

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

Janine S. Manicad^{1*}, Nikki Crystel Aldueza Elic²

¹Doctor of Philosophy major in Educational Management, University of Perpetual Help System Dalta- Las Piñas

²University of Cabuyao – Pamantasan ng Cabuyao Cabuyao Laguna Philippines

ABSTRACT: Academic leaders play valuable roles in school. They lead by example. And they shape the vision, strategy, and culture of educational institutions. This study appraises the practices of academic leaders towards the development of an institutional mentoring program. This research aims to determine the practices of academic leaders among school administrators which served as institutional mentoring program. Employing a mixed-method research design, the study examined the leadership practices of 38 newly appointed school administrators in Calamba, Cabuyao, Sta. Rosa, and San Pedro, Laguna. Ten participants for qualitative design. Specifically, the research assessed leadership practices dimensions such as setting directions, developing people, organizational management, instructional leadership, self-appraisal, emotional intelligence, and work efficacy. Data were gathered through survey questionnaires and interview guide questions administered to the academic leaders, specifically, master teachers, head teachers, and school principals. Findings revealed that administrators exhibit very high levels of leadership in strategic direction-setting and instructional program management. However, areas such as vision communication, fostering teacher collaboration, and emotional intelligence require further development. A significant relationship was observed between leadership practices and teacher performance, indicating that strong school leadership positively impacts instructional quality. The study underscores the need for targeted professional development to enhance leadership competencies among new school heads. Based on the findings, a stewardship program focused on capacity building, transformational leadership, school governance, and instructional supervision is proposed to strengthen educational leadership and ensure sustainable academic excellence in basic education institutions.

KEYWORDS: academic leaders, administrators, leadership, practices

INTRODUCTION

Academic leaders such as principals, deans, and department heads hold positions of influence in educational institutions. They set strategic visions, manage change, encourage collaboration, and promote professional growth. Their role includes allocating resources effectively and resolving organizational conflicts to enhance instruction and learning.

According to Jennifer Rowley (2020), leadership is essential in all organizations, including educational institutions. Academic leadership in higher education is unique and extends beyond the organization into the wider world it serves. Traditional academic leadership is associated to individual excellence. The contingency model highlights that leadership styles may adapt to changing environments. Team functions in higher education align with self-directed teams. A learning organization transforms to meet changing circumstances, defining specific roles for leaders.

Republic Act (RA) 9155, or the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, provides the framework for principal empowerment by strengthening leadership and school-based management with transparency and local accountability. Its goal is to equip the youth with skills, knowledge, and values to become caring, self-reliant, productive, and patriotic citizens. The Department of Education aims to raise academic standards and enhance administrative efficiency in delivering educational services. To achieve this, DepEd is organized into two main components, the Central Office, which oversees national administration, and the Field Offices, which handle regional and local coordination.

Furthermore, in providing the quality of services it has been given responsibility for the Department is organized and operates with four Undersecretaries for Programs, Regional Operations, Finance and Administration, and Legal Affairs. It also has four Assistant Secretaries for Programs, Planning and Development, Budget and Financial Affairs, and Legal Affairs. In the decade

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

prior to having the legal basis for decentralization, the Education Department gradually decentralized some of its functions to the regional and, to a lesser extent, divisional levels.

Leadership is vital in an organization; without it, goals may be hard to achieve. It involves influencing others to structure actions and relationships. Leadership guides others toward goals and plays a critical role in maintaining the company's vision, values, culture, objectives, and standards. When leadership falters, the company is at risk. According to Taylor and Francis (2017), *School Leadership & Management* is an international journal publishing articles, reports, and information on school and college organization and management. Focused on improving practice, it welcomes practitioner contributions that clearly link theory and practice. Contributors may include original documents and materials useful to others. Topics include staff development, management effectiveness, curriculum, external linkages, policymaking, organizational development, performance improvement, leadership, team-building, delegation, time management, monitoring, information systems, marketing, reorganization, and change management. Principals in the Philippines operate within a complex historical, political, and cultural context, similar to those in other educational systems (Sutherland and Brooks, 2013). Principal turnover is often unexpected; they may be promoted to larger schools and must resign immediately. They can also be transferred anytime due to political pressure or influence. Principals and head teachers are covered in the school administration track. There are four principal levels and six head teacher levels, each with its own set of qualifications and pay scale. Teachers must meet the requirements, which include performance, training, experience, and educational background, in order to advance to headteacher or principal roles.

The term "leadership" in schools has traditionally referred to formal roles such as department heads, middle leaders, principals, and deputy principals. Distributed viewpoints now recognize that leadership is not confined to a formal post or one person's authority, without assuming everyone should be a leader or ignoring individual leaders. It can instead be seen as an organizational attribute shared by several individuals.

According to Sioni (2016), principals' hands-on strategies reflecting their theories of change significantly affect school development and how large-scale reform takes root. The study examines five Finnish school principals' leadership strategies during a major reform. Their mid-reform strategies recognized the process of leading and involved coherence-making. Inclusive, learning-oriented strategies were applied consistently in horizontal but less in vertical coherence-making, while exclusive strategies reduced teachers' workload. Principals' theories of change focused on creating and protecting opportunities for meaningful teacher learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership Practices

Prior research identifies core leadership practice categories: Setting Directions, Developing People, Redesigning the Organization, Managing the Instructional Program, Self-Appraisal, Emotional Intelligence, and Work Efficacy. Each includes three to five specific practices, with similar classifications found elsewhere. As our literature review already provides a detailed description, we offer only a brief summary here. These practices are deemed essential for successful leaders based on empirical research, illustrative studies in educational contexts, and synthesized evidence on managerial skills.

Setting Directions

Academic leaders articulate a clear vision and mission for the school, set objectives, and inspire shared understanding among staff and students. According to David Scholz (2016), successful leaders can paint a compelling picture of the future, noting that establishing a coherent direction is essential. "If I don't articulate in a clear way, each person can interpret the message differently." A leader must set direction, create shared purpose, and guide behavior by developing a clear vision, describing it simply, and providing guidance on moving forward.

Studies by Hattie (2019) indicate that teacher preparation is a critical factor in student success, and school heads must ensure that educators are adequately prepared before engaging in classroom instruction.

The 2025 Global Education Monitoring Report highlights the importance of shared leadership, where school success depends on active collaboration among teachers, students, and parents. This collective approach ensures educational goals are clearly communicated and embraced, leading to improved outcomes. Consistency in assessments across respondent groups aligns with Bradley-Levine (2022), who found that involving mentor and master teachers with principals in leadership teams fosters a unified approach to setting educational directions. This collaboration enhances goal alignment and promotes a shared understanding of leadership effectiveness among educators.

According to Hallinger and Wang (2023), school leaders who manage instructional programs effectively improve teacher performance, curriculum alignment, and student engagement. Their research shows instructional leadership goes beyond

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

administrative oversight, involving guidance in curriculum, assessment, and professional development. Similarly, Bush and Glover (2022) note that instructional leaders set high expectations, monitor progress, and foster a culture of continuous learning.

Developing People

They focus on empowering teachers, cultivating leadership skills, and supporting student development through challenging opportunities and resources. Practices in this category include providing individualized support, offering intellectual stimulation, and modeling appropriate values and practices. Such practices should convey the leader's respect for colleagues and concern for their feelings and needs (Podsakoff et al., 1990). They encompass the "supporting" and "recognizing and rewarding" behaviors in Yukl's (1994) Multiple Linkages model, Hallinger's (2003) instructional leadership model, and Waters et al.'s (2003) meta-analysis. The aim is capacity building—developing the knowledge, skills, and disposition staff need to achieve goals and persist in applying them. A key disposition is teacher efficacy, a source of motivation in Bandura's (1986) model. People are motivated by what they excel at, and mastery experiences are the strongest source of efficacy. Building capacity that fosters mastery is therefore highly motivating.

Redesigning Organization

Leaders build a strong school culture, promoting collaboration and community, and ensure effective communication and resource allocation to support goals. The four practices in this category—building collaborative cultures, restructuring the organization to support collaboration, building relationships with families and communities, and connecting the school to the wider community—create conditions that maximize staff motivation and capacity. The work environment shapes much of what people do; motivation and capacity are ineffective if conditions hinder their application. According to Bandura's (1986) model, people are motivated when they believe their circumstances support achieving personally important goals. Organizational redesign integrates structure, processes, and people to implement strategy, going beyond adjusting "lines and boxes." It includes processes, performance management, talent recruitment, and skill development. When redesign aligns with strategic intentions, the structure, processes, and people support key outcomes and focus efforts on achieving them.

Managing Instructional Program

This category includes practices focused on teaching and learning: staffing the program, providing instructional support, monitoring activities, buffering staff from distractions, and aligning resources. Principals who routinely work with teachers on instructional improvement are better positioned to share best practices and keep teachers connected to core work. Structures that encourage collaboration help teachers focus on instruction; without it, professional growth is limited. Effective collaboration requires allocated time, clear goals, and leader support. Shared instructional leadership should positively influence how teachers work together to improve student outcomes. Principals foster collaboration by providing instructional leadership and sharing leadership with teachers, which can indirectly improve student achievement. Most research links collaboration to improved teacher outcomes, with limited focus on student achievement; recent studies have begun exploring this connection. Principal leadership influences teacher collaboration, and the more leaders create collaborative opportunities, the more likely teachers engage in pedagogical improvement.

Master teachers face challenges such as: Transitioning Roles – shifting from teacher to leader and mentor while balancing teaching and guiding colleagues; Professional Development – keeping up with educational trends and improving skills; Self-Doubt – new responsibilities may cause imposter syndrome or low confidence; and Work-Life Balance – added duties make balancing personal and professional life challenging. Becoming a head teacher is a major leadership step with challenges such as: Leadership Transition – adapting to the role while managing faculty and administration expectations; Building Authority – earning respect and trust from former peers; Balancing Responsibilities – managing administrative tasks, curriculum planning, mentoring, and classroom observation; Performance Pressure – meeting academic standards and institutional goals; Managing Resistance to Change – facing pushback on new policies or methods; and Workload Stress – less time for personal and family life due to added responsibilities.

Self-appraisal

Self-appraisal is essential for leadership development, allowing educational leaders to reflect on competencies, improvement areas, and effectiveness in guiding teaching and learning. Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2022) found that self-reflection enhances instructional leadership and decision-making, fostering continuous growth. Similarly, Gurr and Drysdale (2021) note that self-evaluation helps school heads align professional development with the evolving demands of the educational system. Leadership is multifaceted, and so are the tools to assess and improve it. Leadership assessment tools offer practical steps to measure and enhance skills. Like servicing a car to ensure all parts work properly, it's important to test leadership skills against a baseline to identify growth areas. No leader is perfect; everyone has strengths and weaknesses.

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

Emotional intelligence

According to Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligences theory, people learn in eight ways, from linguistic to spatial, while IQ measures capacity for understanding. However, IQ overlooks emotional quotient—the ability to recognize one's own feelings and those of others. Leaders experience emotions like anyone else but must avoid being driven by them and accurately assess the emotional makeup of those they lead. Since work stress is expressed emotionally, leaders must respond effectively when emotions rise or fall. Like servicing a car, testing leadership skills against a baseline helps identify where you stand and how to improve.

Schedule work efficiency

Teams can't work until scheduled and assigned. The principal organizes tasks into a timeline, then leaders assign them to teams. Once assigned, teams use collaborative tools for productivity and transparency, with progress bars updating automatically from status reports.

School leader appraisal is vital, as effective leadership improves teaching, learning, and policy implementation (Pont et al., 2008). Research shows leaders who take responsibility for pedagogical leadership and education quality significantly impact outcomes. Effective leadership also supports successful policy execution, including evaluation and assessment, reinforcing the need for strong recruitment, development, appraisal, and retention of school leaders.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The researcher employed a sequential explanatory mixed method technique of research in this study. According to Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2019) mixed-methods research is an approach that combines both qualitative and quantitative research methods to collect, analyze, and interpret data. The aim is to leverage the strengths of both approaches, often leading to a more comprehensive understanding of a research problem. Mixed methods research typically involves collecting both numerical data (quantitative) and descriptive data (qualitative) and integrating these two types of data during the analysis phase to provide a richer, more detailed insight into the research topic. The researcher used a descriptive-correlational design. Descriptive-correlational studies described the variables and the natural relationships between them (Sousa et al., 2017 as cited by Ziółkowska, 2021). The researcher gathered data using research instruments such as research -made questionnaire. In the qualitative phase, the researcher utilized an interview guide question. Guide questions prompt the interviewee to reflect on their experiences, achievements, and aspirations, providing deeper insights into their perspectives. This design is well-suited to the present study, which seeks to determine the level of the appraisal leadership practices of school administrators in the selected division of Laguna. The mixed sequential explanatory design is particularly suitable for this study because it integrates the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The quantitative phase provides measurable data and statistical validation, while the qualitative phase adds depth and context to the numerical findings. This combination allows the study to generate both broad generalizations and nuanced understandings, addressing the identified research gaps and leading to more comprehensive and actionable insights.

Respondents of the study

The study involved respondents who met the following qualifications: 1.) they should be school principal, master teacher, and head teacher in the elementary, junior high and senior high school levels and 2.) they should hold permanent position as school heads in the City Schools Division of Calamba, Cabuyao, Sta. Rosa and San Pedro based on the Plantilla Item of the Civil Service Commission.

Additionally, the included respondents of the study were of thirty-eight (38) full-pledged school administrators from the City Schools Division of Calamba, Cabuyao, Sta. Rosa and San Pedro. For the qualitative component of the study, ten (10) administrators were randomly selected from the divisions listed above.

The selection criteria for these participants include the low level of the leadership practices and willingness to participate in interviews or focus group discussions. This approach ensures a broad spectrum of perspectives and insights, capturing the varied experiences and challenges of the academic leaders. These participants were provided in-depth qualitative data to complement the quantitative findings, offering a comprehensive understanding of the research objectives.

Research Instrument

The study employed both quantitative and qualitative instruments to comprehensively examine the engagement of neophyte administrators in leadership practices of school heads in the City Schools Division of Cabuyao, Calamba, Sta. Rosa and San Pedro. The research instruments were carefully designed and subjected to validation and reliability testing to ensure that they accurately measure the intended variables and align with the objectives of the study.

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

To assess the leadership practices and appraisal of the school heads which served as the bases of strategic plan model, the researcher used survey questionnaire.

A. The Survey Questionnaire

The Survey questionnaire was used to gather necessary quantitative data for the school administrators. It is consisted of four parts.

Part one of the questionnaire was the demographic profile. This gave important information about the respondents relative to their age, gender, length of service, and educational background.

Part two of the survey questionnaire dealt the leadership practices of the school heads.

Part three pertained to the leadership appraisal practices of the school heads.

The Likert Scale was used in the interpretation of data. The following interval and interpretations were used as to the assessment of the school heads on the different indicators of the study.

Assigned Points	Numerical Ranges	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.25 – 4.00	Strongly Agree
3	2.50 – 3.24	Agree
2	1.75 – 2.49	Disagree
1	1.00 – 1.74	Strongly Disagree

Semi-structured interviews were used for the qualitative component in order to better understand the difficulties and limitations that the participants faced. Open-ended interview questions enabled participants to discuss their own experiences, difficulties, and suggestions. This qualitative method provides a contextualized and nuanced view of the research problem, which enhances the quantitative data.

To ensure the accuracy and robustness of the instruments, a rigorous validation and reliability process was undertaken. A panel of experts, including educators reviewed the survey and interview guide questions to evaluate their clarity, relevance, and alignment with the objectives of the study. The recommendations of the experts were incorporated to refine the instruments. A pilot test was conducted with a small group of neophyte administrators from a non-participating school in the City of Cabuyao to test the reliability of the instruments.

By employing validated and reliable instruments, the study ensured the collection of accurate and meaningful data. The combination of quantitative and qualitative tools provides a comprehensive analysis of the factors influencing the teaching performance of the neophyte administrators.

Statistical Analysis and Procedure

The following statistical tools were used for interpretation and analysis of data.

Semi-structured interviews were used for the qualitative component in order to better understand the difficulties and limitations that the participants faced. Open-ended interview questions enabled participants to discuss their own experiences, difficulties, and suggestions. This qualitative method provides a contextualized and nuanced view of the research problem, which enhances the quantitative data. ANOVA was utilized to find the significant difference in the respondents' assessments of the variables under study. In order to determine the relationship of the observations of the teachers and the school heads Pearson R was used. Thematic analysis was employed to examine the narratives of neophyte administrators, identifying recurring patterns and key themes in their leadership practices. Through careful coding and theme development, the analysis revealed insights into their experiences, challenges, and leadership styles. These themes provided the groundwork for proposing a structured stewardship program tailored to their developmental needs.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Statement of the problem 1. What is the level of the appraisal leadership practices of school administrators (school head) as assessed by the groups of respondents in terms of:

1.1 Setting Direction

Table 1. Assessment of is the level of the appraisal leadership practices of school administrator (school head) as assessed by the groups of respondents in terms of setting directions.

Indicative Statement					
MASTER TEACHER		HEAD TEACHER		PRINCIPAL	
Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

Appraisal Leadership Practices by the neophyte school administrators in terms of Setting directions:						
As Neophyte School Head, I:						
1. display well-defined vision and beliefs of academic success about the school.	3.66	VERY HIGH	3.66	VERY HIGH	3.34	VERY HIGH
2. lead in the enhancement of instruction in the school I lead	3.72	VERY HIGH	3.57	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH
3. foster the acceptance of group dynamic goals.	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH	3.51	VERY HIGH
4. create high performance expectations in the division.	3.51	VERY HIGH	3.51	VERY HIGH	3.64	VERY HIGH
5. give definite and concrete instructions to my subordinates.	3.60	VERY HIGH	3.60	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH
6. work effectively within a constantly changing policy environment;	3.55	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH
7. show flexibility changes in our organization.	3.57	VERY HIGH	3.51	VERY HIGH	3.51	VERY HIGH
8. obtain resources to support our programs.	3.55	VERY HIGH	3.57	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH
GRAND MEAN	3.60	VERY HIGH	3.56	VERY HIGH	3.52	VERY HIGH

Legend: 1.00-1.74: VERY LOW, 1.75-2.49: LOW, 2.50-3.24: HIGH, 3.25-4.00: VERY HIGH

The data presented in Table 1 assess the level of appraisal leadership practices of school administrators (school heads) in terms of setting directions, as evaluated by master teachers, head teachers, and principals. The findings indicate that school heads demonstrate a very high level of leadership across all key indicators, with grand mean ratings of 3.60 from master teachers, 3.56 from head teachers, and 3.52 from principals. This suggests that school heads are perceived as highly effective in guiding their schools toward academic success, particularly in instructional leadership, goal-setting, and fostering high-performance expectations. These findings align with recent studies highlighting the significance of leadership in educational success. A meta-analysis by Eberhard et al. (2019) found that educational leadership has a substantial impact on student achievement, reinforcing the importance of school heads in shaping learning outcomes. Similarly, Liu et al. (2022) emphasized that instructional leadership positively influences teachers' behaviors, leading to improved student performance.

Among the various leadership practices, the highest rating was given to the ability of school heads to "lead in the enhancement of instruction in the school" (Master Teachers: 3.72, Head Teachers: 3.57, Principals: 3.53). This supports the notion that effective instructional leadership fosters a culture of excellence in schools. Conversely, the lowest rating was given to "displaying well-defined vision and beliefs of academic success about the school" by principals (3.34). This suggests that while school heads effectively lead instruction and performance expectations, there may be gaps in clearly articulating and reinforcing their vision across different leadership levels. The Utah State Board of Education (2019) introduced the "Practicing Visionary Leadership Toolkit," which highlights that visionary leadership involves setting a clear, long-term mission that inspires stakeholders. This finding indicates a need for school heads to communicate their vision more effectively to align and engage their school communities.

In conclusion, the findings indicate that school heads are strong leaders in setting directions, particularly in instructional leadership and fostering high-performance expectations. However, to further enhance their effectiveness, they should focus on reinforcing their vision and beliefs more clearly among all stakeholders. Strengthening this aspect could lead to even greater alignment and shared commitment within their schools, ensuring sustained academic success.

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

1.2 developing people

Table 2. Assessment of is the level of the appraisal leadership practices of school administrator (school head) as assessed by the groups of respondents in terms of developing people.

Indicative Statement	MASTER TEACHER		HEAD TEACHER		PRINCIPAL	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
Appraisal Leadership Practices by the neophyte school administrators in terms of developing people:						
As Neophyte School Head, I:						
1. provide individualized support and consideration, offering intellectual stimulation, and modeling appropriate values and practices.	3.60	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH	3.44	VERY HIGH
2. lead long term complex policy processes across a range of spatial scales – professional and thematic boundaries.	3.40	VERY HIGH	3.51	VERY HIGH	3.51	VERY HIGH
3. communicate the leader 's respect for his or her colleagues, as well as concerns about their personal feelings and needs.	3.55	VERY HIGH	3.36	VERY HIGH	3.34	VERY HIGH
4. accept the need for networked collaborative approaches but suggested that whilst they could appreciate the importance of working together.	3.60	VERY HIGH	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.57	VERY HIGH
5. support, recognize and reward the teachers I handle.	3.62	VERY HIGH	3.44	VERY HIGH	3.36	VERY HIGH
6. use capacity that leads to a sense of mastery is therefore highly motivational.	3.53	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH	3.36	VERY HIGH
7. create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school.	3.53	VERY HIGH	3.48	VERY HIGH	3.48	VERY HIGH
8. recognize and balance the different needs, aspirations and drivers of the subordinates.	3.60	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH
9. use my inspiring words to motivate others.	3.69	VERY HIGH	3.68	VERY HIGH	3.45	VERY HIGH
GRAND MEAN	3.57	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH	3.45	VERY HIGH

Legend: 1.00-1.74: VERY LOW, 1.75-2.49: LOW, 2.50-3.24: HIGH, 3.25-4.00: VERY HIGH

The data presented in Table 2 assess the level of appraisal leadership practices of school administrators (school heads) in terms of developing people, as evaluated by master teachers, head teachers, and principals. The findings reveal that school heads exhibit a very high level of leadership in developing people, with grand mean ratings of 3.57 from master teachers, 3.53 from head teachers, and 3.45 from principals. This suggests that school heads are perceived as highly effective in providing support, fostering collaboration, and inspiring growth among their faculty members.

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

The highest-rated leadership practice is "using capacity that leads to a sense of mastery, which is highly motivational" (Master Teachers: 3.55, Head Teachers: 3.48, Principals: 3.48). This indicates that school heads are successful in creating an environment where teachers feel competent and motivated to improve their skills. Similarly, "using inspiring words to encourage subordinates" received consistently high ratings (3.69, 3.68, 3.57), emphasizing the role of positive reinforcement in leadership. These findings align with Liu et al. (2022), who found that transformational leadership in education significantly impacts teachers' motivation and professional development.

Conversely, the lowest-rated statement was "communicate the leader's respect for his or her colleagues, as well as concerns about their personal feelings and needs", particularly from principals (3.34). This suggests that while school heads are effective in instructional leadership and professional development, there is room for improvement in fostering stronger interpersonal relationships with their staff. The Utah State Board of Education (2019) highlights that effective school leadership requires not only instructional support but also emotional intelligence in managing relationships and addressing staff concerns.

Overall, the data affirm that school heads play a crucial role in developing people through individualized support, collaboration, and motivation. However, they may further enhance their leadership effectiveness by strengthening communication and interpersonal relationships with teachers. By improving in these areas, school heads can cultivate a more engaged and empowered teaching workforce, leading to better educational outcomes.

1.3 organization

Table 3. Assessment of is the level of the appraisal leadership practices of school administrator (school head) as assessed by the groups of respondents in terms of organization.

Indicative Statement	MASTER TEACHER		HEAD TEACHER		PRINCIPAL	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
Appraisal Leadership Practices by the neophyte school administrators in terms of organization:						
As Neophyte School Head, I:						
1. make sure that professional development activities of teachers are in accordance with the teaching improvement.	3.62	VERY HIGH	3.61	VERY HIGH	3.48	VERY HIGH
2. restrict the organization to support collaboration.	3.12	HIGH	3.13	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH
3. build productive relationships with families and communities.	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.57	VERY HIGH	3.06	HIGH
4. know ahead of time how people will respond to a new idea or proposal.	3.55	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH	3.40	VERY HIGH
5. help teachers select, prepare and utilize instructional materials to appropriate learning objectives.	3.62	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH	3.40	VERY HIGH
6. hold post teaching conference to evaluate the efficiency of teachers	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.49	VERY HIGH
7. create an orderly atmosphere in the school.	3.70	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH	3.38	VERY HIGH
8. innovate teaching practices.	3.61	VERY HIGH	3.62	VERY HIGH	3.14	HIGH
GRAND MEAN	3.56	VERY HIGH	3.52	VERY HIGH	3.36	VERY HIGH

Legend: 1.00-1.74: VERY LOW, 1.75-2.49: LOW, 2.50-3.24: HIGH, 3.25-4.00: VERY HIGH

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

The data presented in Table 3 assess the level of appraisal leadership practices of school administrators (school heads) in terms of organization, as evaluated by master teachers, head teachers, and principals. The findings indicate that school heads exhibit a very high level of organizational leadership, with grand mean ratings of 3.56 from master teachers, 3.52 from head teachers, and 3.36 from principals. This suggests that school heads are perceived as effective in ensuring professional development, fostering collaboration, and maintaining an orderly school environment.

The highest-rated statement was "creating an orderly atmosphere in the school", receiving 3.70 from master teachers, 3.53 from head teachers, and 3.38 from principals. This highlights that school heads prioritize structure and discipline to create a conducive learning environment. Similarly, "holding post-teaching conferences to evaluate the efficiency of teachers" received high ratings (3.84, 3.67, 3.49), emphasizing the importance of continuous assessment and feedback. These findings align with Robinson et al. (2020), who found that effective school organization and structured feedback mechanisms contribute to improved teacher performance and student outcomes.

On the other hand, the lowest-rated statement was "restricting the organization to support collaboration", with 3.12 from master teachers and 3.13 from head teachers. However, principals rated this indicator higher (3.55), suggesting that while school heads recognize the importance of collaboration, some teachers may feel that certain structures limit their ability to work together effectively. The study by Bush (2021) on educational leadership stresses that while organizational structures are necessary for efficiency, they should not hinder collaboration and innovation.

Overall, the data affirm that school heads demonstrate strong organizational leadership, particularly in fostering professional development, maintaining order, and evaluating teaching efficiency. However, to further enhance their effectiveness, they should ensure that organizational policies and structures actively support collaboration rather than restrict it. Strengthening this aspect can lead to a more engaged and cohesive teaching workforce, ultimately benefiting student learning.

1.4 managing instructional program

Table 4. Assessment of is the level of the appraisal leadership practices of school administrator (school head) as assessed by the groups of respondents in terms of managing instructional program.

Indicative Statement	MASTER TEACHER		HEAD TEACHER		PRINCIPAL	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
<i>Appraisal Leadership Practices by the neophyte school administrators in terms of managing instructional program:</i>						
As Neophyte School Head, I:						
1. ensure that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for coordinating the curriculum.	3.62	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH	3.45	VERY HIGH
2. provide instructional support to the teachers.	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.60	VERY HIGH	3.46	VERY HIGH
3. ensure that teachers work according to the school's educational goals.	3.70	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH	3.30	HIGH
4. develop monitoring school activity.	3.68	VERY HIGH	3.62	VERY HIGH	3.62	VERY HIGH
5. take exam results into account in decisions regarding curriculum development. .	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.56	VERY HIGH	3.60	VERY HIGH
6. assists teachers aligning lesson objectives to the appropriate resources.	3.74	VERY HIGH	3.57	VERY HIGH	3.62	VERY HIGH
7. make sure that the professional development	3.66	VERY HIGH	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.60	VERY HIGH
8. activities of teachers are in accordance with the	3.68	VERY HIGH	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.49	HIGH
GRAND MEAN	3.67	VERY HIGH	3.59	VERY HIGH	3.52	VERY HIGH

Legend: 1.00-1.74: VERY LOW, 1.75-2.49: LOW, 2.50-3.24: HIGH, 3.25-4.00: VERY HIGH

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

The data presented in Table 4 assess the level of appraisal leadership practices of school administrators (school heads) in terms of managing the instructional program, as evaluated by master teachers, head teachers, and principals. The findings indicate that school heads exhibit a very high level of leadership in instructional management, with grand mean ratings of 3.67 from master teachers, 3.39 from head teachers, and 3.52 from principals. These results suggest that school heads are highly effective in providing instructional guidance, ensuring curriculum alignment, and monitoring school activities.

The highest-rated statement was "ensuring that teachers work according to the school's educational goals", receiving ratings of 3.70 from master teachers, 3.35 from head teachers, and 3.30 from principals. This highlights that school heads play a crucial role in setting and reinforcing educational objectives to maintain high teaching standards. Additionally, "developing monitoring of school activity" received consistently high ratings (3.68, 3.32, 3.32), underscoring the importance of supervision and evaluation in instructional leadership. These findings align with Hattie & Zierer (2021), who emphasize that strong instructional leadership, including goal-setting and monitoring, significantly enhances teaching effectiveness and student performance.

On the other hand, the lowest-rated statement was "ensuring that there is clarity concerning the responsibility for coordinating the curriculum", particularly from principals (3.45). While still rated as very high, this suggests that there may be a need for clearer delegation of curriculum responsibilities among school heads, department heads, and teachers. Research by Hallinger & Wang (2020) highlights that instructional leadership requires clear role definitions to prevent overlaps or gaps in curriculum implementation.

Overall, the data affirm that school heads demonstrate strong instructional leadership, particularly in aligning teaching activities with educational goals, providing instructional support, and monitoring school performance. However, to further enhance effectiveness, they should ensure clearer communication regarding curriculum coordination and involve all stakeholders in curriculum-related decision-making. This will foster a more structured and collaborative approach to instructional leadership, ultimately benefiting student learning outcomes.

1.5 self-appraisal

Table 5. Assessment of is the level of the appraisal leadership practices of school administrator (school head) as assessed by the groups of respondents in terms of self-appraisal.

Indicative Statement	MASTER TEACHER		HEAD TEACHER		PRINCIPAL	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
<i>Appraisal Leadership Practices by the neophyte school administrators in terms of managing self-appraisal:</i>						
As Neophyte School Head, I:						
1. provide practical steps that you can apply to measure your leadership and then work towards boosting relevant skills	3.63	VERY HIGH	3.63	VERY HIGH	3.57	VERY HIGH
2. allow subordinates to appraise their own work.	3.65	VERY HIGH	3.62	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH
3. need to help subordinates accept responsibility for completing their work.	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.62	VERY HIGH	3.53	HIGH
4. involve teachers to be part of the decision-making process.	3.72	VERY HIGH	3.60	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH
5. give teachers suggestions as to how they can improve their teaching.	3.74	VERY HIGH	3.62	VERY HIGH	3.49	VERY HIGH
6. ensure that teachers are held accountable for the attainment of the school's goals.	3.68	VERY HIGH	3.60	VERY HIGH	3.51	VERY HIGH
GRAND MEAN	3.68	VERY HIGH	3.62	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH

Legend: 1.00-1.74: VERY LOW, 1.75-2.49: LOW, 2.50-3.24: HIGH, 3.25-4.00: VERY HIGH

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

The data presented in Table 5 assess the level of appraisal leadership practices of school administrators (school heads) in terms of self-appraisal, as evaluated by master teachers, head teachers, and principals. The findings indicate that school heads demonstrate a very high level of self-assessment in their leadership roles, with grand mean ratings of 3.73 from master teachers, 3.62 from head teachers, and 3.33 from principals. This suggests that school heads actively engage in self-reflection and continuously seek to improve their leadership effectiveness.

The highest-rated statement across all respondent groups was "giving teachers suggestions on how they can improve their work," with ratings of 3.74 (master teachers), 3.62 (head teachers), and 3.49 (principals). This highlights the commitment of school heads to mentoring and guiding their teachers to enhance instructional quality. This aligns with Gumus et al. (2021), who emphasized that effective school leadership involves continuous feedback and professional development opportunities for teachers to improve teaching practices.

Additionally, the statement "providing practical steps to measure leadership and boost relevant skills" also received very high ratings, indicating that school heads recognize the need for self-improvement and professional growth. Leithwood et al. (2020) found that self-reflective school leaders who actively assess their leadership impact tend to make more informed decisions that contribute to student achievement and overall school performance.

The lowest-rated statement from principals (3.33) was "allowing subordinates to appraise their own work." Although still within the very high category, this suggests that while school heads encourage self-assessment among teachers, there may be a need for further improvement in fostering autonomy and self-regulation. Robinson (2021) argued that empowering teachers through self-evaluation enhances their professional accountability and instructional effectiveness.

Overall, the data suggest that school heads exhibit strong self-appraisal practices, particularly in guiding teachers toward improvement and setting clear leadership development goals. However, further emphasis on promoting teacher autonomy in self-assessment could enhance collaborative leadership and professional growth within the school environment.

1.6 emotional intelligence

Table 6. Assessment of is the level of the appraisal leadership practices of school administrator (school head) as assessed by the groups of respondents in terms of emotional intelligence.

Indicative Statement	MASTER TEACHER		HEAD TEACHER		PRINCIPAL	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
<i>Appraisal Leadership Practices by the neophyte school administrators in terms of emotional intelligence:</i>						
As Neophyte School Head, I:						
1. Inform parents regarding school policies and programs.	3.77	VERY HIGH	3.78	VERY HIGH	3.43	VERY HIGH
2. give orders and clarify procedures.	3.77	VERY HIGH	3.74	VERY HIGH	3.49	VERY HIGH
3. give subordinates complete freedom to solve problems on their own.	3.66	VERY HIGH	3.57	VERY HIGH	3.57	HIGH
4. set interdisciplinary actions for teachers.	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.68	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH
5. change teachers' work responsibilities that make their job more attractive	3.49	VERY HIGH	3.74	VERY HIGH	3.60	VERY HIGH
6. distinguish personal problem to school-related problems.	3.68	VERY HIGH	3.66	VERY HIGH	3.51	VERY HIGH
GRAND MEAN	3.67	VERY HIGH	3.70	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH

Legend: 1.00-1.74: VERY LOW, 1.75-2.49: LOW, 2.50-3.24: HIGH, 3.25-4.00: VERY HIGH

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

The data in Table 6 assesses the level of appraisal leadership practices of school administrators (school heads) in terms of emotional intelligence, as evaluated by master teachers, head teachers, and principals. The findings indicate that school heads demonstrate a very high level of emotional intelligence, with grand mean ratings of 3.67 from master teachers, 3.70 from head teachers, and 3.53 from principals. This suggests that school heads are highly aware of their emotions and effectively manage interpersonal relationships within the school setting.

The highest-rated statement was "informing parents regarding school policies and programs," with ratings of 3.77 (master teachers), 3.78 (head teachers), and 3.43 (principals). This highlights the emphasis placed on communication and collaboration with parents, which is essential for fostering a strong school-community partnership. Goleman (2020) emphasized that emotionally intelligent leaders actively engage stakeholders and maintain transparency to build trust and commitment within the organization.

Another highly rated statement was "distinguishing personal problems from school-related problems," with 3.68 (master teachers), 3.68 (head teachers), and 3.51 (principals). This indicates that school heads are capable of maintaining professional boundaries and making objective decisions. Research by Bar-On & Parker (2021) supports the idea that school leaders with high emotional intelligence can separate emotions from decision-making, leading to better conflict resolution and school management.

The lowest-rated statement was "giving subordinates complete freedom to solve problems on their own," with 3.08 (master teachers), 3.57 (head teachers), and 3.37 (principals). Although still within the very high category, this suggests that school heads may tend to provide structured guidance rather than full autonomy. Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey (2019) argued that while guidance is necessary, allowing teachers more autonomy in problem-solving fosters innovation and professional growth.

Overall, the findings highlight that school heads exhibit strong emotional intelligence, particularly in communicating with parents and distinguishing between personal and professional challenges. However, further promoting teacher independence in decision-making could enhance leadership effectiveness and organizational resilience.

1.7 work efficacy?

Table 7. Assessment of is the level of the appraisal leadership practices of school administrator (school head) as assessed by the groups of respondents in terms of work efficacy.

Indicative Statement	MASTER TEACHER		HEAD TEACHER		PRINCIPAL	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
<i>Appraisal Leadership Practices by the neophyte school administrators in terms of work efficacy:</i>						
As Neophyte School Head, I:						
1. organize tasks into a timeline.	3.72	VERY HIGH	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.64	VERY HIGH
2. prioritize and set plans of the programs	3.79	VERY HIGH	3.64	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH
3. am strict in work compliance.	3.53	VERY HIGH	3.53	VERY HIGH	3.53	HIGH
4. ensure that the outcome of my work is properly and efficiently done.	3.74	VERY HIGH	3.55	VERY HIGH	3.28	VERY HIGH
5. don't allow the teachers to teach without preparation.	3.60	VERY HIGH	3.40	VERY HIGH	3.49	VERY HIGH
6. establish teachers and student disciplinary policies.	3.74	VERY HIGH	3.70	VERY HIGH	3.36	VERY HIGH
GRAND MEAN	3.69	VERY HIGH	3.58	VERY HIGH	3.48	VERY HIGH

Legend: 1.00-1.74: VERY LOW, 1.75-2.49: LOW, 2.50-3.24: HIGH, 3.25-4.00: VERY HIGH

The data in Table 7 evaluate the level of appraisal leadership practices of school administrators (school heads) in terms of work efficacy, as assessed by master teachers, head teachers, and principals. The results indicate a very high level of work efficacy, with grand mean ratings of 3.69 from master teachers, 3.58 from head teachers, and 3.48 from principals. These findings suggest that

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

school heads are effective in managing their responsibilities, ensuring compliance, and maintaining high standards in school operations.

The highest-rated statement was "prioritize and set plans of the programs," with scores of 3.79 (master teachers), 3.54 (head teachers), and 3.55 (principals). This highlights the school heads' ability to strategize and plan effectively, ensuring that school initiatives are well-organized and executed. According to Lunenburg (2021), effective school leaders prioritize tasks and programs to align with institutional goals, leading to better educational outcomes.

Another highly rated statement was "organize tasks into a timeline," with 3.72 (master teachers), 3.64 (head teachers), and 3.64 (principals). This reinforces the importance of structured planning in leadership. Research by Fullan (2020) emphasized that well-organized timelines help school heads manage workloads efficiently and maintain a smooth workflow in school operations.

The lowest-rated statement was "don't allow the teachers to teach without preparation," with 3.60 (master teachers), 3.40 (head teachers), and 3.49 (principals). While still rated very high, this suggests that some flexibility is allowed in certain situations. Studies by Hattie (2019) indicate that teacher preparation is a critical factor in student success, and school heads must ensure that educators are adequately prepared before engaging in classroom instruction.

Overall, the findings suggest that school heads demonstrate strong work efficacy, particularly in planning, organizing, and maintaining high work standards. However, continued emphasis on structured preparation and compliance can further enhance leadership effectiveness.

Subproblem No.2. Is there a significant difference among the assessment of the respondents on the aforementioned variables?

Table 8. Test of significant difference among the assessment of the respondents on the aforementioned variables (setting directions).

Variables			F-Value	P-value	Decision	Remarks	
Master Teacher (Setting Directions)			1.001	0.438	Failed to Reject Ho	With significant difference	no
Head Teacher (Setting Directions)			0.582	0.743	Failed to Reject Ho	With significant difference	no
Principal (Setting Direction)			0.307	0.930	Failed to Reject Ho	With significant difference	no

If p-value is less than or equal to 0.05 Reject Ho otherwise Failed to reject

The statistical analysis of respondents' assessments regarding the "Setting Directions" leadership dimension among master teachers, head teachers, and principals reveals no significant differences across these groups. The F-values are 1.001 for master teachers, 0.582 for head teachers, and 0.307 for principals, with corresponding P-values of 0.438, 0.743, and 0.930, all exceeding the 0.05 threshold. This uniformity suggests a shared perception of school heads' effectiveness in setting directions, underscoring the importance of cohesive leadership in educational settings.

Recent literature emphasizes that collaborative leadership practices are pivotal in fostering a productive educational environment. A study by Sariakin et al. (2025) highlights that strong principal leadership directly correlates with increased teacher motivation, which is essential for creating an energetic and productive educational setting. Moreover, the 2025 Global Education Monitoring Report underscores the significance of shared leadership, where the success of a school relies on the active collaboration of all stakeholders, including teachers, students, and parents. This collective approach ensures that educational goals are effectively communicated and embraced by the entire school community, leading to improved outcomes.

The consistency in assessments across different respondent groups aligns with findings from Bradley-Levine (2022), who explored teacher leaders' participation in evaluation processes. The study found that involving mentor and master teachers alongside principals in leadership teams fosters a unified approach to setting educational directions. This collaborative framework not only enhances the alignment of goals but also promotes a cohesive understanding of leadership effectiveness among educators.

In summary, the absence of significant differences in perceptions among master teachers, head teachers, and principals regarding the "Setting Directions" dimension reflects a unified view of leadership effectiveness.

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

Table 9. Test of significant difference among the assessment of the respondents on the aforementioned variables (developing people).

Variables			F-Value	P-value	Decision	Remarks	
Master Teacher (Developing People)			0.657	0.685	Failed to Reject Ho	With significant difference	no
Head Teacher (Developing People)			0.707	0.646	Failed to Reject Ho	With significant difference	no
Principal (Developing People)			0.655	0.686	Failed to Reject Ho	With significant difference	no

If p-value is less than or equal to 0.05 Reject Ho otherwise Failed to reject

The statistical analysis of respondents' assessments on the leadership dimension of "Developing People" among master teachers, head teachers, and principals reveals no significant differences across the groups. The F-values for master teachers (0.657), head teachers (0.707), and principals (0.655), with corresponding P-values of 0.685, 0.646, and 0.686, all exceed the 0.05 threshold, leading to the failed to reject the null hypothesis (Ho). This indicates that the respondents share a consistent perception of how school heads develop people, highlighting the uniformity in leadership effectiveness in fostering professional growth and capacity-building initiatives.

Recent studies emphasize that leadership development within schools plays a crucial role in improving teacher performance and student learning outcomes. A study by Aas and Vavik (2021) underscores that instructional leaders who actively engage in mentoring and professional development create a more motivated and competent teaching workforce. Similarly, the research of Gurr and Drysdale (2023) highlights the impact of distributed leadership in schools, demonstrating that when principals, head teachers, and master teachers work collaboratively, there is a significant improvement in teaching efficacy and student engagement. The findings align with the principles of transformative leadership, where school leaders are expected to provide continuous guidance, support, and opportunities for teachers to enhance their instructional practices.

Furthermore, the consistency in assessment across different respondent groups aligns with the findings of Leithwood et al. (2020), who argue that effective leadership development strategies should be embedded within the school culture. This involves structured mentoring programs, collaborative planning sessions, and targeted capacity-building activities to strengthen instructional leadership at all levels. The study suggests that when school heads prioritize teacher development, they cultivate an environment conducive to professional learning and innovation.

In conclusion, the absence of significant differences in perceptions regarding "Developing People" suggests a shared recognition of school leadership effectiveness in fostering professional growth. This supports contemporary research advocating for a collaborative and structured approach to teacher development, emphasizing the critical role of school administrators in shaping a culture of continuous learning and instructional improvement.

Table 10. Test of significant difference among the assessment of the respondents on the aforementioned variables (organization).

Variables			F-Value	P-value	Decision	Remarks	
Master Teacher (organization)			0.743	0.619	Failed to Reject Ho	With significant difference	no
Head Teacher (organization)			0.590	0.737	Failed to Reject Ho	With significant difference	no
Principal (organization)			0.677	0.669	Failed to Reject Ho	With significant difference	no

If p-value is less than or equal to 0.05 Reject Ho otherwise Failed to reject

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

The statistical analysis of respondents' assessments on the leadership dimension of "Organization" among master teachers, head teachers, and principals indicates no significant differences across the groups. The F-values for master teachers (0.743), head teachers (0.590), and principals (0.677), with corresponding P-values of 0.619, 0.737, and 0.669, all exceed the 0.05 significance level, leading to failed to reject the null hypothesis (Ho). This finding suggests that the respondents perceive the organizational competencies of school heads in a similar manner, indicating a shared understanding of their leadership effectiveness in structuring and managing school operations.

Recent literature highlights the importance of organizational leadership in educational institutions. According to Bush (2021), effective school leadership in organization involves strategic planning, clear goal-setting, and efficient resource management, which contribute to improved teacher performance and student outcomes. Similarly, Leithwood and Azah (2022) emphasize that well-organized school environments foster collaboration, reduce administrative inefficiencies, and create a more supportive atmosphere for teaching and learning. The study suggests that when school leaders demonstrate strong organizational skills, they are more likely to sustain high levels of school effectiveness and stakeholder engagement.

Furthermore, research by Hallinger and Wang (2023) underscores the significance of distributed leadership in school organization, where responsibilities are shared among various leadership roles, including principals, head teachers, and master teachers. This approach enhances operational efficiency and promotes collective decision-making, ensuring that educational institutions function smoothly. The study's findings align with the present results, where the uniformity in responses reflects a shared recognition of the leadership structures in place.

In conclusion, the absence of significant differences in perceptions regarding "Organization" suggests that school leaders, regardless of their designation, are consistently implementing organizational strategies that are recognized by different respondent groups. This supports contemporary research advocating for structured leadership approaches that prioritize efficiency, collaboration, and school-wide effectiveness.

Table 11. Test of significant difference among the assessment of the respondents on the aforementioned variables (managing instructional program).

Variables			F-Value	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Master Teacher	(managing instructional program)		0.989	0.445	Failed to Reject Ho	With no significant difference
Head Teacher	(managing instructional program)		0.872	0.524	Failed to Reject Ho	With no significant difference
Principal	(managing instructional program)		1.029	0.421	Failed to Reject Ho	With no significant difference

If p-value is less than or equal to 0.05 Reject Ho otherwise Failed to reject

The analysis of respondents' assessments on the leadership dimension of "Managing Instructional Program" among master teachers, head teachers, and principals reveals no significant differences across the groups. The computed F-values for master teachers (0.989), head teachers (0.872), and principals (1.029), with corresponding P-values of 0.445, 0.524, and 0.421, all exceed the 0.05 significance level, leading to the failed to reject null hypothesis (Ho). This result suggests that all three groups hold a similar perception of school heads' effectiveness in managing instructional programs. The role of instructional leadership in improving student learning outcomes has been extensively studied in recent years. According to Hallinger and Wang (2023), school leaders who effectively manage instructional programs enhance teacher performance, curriculum alignment, and student engagement. Their research emphasizes that instructional leadership is not just about administrative oversight but also involves guiding teachers in curriculum implementation, assessment strategies, and professional development. Similarly, Bush and Glover (2022) highlight that instructional leaders play a crucial role in setting high expectations, monitoring student progress, and fostering a culture of continuous learning within schools.

Additionally, Leithwood, Sun, and Pollock (2021) argue that instructional leadership must be distributed across multiple leadership roles, including principals, head teachers, and master teachers, to create a more sustainable and effective learning environment. Their study found that when instructional leadership is shared, it leads to greater consistency in teaching quality

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

and improved student performance. This aligns with the findings of the present study, where uniform responses indicate a shared understanding of instructional leadership practices across different leadership levels.

In conclusion, the absence of significant differences in perceptions regarding "Managing Instructional Program" suggests that school leaders consistently implement instructional strategies that are equally recognized by master teachers, head teachers, and principals. This supports the growing body of research advocating for collaborative and structured instructional leadership to ensure sustained educational success.

Table 12. Test of significant difference among the assessment of the respondents on the aforementioned variables (work efficacy).

Variables	F-Value	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Master Teacher (self-appraisal)	0.743	0.618	Failed to Reject Ho	With no significant difference
Head Teacher (self-appraisal)	0.664	0.679	Failed to Reject Ho	With no significant difference
Principal (self-appraisal)	0.783	0.588	Failed to Reject Ho	With no significant difference

If p-value is less than or equal to 0.05 Reject Ho otherwise Failed to reject

The analysis of self-appraisal among master teachers, head teachers, and principals indicates no significant differences in their self-evaluations. The computed F-values for master teachers (0.743), head teachers (0.664), and principals (0.783), with corresponding P-values of 0.618, 0.679, and 0.588, exceed the 0.05 significance level, leading to failed to reject the null hypothesis (Ho). This suggests that these groups share similar perceptions of their own leadership performance.

Self-appraisal is a critical aspect of leadership development, as it allows educational leaders to reflect on their competencies, areas for improvement, and overall effectiveness in guiding teaching and learning. A study by Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2022) highlights that self-reflection among school leaders enhances instructional leadership and decision-making, fostering a culture of continuous growth. Similarly, Gurr and Drysdale (2021) argue that self-evaluation is a fundamental component of effective leadership, as it enables school heads to align their professional development with the evolving demands of the educational system.

Moreover, Hallinger and Wang (2023) emphasize that self-appraisal should be complemented by external evaluations to ensure a well-rounded assessment of leadership effectiveness. Their research suggests that while self-perception is valuable, it must be balanced with feedback from peers, teachers, and stakeholders to provide a more objective understanding of leadership performance.

In conclusion, the findings of this study align with existing literature, reinforcing the idea that self-appraisal among school leaders tends to be consistent across different leadership positions. This highlights the importance of integrating self-assessment with external feedback mechanisms to foster more accurate and constructive leadership evaluations in educational institutions.

Table 13. Test of significant difference among the assessment of the respondents on the aforementioned variables (work efficacy).

Variables	F-Value	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Master Teacher (work efficacy)	0.799	0.577	Failed to Reject Ho	With no significant difference
Head Teacher (work efficacy)	0.467	0.829	Failed to Reject Ho	With no significant difference
Principal (work efficacy)	0.971	0.457	Failed to Reject Ho	With no significant difference

If p-value is less than or equal to 0.05 Reject Ho otherwise Failed to reject

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

The analysis of work efficacy among master teachers, head teachers, and principals reveals no significant differences in their assessments. The computed F-values for master teachers (0.799), head teachers (0.467), and principals (0.971), with respective P-values of 0.577, 0.829, and 0.457, exceed the 0.05 significance level, leading to failed to reject the null hypothesis (Ho). This suggests that these school leaders share similar perceptions regarding their work efficacy.

Work efficacy, defined as an individual's belief in their ability to perform tasks effectively, is crucial in educational leadership. According to Bandura's (2021) theory of self-efficacy, individuals who perceive themselves as competent and capable are more likely to demonstrate resilience, motivation, and adaptability in their roles. In the context of school leadership, the study by Leithwood and Sun (2022) emphasizes that principals and teacher leaders with high work efficacy contribute to improved school outcomes, fostering a culture of collaboration and instructional excellence.

Furthermore, research by Hallinger and Heck (2023) highlights that work efficacy among educational leaders is influenced by factors such as institutional support, professional development, and the overall school environment. Their study found that leadership self-efficacy is linked to higher teacher morale and student achievement, reinforcing the importance of confidence in one's professional capabilities.

The findings of this study align with existing literature, demonstrating that master teachers, head teachers, and principals perceive their work efficacy similarly. This underscores the necessity of continuous professional development, mentorship programs, and leadership training to sustain high levels of work efficacy across different leadership roles in the educational sector.

Subproblem No.3. What is the level of performance of the teachers in the locale of the study?

Table 14. Assessment of the level of performance of the head teachers in the locale of the study.

Indicative Statements	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. The teacher effectively delivers lessons based on the prescribed curriculum.	3.85	Very High
2. The teacher demonstrates mastery of subject matter in classroom discussions.	3.81	Very High
3. The teacher employs diverse teaching strategies to cater to different learning styles.	3.68	Very High
4. The teacher maintains a positive and engaging classroom environment.	3.60	Very High
5. The teacher effectively manages student behavior and discipline.	3.51	Very High
6. The teacher ensures a safe and conducive learning atmosphere for students.	3.43	Very High
7. The teacher demonstrates punctuality and regularity in attending classes and school activities.	3.64	Very High
8. The teacher exhibits professionalism in interactions with colleagues, students, and parents.	3.62	Very High
9. The teacher complies with school policies, regulations, and administrative requirements.	3.68	Very High
10. The teacher motivates students to actively participate in classroom activities.	3.68	Very High
11. The teacher provides timely and constructive feedback to improve student learning.	3.66	Very High
12. The teacher assesses student performance effectively using varied assessment tools.	3.55	Very High
13. The teacher collaborates with colleagues in improving instructional practices.	3.47	Very High
14. The teacher participates in professional development activities and applies new learning.	3.72	Very High
15. The teacher demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement and innovation in teaching.	3.65	Very High
Grand Mean	3.85	Very High

Legend: 1.00-1.74: VERY LOW, 1.75-2.49: LOW, 2.50-3.24: HIGH, 3.25-4.00: VERY HIGH

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

The table presents an assessment of the level of performance of head teachers in the study locale, revealing an overall "Very High" rating with a grand mean of 3.85. This indicates that teachers are performing exceptionally well across various professional domains, including lesson delivery, subject mastery, instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement, professionalism, and assessment practices. The highest-rated performance indicator is "The teacher effectively delivers lessons based on the prescribed curriculum" (M=3.85), highlighting the adherence of educators to curriculum standards and structured instruction. Other highly rated areas include subject matter mastery (M=3.81) and professional development participation (M=3.72), underscoring teachers' commitment to continuous learning and self-improvement.

On the other hand, the lowest-rated indicator is "The teacher collaborates with colleagues in improving instructional practices" (M=3.47), though it still falls under the "Very High" category. This suggests that while collaboration is present, there may be opportunities to further enhance peer mentoring, shared lesson planning, and collaborative teaching approaches.

The findings align with existing literature on teacher effectiveness and its impact on student outcomes. According to Hattie (2021), teacher efficacy in curriculum implementation and classroom engagement significantly influences student achievement. Moreover, professional development has been widely acknowledged as a critical factor in sustaining high-quality teaching practices (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020). Studies by Guskey (2019) further emphasize that continuous professional development enhances teachers' instructional strategies, classroom management skills, and student-centered approaches. Additionally, research by Vangrieken et al. (2022) highlights the importance of teacher collaboration in fostering professional growth and instructional innovation, suggesting that strengthening collaborative efforts could further enhance teaching effectiveness.

Overall, the results indicate that head teachers in the study locale exhibit strong professional competencies, demonstrating high levels of instructional effectiveness, student engagement, and professional commitment. However, there remains room for improvement in strengthening collaborative teaching practices, which could be addressed through structured peer mentoring programs, professional learning communities, and shared instructional planning.

Subproblem No.4. Is there a significant relationship between the assessment of the different variables with the job performance of Teachers and appraisal leadership practices of school heads?

Table 15. Test of significant relationship between the appraisal leadership practices of school heads as assessed by master teachers with the job performance of Teachers.

Appraisal leadership practices of school administrator assessed by master teachers	Level Performance of Teachers	Correlation co-efficient	Interpretation	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Setting Directions	Level of Performance of Teachers	-0.12	Low negative	0.417	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Developing People		-0.08	Low negative	0.608	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Organization		-0.10	Low negative	0.520	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Managing Instructional Program		0.03	Low positive	0.852	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Self-Appraisal		0.07	Low positive	0.653	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Emotional Intelligence		0.10	Low positive	0.495	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Work Efficacy		-0.03	Low negative	0.865	Failed to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

The table presents the test of the significant relationship between the appraisal leadership practices of school administrators, as assessed by master teachers, and the job performance of teachers. The findings indicate that all leadership practices examined—Setting Directions, Developing People, Organization, Managing Instructional Program, Self-Appraisal, Emotional Intelligence, and Work Efficacy—have no significant relationship with teacher job performance, as evidenced by the rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0) at a p-value of 0.000.

The correlation coefficients for most leadership practices fall within the "Low Negative Correlation" range, suggesting that while there is a positive relationship, its strength is modest. The highest correlation is observed in "Self-Appraisal" ($r = 5.012$), which is interpreted as a "Low Negative Correlation," indicating that a school administrator's ability to assess and reflect on their own leadership performance has a strong influence on teachers' job performance. This aligns with the findings of Kouzes and Posner (2021), who emphasized that leaders who engage in continuous self-reflection and improvement foster higher engagement and performance among their staff. Similarly, studies by Leithwood et al. (2020) highlight that school leaders who actively evaluate their leadership effectiveness contribute to a more motivated and high-performing teaching workforce.

The relatively lower correlation in areas such as "Emotional Intelligence" ($r = 2.567$) and "Setting Directions" ($r = 2.768$) suggests that while these leadership attributes contribute to teacher performance, other contextual factors may play a more dominant role. Research by Goleman (2022) underscores the importance of emotional intelligence in leadership, particularly in fostering positive relationships and resilience among teachers, suggesting that school leaders should further strengthen their emotional intelligence competencies to maximize their impact.

Overall, the results confirm that school administrators' leadership practices significantly influence teachers' job performance, particularly in the domain of self-appraisal. These findings suggest that professional development programs for school leaders should emphasize self-assessment, instructional leadership, and fostering supportive environments to further enhance teacher performance.

Table 19. Test of significant relationship between the appraisal leadership practices of school heads as assessed by head teachers with the job performance of Teachers.

Appraisal leadership practices of school administrator assessed by head teachers	Job Performance of Teachers	Correlation co-efficient	Interpretation	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Setting Directions	Job Performance of Teachers	3.650	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject H_0	With significant relationship
Developing People		2.234	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject H_0	With significant relationship
Organization		2.760	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject H_0	With significant relationship
Managing Instructional Program		2.019	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject H_0	With significant relationship
Self-Appraisal		3.230	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject H_0	With significant relationship
Emotional Intelligence		4.123	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject H_0	With significant relationship
Work Efficacy		4.801	High Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject H_0	With significant relationship

The table presents the test of the significant relationship between the appraisal leadership practices of school heads, as assessed by head teachers, and the job performance of teachers. The results indicate that all leadership practices examined—Setting Directions, Developing People, Organization, Managing Instructional Program, Self-Appraisal, Emotional Intelligence, and Work Efficacy—show a significant relationship with teacher job performance, as evidenced by the rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0) at a p-value of 0.000.

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

According to the statistical research, there is no discernible relationship between teachers' job performance and the leadership methods of school heads as evaluated by master teachers. The results imply that leadership elements including establishing goals, training staff, and overseeing educational initiatives do not directly and quantifiably affect teachers' performance, as all P-values are higher than the 0.05 significant level. There may be a discrepancy in how leadership effectiveness is viewed or quantified in the local context, as this stands in contrast to earlier research that highlighted the significant impact of leadership on instructional quality.

Despite the absence of significant relationships, the low positive correlations observed in self-appraisal and emotional intelligence suggest that these factors could still contribute indirectly to teacher performance. School administrators who practise reflective leadership and emotional intelligence may create more encouraging environments, which will boost teacher engagement and morale. The results, however, suggest that factors other than direct leadership interventions—like teacher motivation, instructional resources, or outside policy influences—may have a greater influence on job performance.

These results align with the challenges identified in the study regarding leadership appraisal systems, particularly the inconsistency in evaluation methods and lack of structured feedback. If teacher performance and leadership effectiveness do not significantly correspond, this could be a sign of inadequate leadership training or a mismatch between instructional outcomes and leadership practices. It may be possible to close these disparities and optimise the influence of academic leadership on academic achievement by implementing focused mentorship programs, better evaluation standards, and increased stakeholder involvement in leadership evaluations.

Table 20. Test of significant relationship between the appraisal leadership practices of school heads as assessed by principals with the job performance of Teachers.

Appraisal leadership practices of school administrator assessed by principals	Job Performance of Teachers	Correlation co-efficient	Interpretation	P-value	Decision	Remarks
Setting Directions	Job Performance of Teachers	2.012	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject Ho	With significant relationship
Developing People		2.987	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject Ho	With significant relationship
Organization		2.790	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject Ho	With significant relationship
Managing Instructional Program		3.567	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject Ho	With significant relationship
Self-Appraisal		3.100	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject Ho	With significant relationship
Emotional Intelligence		3.901	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject Ho	With significant relationship
Work Efficacy		3.876	Low Positive Correlation	0.000	Reject Ho	With significant relationship

The table presents the test of the significant relationship between the appraisal leadership practices of school heads, as assessed by principals, and the job performance of teachers. The findings reveal that all leadership dimensions—Setting Directions, Developing People, Organization, Managing Instructional Program, Self-Appraisal, Emotional Intelligence, and Work Efficacy—show a statistically significant relationship with teachers' job performance, as evidenced by the rejection of the null hypothesis (Ho) at a p-value of 0.000.

Among the leadership variables, "Managing Instructional Program" ($r = 3.567$), "Emotional Intelligence" ($r = 3.901$), and "Work Efficacy" ($r = 3.876$) have relatively higher correlation coefficients, suggesting that principals who actively manage instructional programs, exhibit emotional intelligence, and demonstrate strong work efficacy have a more substantial influence on teachers' performance. This finding aligns with recent research by Bush and Glover (2022), which emphasizes that effective

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

instructional leadership leads to better teaching strategies and classroom engagement. Furthermore, a study by Fullan (2021) highlights that leaders with high emotional intelligence foster a supportive school environment, increasing teacher motivation and retention. Additionally, the role of work efficacy in leadership effectiveness is supported by Lemoine et al. (2023), who found that school heads with strong efficacy beliefs inspire confidence and performance among teachers.

On the other hand, "Setting Directions" ($r = 2.012$) shows the lowest correlation coefficient, though it remains statistically significant. This suggests that while providing a clear vision and direction is essential for school leadership, other leadership dimensions, such as instructional support and emotional intelligence, may have a more direct impact on teacher effectiveness. This finding is consistent with the work of Harris and Jones (2020), who assert that while vision-setting is fundamental, its effectiveness is enhanced when paired with collaborative leadership and continuous teacher development.

Overall, the results affirm that the leadership practices of school heads, as assessed by principals, significantly contribute to the job performance of teachers. The findings suggest that leadership training programs should focus on strengthening instructional leadership, fostering emotional intelligence, and enhancing work efficacy to maximize their impact on teacher effectiveness and overall school improvement.

5. What are the problems/constraints encountered by the respondents relative to the appraisal leadership practices of the school heads?

Participant 1 (Senior Teacher, 2 years in service)

*"The biggest issue with leadership appraisal is the **lack of clear criteria**. We are often told that school heads are evaluated based on their leadership effectiveness, but we don't know the specific benchmarks. What makes a principal 'effective'? What does a high rating mean? There are no standard guidelines, and as a result, the process seems arbitrary."*

Participant 2 (Newly Hired Teacher, 2 years in service)

"As a new teacher, I have never been asked for my feedback on the principal's leadership. The appraisal seems to be conducted behind closed doors, with only a few people involved. If teachers, who interact with the school head daily, are not consulted, how can the evaluation be truly reflective of their leadership performance?"

Participant 3 (Department Head, 4 years in service)

*"I have observed that **favoritism** plays a huge role in how some school heads are appraised. Some principals have strong personal connections with evaluators, which often results in inflated ratings. This discourages those who work hard because they feel that performance is not the only factor that matters in leadership appraisal."*

Participant 4 (School Principal, 5 years in leadership role)

*"One challenge I personally face is that the feedback given to school heads is very general. We receive our ratings, but there is no specific **guidance on how to improve**. If I receive a score of '3' in 'collaborative leadership,' what does that mean? What specific actions should I take to improve? Without constructive feedback, appraisal serves little purpose."*

Participant 5 (Master Teacher, 5 years in service)

*"I have been in the education sector for a long time, and one issue I keep seeing is that **appraisals are done inconsistently**. In some years, the evaluation is thorough, with discussions and consultations. Other years, it seems rushed, like a mere formality. There is no clear **schedule** for when these appraisals should take place, and this inconsistency weakens its effectiveness."*

Participant 6 (Public School Teacher, 5 years in service)

*"Some principals view the appraisal process as **a threat rather than an opportunity for growth**. Instead of accepting feedback and using it to improve, they become defensive and dismissive. This makes it difficult for teachers to be honest in their assessments, as they fear negative consequences if they provide critical feedback."*

Participant 7 (Head of Parent-Teacher Association, community stakeholder)

*"The community is rarely involved in leadership appraisals. As a **PTA representative**, I believe that school leadership is not just about administration but also about engaging with the community. However, our opinions are almost never considered in these evaluations. Principals should also be assessed based on how they work with parents and community members, not just teachers and supervisors."*

Participant 8 (Guidance Counselor, 5 years in service)

*"Many leadership appraisals focus **too much on paperwork** rather than actual leadership impact. Principals are often required to submit numerous documents to prove their effectiveness, but leadership is not something that can always be measured on paper. It should be assessed based on actual interactions, school culture, and staff morale."*

Participant 9 (School Administrator, 3 years in leadership)

*"One of my frustrations is the **lack of professional development support after appraisal**. Even if a school head receives low scores in certain areas, there is no structured mentoring or training provided. It would be much more beneficial if the appraisal process led to targeted leadership training, rather than just being an annual evaluation with no follow-up."*

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

Participant 10 (English Teacher, 4 years in service)

"Leadership appraisals do not always reflect the reality in schools. Many evaluations rely on **self-reports and formal observations**, but these can be misleading. When a school head knows that they are being observed, they may put on a good show. However, what truly matters is their **day-to-day leadership**—how they handle conflicts, communicate with staff, and support teachers. This is rarely measured in appraisals."

Table 21. Summary of Common Issues Based on Participant Responses.

Issue	No. of Participants Who Mentioned It	Example Response
Lack of Clear Criteria for Appraisal	2 (P1, P4)	"We don't know the specific benchmarks for what makes a principal 'effective'."
Limited Teacher Involvement in Evaluation	2 (P2, P10)	"As a teacher, I have never been asked for feedback about the principal."
Bias and Favoritism in Ratings	1 (P3)	"Some principals receive high ratings because of personal connections rather than performance."
Inconsistency in Conducting Evaluations	1 (P5)	"Some years, the evaluation is thorough; other times, it feels rushed and unimportant."
Resistance to Feedback from School Heads	1 (P6)	"Some principals see appraisal as a threat rather than an opportunity to improve."
Lack of Community and Stakeholder Involvement	1 (P7)	"As a PTA member, I believe school heads should be assessed based on community engagement too."
Overemphasis on Paperwork vs. Real Leadership	1 (P8)	"Principals are asked to submit many documents, but leadership is not just about paperwork."
No Professional Development Support After Appraisal	1 (P9)	"There are no mentoring or training programs based on appraisal results."

The table presents a summary of common issues in the appraisal process of school leaders based on participant responses. Several key themes emerge, indicating challenges in the evaluation system.

One major issue is the lack of clear criteria for appraisal, as mentioned by two participants (P1, P4). Teachers expressed concerns about the absence of specific benchmarks to define an effective principal. This aligns with research by Grissom et al. (2021), which suggests that ambiguous evaluation criteria can lead to inconsistencies in leadership assessments, ultimately affecting school improvement efforts.

Another recurring concern is the limited involvement of teachers in evaluations (P2, P10). Teachers highlighted that their feedback is rarely sought in principal evaluations. Studies by Kraft and Gilmour (2020) emphasize that teacher input in leadership appraisals is essential for a holistic assessment, ensuring that instructional leadership is properly measured.

Bias and favoritism in ratings (P3) was another issue raised, with participants noting that some principals receive high scores based on personal connections rather than performance. This finding is supported by Harris et al. (2019), who argue that subjective biases in performance evaluations can undermine the credibility of the appraisal process and demotivate staff.

Inconsistency in conducting evaluations (P5) was also noted, with reports of irregular evaluation rigor across different years. Research by Sun and Ni (2022) highlights that appraisal systems must be consistently implemented to provide reliable assessments and constructive feedback.

Resistance to feedback from school heads (P6) was identified, where some principals perceive appraisal as a threat rather than an opportunity for growth. Studies by Robinson et al. (2021) indicate that effective leaders embrace feedback as a tool for professional development, emphasizing the need for a cultural shift in school leadership evaluations.

The lack of community and stakeholder involvement (P7) also emerged as a concern, with participants arguing that school leaders should be assessed based on their engagement with parents and the wider community. Research by Epstein (2020) underscores the role of community collaboration in school effectiveness and leadership accountability.

Lastly, the lack of professional development support after appraisal (P9) was highlighted, with concerns that no mentoring or training programs are offered based on evaluation results. According to Darling-Hammond et al. (2021), effective

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

appraisal systems should not only assess but also provide continuous professional development to help leaders improve.

Overall, these findings suggest that principal appraisal systems should be more transparent, involve multiple stakeholders, ensure consistency, and be linked to professional growth opportunities. Addressing these issues could lead to more effective leadership assessments that contribute to school improvement.

6. Based on the findings of the study, what output can be proposed that is geared towards the improvement of the school?

A strategic program is recommended to address the issues concerned based on the findings of the study. This program aims to provide guidance, support, and development opportunities to both new and experienced educators, with the ultimate goal of improving teaching quality and student learning outcomes. To support the continuous professional development of teachers, especially new and struggling ones, through structured mentoring led by experienced academic leaders, aligning with DepEd's commitment to quality education. This is intended to improve the performance of academic leaders in the division of Laguna specifically, Calamba, Cabuyao, Sta. Rosa and San Pedro.

Title: INSTITUTIONAL MENTORING PROGRAM

Rationale: The program aims to strengthen the professional growth of academic leaders and teachers by institutionalizing mentoring practices. Anchored in findings from the thesis on the practices of academic leaders, the IMP addresses the gaps in teacher support, instructional leadership, and sustainable school improvement.

The Institutional Mentoring Program (IMP) presents a transformative approach to professional growth, ensuring that academic leaders and teachers receive structured guidance tailored to their development needs. By institutionalizing mentoring practices, the program fosters a culture of shared leadership, collaboration, and sustained instructional improvement. Rooted in research findings, it directly addresses gaps in teacher support, instructional leadership, and school sustainability, making it a strategic initiative for long-term educational impact. The IMP's alignment with evidence-based leadership techniques is one of its main advantages; it offers both immediate assistance and the foundation for long-lasting institutional transformation. The program enables teachers to hone their skills, build their leadership abilities, and foster an atmosphere where professional development is ongoing and intricately woven into the structure of the school as mentoring relationships thrive.

This initiative highlights the crucial role of mentorship in shaping academic excellence, reinforcing the idea that leadership is a shared endeavor. By bridging existing gaps, the IMP contributes to a more resilient, empowered, and forward-thinking educational community.

Objectives	Activities	Duration	Person Responsible	Key Performance Indicator (KPI)	Budget	Expected Outcomes
1. To improve supervisory skills competence among newly hired academic leaders	Orientation and onboarding for new academic leaders	1 day (at start of school year)	Experienced School Head / HR / Senior Teachers	% increase in academic leaders performance ratings	₱10,000	Academic leaders are familiar with DepEd policies, school protocols, and expectations
2. To provide continuous professional development	Monthly mentoring sessions with experienced administrators	Monthly (1 session/month)	Department Experienced Head / Master Teacher	Number of mentoring sessions conducted	₱5,000/month (snacks, materials)	Improved instructional strategies and academic leaders' confidence
3. To enhance supervisory engagement	Peer observation and feedback system	Quarterly	Mentor Teachers	% of new administrators who report improved confidence and satisfaction	₱3,000/quarter	New academic leaders apply classroom management techniques effectively

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

4.To support academic leaders in strategic planning	Strategic Planning workshops and review	Bi-monthly	Department Head / Master Teachers	% of new academic leaders who report improved confidence and satisfaction	5000,00 per workshop	Better-aligned with MELCs and teachers, and learner needs
5. To prepare admin tasks for RPMS and career progression	Coaching on RPMS-PPST indicators and documentation	Per grading period	School Head / IPCRF Coordinator	- Mentor-mentee matching success rate	₱3,000/period	Teachers understand and meet RPMS indicators efficiently
6. To promote collaborative culture among faculty	Team-building and reflective practice sharing	Mid-year and Year-end	School Leadership Team	Retention and satisfaction of new teachers	₱50,000/event	Strengthened academic leaders and teacher collaboration and morale

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Neophyte school heads are perceived as highly effective leaders across all dimensions, with strong capabilities in instructional leadership, organizational management, and professional development.
2. While leadership practices are consistently rated as very high, certain areas require enhancement, particularly in articulating a clear vision, fostering interpersonal relationships, and allowing greater teacher autonomy in decision-making and self-appraisal.
3. The uniformity in assessments across different respondent groups highlights a cohesive leadership framework within schools, reinforcing the effectiveness of collaborative leadership approaches.
4. Statistical tests revealed no significant differences in the assessments among master teachers, head teachers, and principals, indicating a general consensus on the leadership effectiveness of neophyte school heads. This suggests that leadership practices are consistently implemented and perceived across different levels of school administration.
5. A significant relationship exists between the appraisal leadership practices of school administrators and the job performance of teachers, as demonstrated in statistical analyses. While all leadership dimensions exhibit a positive correlation with teacher performance, self-appraisal and work efficacy have the strongest relationships, underscoring the importance of reflective leadership and efficiency in enhancing teacher effectiveness. These findings align with leadership theories that highlight the critical role of self-awareness and efficacy in driving school success.
6. Interviews reveal persistent challenges in leadership appraisal, including the lack of clear evaluation criteria, limited teacher involvement, inconsistencies in evaluation processes, and resistance to feedback. While quantitative results confirm the overall effectiveness of school heads, qualitative responses highlight gaps in transparency, accountability, and stakeholder participation. Addressing these concerns through a more structured and inclusive appraisal system can lead to more meaningful leadership assessments and better support for professional development.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the foregoing findings and resolutions, the following recommendations were offered:

1. Academic leaders should engage more in mentorship programs to strengthen their leadership and decision-making skills. They should also develop clear and concise communication strategies to effectively convey their vision and school goals to all stakeholders. Continuous professional development in instructional leadership and emotional intelligence should be prioritized to enhance their effectiveness in leading schools. Moreover, fostering strong interpersonal relationships with teachers and staff will help create a more inclusive and supportive work environment, while implementing structured feedback mechanisms will allow teachers to voice concerns and provide valuable input on school policies and programs.
2. It is recommended to establish structured mentorship programs to guide and support teachers, students, parents, community leaders and other stakeholders to create a more participative decision-making process, leading to better

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

school management. Providing regular training and workshops on instructional leadership, curriculum management, and teacher development will equip school heads with essential skills to lead effectively. Additionally, strengthening school policies to support teacher collaboration and innovation without unnecessary restrictions will foster a culture of continuous improvement.

3. Future researchers should conduct further studies on the long-term impact of leadership training programs on neophyte school heads. Exploring the effectiveness of various mentoring approaches for neophyte school leaders can provide insights into best practices. Additionally, investigating the role of emotional intelligence in leadership success among school administrators and assessing the impact of distributed leadership models on school efficiency and student performance will contribute to the body of knowledge in educational leadership. Comparative studies between neophyte and experienced school heads should also be conducted to analyze differences in leadership effectiveness. By addressing these areas, school leadership can be further improved, creating a more dynamic and effective educational environment.

REFERENCES

- 1) Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 130-141.
- 2) Mulford, B. (2003). School leaders: Changing roles and impact on teacher and school effectiveness. Education and Training Policy Division, OECD.
- 3) Horng, E., & Loeb, S. (2010). New thinking about instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(3), 66-69.
- 4) Leithwood, K. R. C. (2003). What we know about successful school leadership. Philadelphia, PA: Laboratory for Student Success. Temple University. Longman
- 5) Leithwood, et al (2004) Review of research: How leadership influences student learning. St Paul: Centre for Applied Research and Educational Research Improvement, University of Minnesota.
- 6) Evans, M. G. (2012). Path-Goal Theory of Leadership. In L. L. Neider & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership* (pp. 115-138). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing
- 7) Leonard, J. (2010). Framing the Issues of Principal Time. In *Finding The Time For Instructional Leadership: Management Strategies for Strengthening the Academic Program* (p. 1). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- 8) Lineburge, P. N. (2010). The influence of the instructional leadership of the p rincipals on change in teachers' instructional practices. Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/handle/10919/26688>
- 9) Morgan, G. (2017) *Images of organization*, Thousand Oaks: Sage
- 10) Sergiovanni, T., & Green, R. (2015). Characteristics of Successful School. In *The principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective* (Seventh ed., p. 206). Pearson Education
- 11) Zepeda, S. (2013). The Principal as Instructional Leader. In *The Principal As Instructional Leader: A Practical Handbook* (Third ed., pp. 3-6). Larchmont,, NY: Eye On Education.
- 12) Sekhu, M. S. (2011). Practices of primary school principals as instructional leaders: implications for learner achievement (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria).
- 13) Leech, W. D., Smith, R., & Green, R. (2005). Exploring teacher perceptions of the leadership practices of middle and high school principals. USCA ESSAYS. Retrieved from: www.usca.edu/essays/vol62003/leech.pdf
- 14) Sharma, S., Sun, H., & Kannan, S. (2012). A Comparative Analysis on Leadership Qualities of School Principals in China, Malaysia & India. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(3), 536-543
- 15) ROUL, S. K. (2012). Practice and Problems of Principals' Leadership Style and Teachers' Job Performance in Secondary Schools of Ethiopia.
- 16) Premavathy,A. (2010). The Relationship Of Instructional Leadership, Teachers' organizational Commitment And Students' Achievement In Small Schools (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Sains Malaysia).
- 17) Hallinger, P. (2011). Leadership for learning: Lessons from 40 years of empirical research. *Journal of Education*, 49(2), 125-142.
- 18) Hallinger, P. (2000). A review of two decades of research on the principalship using the 'Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale' Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- 19) Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading Educational Change:Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. . *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), ,329-351. Retrieved from<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/09578231111116699>
- 20) Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). Some Theories and Theorists on Leadership. In *School Leadership that Works: From Research To Results* (pp. 18-19). ASCD & MCREL.

Practices of Academic Leaders Towards the Development of an Institutional Mentoring Program

- 21) Al Hosani, Hayat Mohamed Abdalla, "Principals' Instructional Leadership Practices And Their Relationship To Teachers' Instructional Practices In Sharjah Schools" (2015). Theses. Paper 22
- 22) Glatthorn, A., & Jailall, J. (2009). Importance of the Principal. In *The Principal As Curriculum Leader: Shaping What is Taught and Tested* (Third ed., p. 37). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- 23) Fullan, M. (2015). Leading Learning. In *The Principal: Three Keys to Maximizing Impact* (First ed., pp. 56-65). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 24) Mead, S. (April 2011). Prek-3rd: Principals as Crucial Instructional Leaders. Foundation for Child Development, 3-11. Retrieved from <http://fcdus.org/resources/prek-3rd-principals-crucial-instructional-leaders>
- 25) Olaniyan, D. A. (1997). Employees Job Performance as Affected by Demographic variables in Nigerian, Educational System in Africa, *J. Educ. Manage.* 5(1-2):38-47
- 26) Daresh, J. C. (2001). *Leaders helping leaders: A practical guide to administrative mentoring* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- 27) Chan Yuen Fook (2009). *Evaluating the effectiveness of educational management and leadership programme*. Shah Alam: UPENA, MARA University of Technology Publisher.
- 28) Cheng, Y. C. (2002). *Leadership and Strategy*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- 29) Lacombe, T. (2013). Definition of supportive leadership style. Chron.com. Retrieved from <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/definition-supportive-leadership-style-21835.html>
- 30) Adeyemi, T. (2010). Principals' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Job Performance in Senior Secondary Schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Current Research Journal of Economic Theory*, 3(3): 84-92.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.