing successful schools: A holistic approach*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- [24.] Gosling, C. (2021). Authentic independent investigations in high school physics laboratories. *The Physics Teacher*, 59(1), 48-50. doi:10.1119/10.0003018
- [25.] Grissom, J. A., Egalite, A. J., & Lindsay, C. T. (2021). How principals affect students and schools: A systematic synthesis of two decades of research. The Wallace Foundation.
<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/principalsynthesis>
- [26.] Hanley, T. (2017). Supporting the emotional labour associated with teaching: Considering a pluralistic approach to group supervision. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 35(4), 253-266.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2017.1358295>
- [27.] Hoque, K.E. et al (2020) Relationship Between Supervision and Teachers Performance and Attitude in Secondary Schools in Malaysia
- [28.] Jerrim, J., Oliver, M., & Sims, S. (2019). The relationship between inquiry-based teaching and students' achievement. New evidence from a longitudinal PISA study in England. *Learning and Instruction*, 61, 35–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.12.004>
- [29.] Lazarides, R. (2020) Teachers' classroom management self-efficacy, perceive classroom management and teaching contexts from beginning until mid-career
- [30.] Lee, D., Huh, Y., Lin, C.-Y., & Reigeluth, C. M. (2022). Personalized learning practice in U.S. learner-centered schools. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 14(4).
<https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/12330>
- [31.] Leithwood, K., Sun, J., & Schumacker, R. (2020). How school leadership influences student learning: A test of "The Four Paths Model." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(4), 570-599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19878772>

-
- [32.] Motegi, H., & Oikawa, M. (2019). The effect of instructional quality on student achievement: Evidence from Japan. *Japan and the World Economy*, 52, 100961. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jap-wor.2019.100961>
- [33.] Oller, J., Engel, A., & Rochera, M. J. (2021). Personalizing learning through connecting students' learning experiences: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 114(4), 404-417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2021.1960255>
- [34.] Pambudi B. A. (2019) Instructional Leadership as an Effort to Increase Teacher Professionalism in the Industrial Revolution Era 4.0 *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 381
- [35.] Patrick, S. K. (2022). Organizing schools for collaborative learning: School leadership and teachers' engagement in collaboration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 58(4), 638-673. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X221107628>
- [36.] Silverman, R. D., Martin-Beltrán, M., Percy, M. M., & Taylor, K. S. (2021). Revisiting reading buddies to support multilingual learners and their peers. *The Reading Teacher*, 75(3), 279-289. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2045>
- [37.] Singh, P., & Allers, A. M. (2022). Reframing education through self-regulated learning. *The International Journal of Pedagogy and Curriculum*, 29(2), 77-96 <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-7963/CGP/v29i02/77-96>
- [38.] Smith J. et al (2019) The Impact of Age and Collaborative Supervision on Teacher Efficacy and Teaching Efficiency: A Meta-Analysis. *Educational Review*, 71(6), 829-850.
- [39.] Stronge, J. H. (2018). *Qualities of Effective Principals*. ASCD. Leading to Improve STEM Instruction
- [40.] Vizeshfir, F., & Torabizadeh, C. (2018). The effect of teaching based on dominant learning style on nursing students' academic achievement. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 28, 103–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2017.10.013>
- [41.] Wiyono B., et al (2021) The Use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in the Implementation of Instructional Supervision and Its Effect on Teachers' Instructional Process Quality 2018, 28, 103– 108. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- [42.] Woolford, S. (2022). Impact of a free-choice (“genius time”) inquiry project on student skillbuilding, agency, and motivation. *I.E.: Inquiry in Education*, 14(2). <https://digitalcommons.nl.edu/ie/vol14iss2/10>
- [43.] Wulandari, N. F., & Jailani. (2015). Indonesian students' mathematics problem solving skills in PISA and TIMSS. In *Proceedings of international conference on research, implementation, and education of mathematics and sciences* (pp. 191–198). <https://eprints.uny.ac.id/23182/>
- [44.] Wyman, P. J., & Watson, S. B. (2020). Academic achievement with cooperative learning using homogenous and heterogeneous groups. *School Science and Mathematics*, 120(6), 356- 363. <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/1707>
-