



AMERICAN JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND INNOVATION (AJMRI)

ISSN: 2158-8155 (ONLINE), 2832-4854 (PRINT)

VOLUME 1 ISSUE 4 (2022)

Indexed in



PUBLISHED BY: E-PALLI, DELAWARE, USA

Capability Enhancement Plan for School Heads Anchored on the National Competency-Based Standards

Maybelle D. Madamba¹, Fredolin P. Julian², Eduardo T. Borja^{2*}

Article Information

Received: September 26, 2022

Accepted: October 01, 2022

Published: October 03, 2022

Keywords

Competence, School Leadership and Management, Capability Enhancement Plan, School Heads

ABSTRACT

A 21st-century school leader requires continuous improvement. School heads must discover their strengths to realize the Department of Education's vision, mission, and core values. This research was conducted to develop a capability enhancement plan (CEP) for school heads based on the competencies in the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads Training and Development Needs Assessment (NCBSSH-TDNA). School heads, teachers, and supervisors were the respondents of the study. The study utilized two instruments: the level of competence of school heads based on NCBSSH-TDNA; and the content validity of the capability enhancement plan for school heads. Mean and analysis of variance were the statistical tools used to interpret the data gathered. Results showed that the school heads need enhancement training along the seven domains for school leadership and management. Findings revealed that significant differences exist in respondents' perceptions of the level of competence in school leadership, instructional leadership, personal and professional attributes, and personal effectiveness. Also, the developed CEP was evaluated by the panel of experts as very highly valid. It indicates that the plan is acceptable for implementation. It is concluded that the school heads are not adequately equipped with the competencies relative to their functions and roles. Hence, using the CEP is highly recommended to the school heads to their knowledge, strengthen their skills, and improve their attitudes and qualities.

INTRODUCTION

In today's high-stakes environment, school leaders must improve teaching and learning. They must be educational visionaries, instructional and curricular leaders, assessment specialists, disciplinarians, community builders, public relations experts, budget analysts, building managers, and special program administrators. Parents, teachers, students, district administrators, unions, and state and federal authorities often have opposing interests. They must be sensitive to student needs. This shows that the field is finally recognizing school leaders' important role and rising expectations (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson, 2005).

A school head can affect the lives of several hundred to several thousand children per year, according to the Southern Regional Education Board (Schmidt-Davis & Bottoms, 2011). They are supposed to lead schools via collaboration and shared decision-making with teachers and staff. Educators, researchers, and organizations interested with ensuring all students have access to high-quality schools agree on the value of school heads.

In many developing countries like the Philippines. Devolving school improvement decision-making puts tremendous pressure on school leaders to be accountable for the quality of education they provide. Decentralization gives schools authority and accountability from the central administration. Localized decision-making improves school and community conditions and needs. Suppose school leaders aren't ready for more authority and responsibilities. Decentralization loses any educational value thereafter.

Republic Act No. 9155 or the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001 states that the State shall protect and promote the right of all citizens to quality basic education and make such education accessible to all by providing free and compulsory elementary and high school education to all Filipino children. Alternative learning mechanisms for out-of-school youth and adults must be included. Basic education should help kids become caring, self-reliant, productive, and patriotic citizens.

Further, the said Act reiterates that schools shall have a single aim of providing the best possible basic education for all learners hence, the school head is expected to perform as an instructional leader as well as an administrative manager.

Consistent with national education policies, plans, and standards, school heads shall have the authority, accountability, and responsibility for establishing the school's mission, vision, goals, and objectives, as well as for fostering a conducive atmosphere for teaching and learning. They are expected to implement the school curriculum and be accountable for higher learning outcomes; develop the school education program and school improvement plan; offer educational programs, projects, and services that provide equitable opportunities for all community learners; introduce new and innovative modes of instruction to achieve higher learning outcomes; and administer and manage all personnel, physical, and financial school resources.

The extent of responsibility that school administrators must assume is exacerbated by the expectations for

¹ Schools Division of Ilocos Norte, Ilocos Norte, Philippines

² Divine Word College of Laoag, Laoag City, Philippines

*Corresponding author's email: eduardo_borja05@yahoo.com

improved education quality that already exist, particularly in the nation. As a result of this greater emphasis on quality education, administrators at all levels of the education sector, especially school principals, must have a deeper understanding of the teaching and learning processes and the activities that are likely to improve the quality of education. Even when resources are available, it is difficult for school administrators to determine which inputs and actions will result in enhanced teaching and learning. The management of education at the school level must be significantly enhanced. As education systems become more decentralized, this requirement is often supported but least studied.

To provide a curriculum appropriate for the 21st century, the Department of Education established its flagship program, the K-12 Basic Education Program. This is in accordance with the reform objectives of the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda – the provision of a package of policy reforms that aims to systematically improve critical regulatory, institutional, structural, financial, cultural, physical, and informational conditions affecting basic education provision, access, and delivery on the ground (Home School Asia World Inc., 2016).

Due to increased pressure on schools to improve teaching and learning, school leaders' duties and responsibilities have expanded to include leading school reforms that increase student achievement, fostering a shared vision within the school community, and successfully implementing new organizational structures that involve teachers in shared decision-making. With these measures, the Schools Division of Ilocos Norte recognizes the crucial role of school administrators in school reform efforts. Thus, this study was conceptualized to provide school leaders with a clear vision of serving students, aligning resources and priorities with the vision, and engaging other key stakeholders within and beyond the school to achieve the vision's goals.

Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted to develop a capability enhancement plan (CEP) for school heads in the Schools Division of Ilocos Norte based on the assessment of their competencies.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following:

1. What is the level of competence of school heads as perceived by them, the teachers, and their immediate supervisors in terms of:

- school leadership;
- instructional leadership;
- creating a student-centered learning climate;
- human resource management and professional development;
- parent involvement and community partnership;
- school management and operations; and
- personal and professional attributes and interpersonal effectiveness?

2. Are there significant differences among the perceptions of the school heads, the teachers, and their immediate

supervisors?

3. What can be prepared to enhance the capability of the school heads?

4. What is the validity of the CEP in terms of the following:

- areas of concern;
- objectives;
- activities;
- persons and agencies involved;
- time frame;
- budgetary requirements; and
- expected outcomes?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Role and Performance of School Heads

School head is defined as the person responsible for the administrative and instructional supervision of the school or cluster of schools. In other words, the school head is the highest-ranking administrator in an elementary, junior or senior high school who typically reports directly to the school's superintendent, but may report to the superintendent's designee, usually an assistant superintendent (Jenlink, 2010).

Principals haven't always existed. As schools developed from one-room schoolhouses to schools with many grades and classrooms, a need arose for a manager. Teachers initially provided this demand by teaching and managing their school. These were principals. Most schools hired full-time principals as schools grew. Most principals abandoned teaching because of management obligations.

As managers, principals were responsible for financial operations, facility upkeep, student scheduling, staff, public relations, school discipline policy, educational program coordination, and other school affairs. Principals' management roles included curriculum and teaching oversight until the 1980s. As the accountability movement gained steam, the principal's role transformed from manager to instructional leader to reform leader. Principals kept their management duties notwithstanding this transformation. Principals are school managers, instructional leaders, and change leaders, he said.

Principals run schools. State statutes outline some of their tasks. State and district principal assessment standards and procedures set expectations. As schools became increasingly accountable for student achievement on national and state tests, principals' obligations evolved. Principals took on increased teaching and learning responsibilities. Their obligation to oversee instruction and aid teachers improved. Principals now need to evaluate instruction and help teachers improve their approaches more effectively. Some states require principals to improve school instruction. Some states remove principals when schools are low performing (children don't fulfil goals) for a defined time.

Seyfarth (2009) reported that as schools faced growing pressure to improve teaching and learning, principals' tasks extended to include spearheading school change

to raise student achievement. A principal's capacity to build a common vision within the school community and execute new organizational structures that include teachers in shared decision-making is key to leading reforms to boost student achievement. Principals have found that including the whole workforce in decision-making increases reform commitment.

Principals are tasked for fostering parent and community relationships, he said. This includes engaging with parents on disciplinary and academic challenges. Principals should communicate with advisory boards, PTOs, and booster clubs. Principals must spend a lot of time with parents of special needs students.

Principals are still accountable for school management, according to Ubben, Hughes, and Norris (2011). School safety is a management priority. This includes ensuring that facilities and equipment are safe and operating, developing, and enforcing school discipline policies, and assigning supervisory tasks to school staff. Elementary principals know they must supervise young students constantly. As students age, their monitoring needs alter. Older pupils who are handicapped, in high-risk settings (labs, shops, athletic facilities), or in situations (field excursions, athletic events, etc.) require close supervision. National Centre for Education Statistics research shows principals are key to school change (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs/ppsp/97455-2.html>). Research on school effectiveness focused on administrators as the accountability movement gained steam. These studies revealed that the principal makes the school. As the only person in a school responsible for and empowered to manage the entire school, principals are in a powerful position to coordinate and advance school operations, according to study. The most effective principals had a clear vision of how the school should serve its students, matched resources, and priorities with the vision, and could involve important stakeholders within and beyond the school in attaining the vision's goals.

The study supported the important role principals play in their school's performance and highlighted other leader qualities. High energy, initiative, ambiguity tolerance, humour, analytical abilities, and common sense. As society diversifies, scholars are examining the principal's role in leading diverse schools.

The evolving role of school leaders is the topic of principalship research. Research has revealed that the principle is crucial to a school's effectiveness in preparing children. This research used public and private education systems. As society and technology change, so will the principal's function. Vouchers, charter schools, and technology could transform education. These changes will affect the principal's role. An online school's principal will operate differently than a traditional schools.

School Leadership

International education policies prioritize school leadership. It influences teacher motivations, capacities, and the school climate and environment to improve

school outcomes. Effective school leadership improves efficiency and equity.

As countries adjust their education systems to modern requirements, school and principal expectations change. Decentralization has made schools more autonomous and accountable for results in many countries. Schools are under pressure to increase overall student performance while serving more diverse student groups.

As a result of these trends, school leadership in OECD nations includes financial and human resource management and learning leadership.

Countries worry that the function of principal as envisioned in the past is no longer appropriate. Many principals are reaching retirement age and are hard to replace. Overburdened jobs, insufficient preparation and training, limited career opportunities, and inadequate support and rewards discourage applicants.

This has made school leadership a global issue. Policymakers must improve and sustain school leadership. Pont, Nusche, and Moorman (2010) identified four policy levers that can strengthen school leadership.

Redefining school leadership. Research shows that empowering school leaders to make crucial decisions improves school and student success. Autonomy alone doesn't lead to advances without help. Also, school leaders' fundamental responsibilities must be clearly stated. School leadership responsibilities should be determined by improving teaching and learning processes.

Leadership distribution. Increased school leadership responsibilities and accountability need leadership distribution within and between schools. School boards have new responsibilities. Middle-management roles are crucial for efficient school leadership, but they are scarce, vague, and rarely recognized. Policymakers must extend the definition of school leadership and change policies and working circumstances.

School leadership development. Different sources suggest that school administrators need specific training to handle expanded tasks and responsibilities. Strategies must focus on enhancing school results and be contextualized.

Making school leadership appealing. Improve existing leadership and build future leadership. Potential applicants are deterred by principals' hard workloads and the job's lack of support and compensation. Uncertain recruitment procedures and principal career prospects may dissuade individuals.

Instructional Leadership

Principals must wear multiple hats for instructional leadership. Principals are administrators, managers, diplomats, teachers, and curriculum leaders, sometimes all in one day. Principals must demonstrate competence in each of these areas. and able to switch roles fluidly.

As instructional leaders, principals and school leaders seek balance and proficiency. Lack of comprehensive training is identified as a reason for poor instructional leadership in schools. Insufficient time for instructional activities, high community expectations, and excessive

paperwork also contributed to the shortage.

Wilhelm (2014) says instructional leadership requires creating clear goals, controlling curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, assigning resources, and evaluating teachers to support student learning and progress. Instructional principals prioritize quality. Instructional leadership values teaching, learning, and knowledge. Staff should meet often to discuss how to improve their work and help students learn.

Principals need these four skills for effective instructional leadership:

Resourcefulness. Principals must understand their faculty's strengths and limitations. The principle should be ready to give personnel with needed resources. Teachers flourish when praised for their work.

Communicativeness. Principals should communicate well. Principals need people skills to succeed. They must explain their values about education, especially that every student can learn. These skills create trust, motivation, and empowerment.

Providing education. Principals and other administration officials advise teachers about effective teaching approaches and education trends. Instructional leaders should know about curriculum, assessment, and pedagogical concerns.

Being accessible. Good principals should be positive, visible, and energetic. A successful instructional principal models learning habits, focuses on learning objectives, and leads by example.

A great educational principle should also have outstanding planning, observation, research, and student and staff performance evaluation skills. Hallinger (2015) explained that the principal's position has shifted from a top-down authority tasked with rescuing failing schools to an effective leader who motivates students and teachers to cross classroom boundaries and change the school from a workplace to a learning environment.

Teachers and assistant principals didn't lead schools 20 years ago. In order, a principal's tasks are managerial, political, and instructional. Now, many administrators have less management and political interests and more instructional and student learning priorities. The positions are increasingly intertwined (Hallinger, 2015).

Today, leadership is diffused among different people and situations; it's more like patterns of influence across numerous participants. Leadership effectiveness depends on how this influence encourages leader, teacher, and parent development to improve student engagement, learning, and well-being. Not one individual did this.

Distributing leadership doesn't mean the administrator abdicates responsibility and ignores student learning. It entails working with instructors to create learning materials, routines, and structures (Timperley, 2011). Studies over the past 25 years reveal the principal's effects on classroom instruction work more through the school's culture and modelling than through direct observation and evaluation of teaching (Reeves, 2010).

A leadership attitude promotes deep student learning,

professional investigation, trusting connections, and action evidence (Timperley, 2011). Creating a secure and safe learning environment and effective interventions for children in need; catching excellent instructors doing things right and supporting them with real gratitude and emotional intelligence.

Educational leadership isn't a hierarchical position. Leadership at all levels affects organizational health and student accomplishment. Recent studies demonstrate school leaders affect student learning (Robinson, 2011, Leithwood and Seashore-Louis, 2011). Vivian Robinson (2011) analyzed 30 papers on educational leadership and student learning. Her investigations found five leadership behaviours that improved student learning.

These five leadership practices or dimensions "inform leaders what to focus on to improve student learning, but say little about the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to make them work" (Leithwood and Seashore-Louis, 2011, Robinson, 2011). Robinson argues that three talents are needed to engage in these five practices: the ability to use relevant information in a leader's practice, the ability to solve difficult challenges, and the ability to trust in developing and strengthening teaching and teacher learning.

Helen Timperley (2011) says principals must know their teachers to lead learning and development. They must know what teachers know and do well and when they must learn. They must also know what affects teacher and student learning. Principals learn to lead teacher learning and growth by engaging in leadership inquiry cycles.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

This study used the research and development methodology, which includes descriptive research. Descriptive research encompasses all that purport to present facts concerning the nature and status of anything – a group of persons, number of objects, a set of conditions, a class of events, a system of phenomenon which one may wish to study (Fox & Bayat, 2009).

In addition, descriptive research is aimed at casting light on current issues or problems through a process of data collection that enables researchers to describe situations more completely. Therefore, to look at the performance of school heads, the researcher used the descriptive research design. The results provided a basis for the design of a Capability Enhancement Plan for school heads.

Planning Stage. This stage included two phases namely: a) bibliographic survey of related literature and studies to determine what has been done along the topic; and b) an empirical survey of the school heads' demographic characteristics, professional qualities, and level of competence in the seven domains for school leadership and management.

Development Stage. This stage included an analysis of the survey on the demographic characteristics, professional qualities, and level of competence along the seven

domains for school leadership and management. The results served as a basis in crafting the capability enhancement plan for school heads.

Validation Stage. The content validation of the capability enhancement plan for school heads was done by a panel of experts which is composed of three Senior Education Program Specialists, three Education Program Supervisors, one School Principal IV, one School Principal I, and one Head Teacher I. The final revision and reproduction of the CEP was done by the researcher after the validation.

Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in all the 372 schools of the Schools Division of Ilocos Norte covering the 1st and 2nd Congressional districts which consist of 21 municipalities starting from the northern most part which is Pagudpud to the southern most part which is Badoc. The different municipalities were divided into four units – North, Central, East, and South units.

The division was selected as the site of the study because the researcher is one of its Senior Education Program Specialists and is in-charge of human resource development.

Population and Sampling

The study involved all the ten Education Program Supervisors (EPS), ten Public Schools District Supervisors (PSDS), 270 elementary and secondary school heads and 658 teachers at the Schools Division of Ilocos Norte. Slovin's formula was utilized to determine the number of teacher respondents while total enumeration was applied in choosing the respondents for the school heads and supervisors.

The content validation of the proposed CEP for school heads was done by a group of experts composed of the Education Program Supervisors, Public Schools District Supervisors, Senior Education Program Specialist, school heads and a head teacher.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

The following instruments were used in the study to gather data:

Questionnaire to Determine the Level of Competence of School Heads in the Seven Domains for School Leadership and Management. The researcher adopted the (NCBSSH-TDNA) tool which is currently used by the Department of Education to systematically determine the training and development needs of school heads to support improved practice as effective school leaders.

The instrument contains a list of competency standards which is used as basis for the school heads' decision

making, actions and performances of their functions. In addition to fundamental direction provided by the set of standards, there are knowledge, skills and values that are clarified through the indicators defined per strand on every domain. The NCBSSH is used as basis for the preparation of a comprehensive training and development based on expected tasks that will be utilized to deliver training programs to ensure efficiency, effectiveness, and excellence of school heads' job performance (DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2010, par 2 and 3).

The following scale and descriptive interpretation were used in the research instrument to determine the school heads' assessment of their competencies.

Scale Descriptive Interpretation

| | |
|---|---|
| 4 | Doing it well and can lead others do the same |
| 3 | Doing it but need to improve |
| 2 | Doing a little of this and need to learn more |
| 1 | Not doing this yet |

The same instrument was given to the teachers and supervisors to validate the responses of the school heads. *Questionnaire to Determine the Content Validity of the Capability Enhancement Plan for School Heads.* This is a rating scale used to determine the content validity of the plan based on the following set of criteria, namely: areas of concern, objectives, activities, persons and agencies involved, time frame, budgetary requirements and expected outcomes. Moreover, it obtained personal information about the validators.

The tool was based on the rating scale which was designed by Frez (2015) for evaluating a strategic/development plan. The following scale was used to describe the content validity of the Capability Enhancement Plan for School Heads.

Scale Descriptive Interpretation

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| 5 | Very strongly agree |
| 4 | Strongly agree |
| 3 | Agree |
| 2 | Strongly disagree |
| 1 | Very strongly disagree |

Data Analysis

The data gathered by the researcher were analyzed and interpreted using frequency counts and percentages. In addition, the means and standard deviation were also computed to arrive at a better understanding of the level of competence of school heads. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was also used to determine whether there are significant differences between and among the assessment of the three groups of respondents and on the seven domains for school leadership and management. The following range of mean values with their descriptive interpretation were used:

Table 1: Range of mean values with their descriptive interpretation

| Range of Mean Values | Quality Label | Descriptor |
|---|----------------------------|---|
| 3.50-4.00 (Doing it well and can lead others do the same) | Can Support Training (CST) | Competencies in this range are strong qualities/abilities that may enable him/her to help in the professional development of colleagues |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| 2.50-3.49 (Doing it but need to improve) | Need Enhancement Training (NET) | Competencies in this range are secondary needs for professional development |
| 1.50-3.49 (Doing a little of this and need to learn more) | Strong Need for Training (SNT) | Competencies in this range are priority needs for professional development |
| 1.00-1.49 (Not doing this yet) | Urgent Need for Training (UNT) | Competencies in this range are priority needs for professional development |

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Presented in this section of this study is the level of competence of the school heads along the seven domains for school leadership and management in terms of the

following: school leadership, instructional leadership, creating a student-centered learning climate, human resource management and professional development, parent involvement and community partnership, school management and operations, and personal and professional attributes and interpersonal effectiveness.

Table 2: School heads' level of competence as perceived by themselves, the teachers, and their supervisors

| Domain/ Strand | Competencies | School Heads (n=270) | | Teachers (n=658) | | Supervisors (n=20) | | Ave. Mean | DI |
|--|--|----------------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| | | CM | DI | CM | DI | CM | DI | | |
| Domain 1 School Leadership | | | | | | | | | |
| Strand 1.A | Developing and Communicating Vision, Mission, Goals, and Objectives (VMGO) | 3.36 | NET | 3.49 | NET | 3.19 | NET | 3.34 | NET |
| Strand 1.B | Data-based Strategic Planning | 3.32 | NET | 3.41 | NET | 3.19 | NET | 3.30 | NET |
| Strand 1.C | Problem Solving | 3.37 | NET | 3.40 | NET | 3.22 | NET | 3.33 | NET |
| Strand 1.D | Building High Performance Teams | 3.31 | NET | 3.40 | NET | 3.20 | NET | 3.30 | NET |
| Strand 1.E | Coordinating with Others | 3.38 | NET | 3.39 | NET | 3.20 | NET | 3.32 | NET |
| Strand 1.F | Leading and Managing Change | 3.42 | NET | 3.42 | NET | 3.20 | NET | 3.33 | NET |
| Overall Mean | | 3.35 | NET | 3.42 | NET | 3.20 | NET | 3.32 | NET |
| Domain 2 Instructional Leadership | | | | | | | | | |
| Strand 2.A | Assessment for Learning | 3.30 | NET | 3.42 | NET | 3.15 | NET | 3.29 | NET |
| Strand 2.B | Developing Programs &/or Adapting Existing Programs | 3.06 | NET | 3.26 | NET | 3.04 | NET | 3.12 | NET |
| Strand 2.C | Implementing programs for Instructional Improvement | 3.18 | NET | 3.37 | NET | 3.14 | NET | 3.23 | NET |
| Strand 2.D | Instructional Supervision | 3.45 | NET | 3.52 | CST | 3.27 | NET | 3.41 | NET |
| Overall Mean | | 3.24 | NET | 3.39 | NET | 3.15 | NET | 3.26 | NET |
| Domain 3 Creating A Student-Centered Learning Climate | | | | | | | | | |
| Strand 3.A | Setting High Social & Academic Expectations | 3.28 | NET | 3.40 | NET | 3.24 | NET | 3.30 | NET |
| Strand 3.B | Creating School Environments focused on the Needs of the Learner | 3.56 | CST | 3.57 | CST | 3.32 | NET | 3.48 | NET |
| Overall Mean | | 3.42 | NET | 3.48 | NET | 3.28 | NET | 3.40 | NET |
| Domain 4 Human Resources Management & Professional Development | | | | | | | | | |
| Strand 4.A | Creating a Professional learning Community | 3.33 | NET | 3.44 | NET | 3.21 | NET | 3.32 | NET |
| Strand 4.B | Recruitment and Hiring | 3.08 | NET | 3.33 | NET | 3.10 | NET | 3.17 | NET |
| Strand 4.C | Managing Performance of Teachers and Staff | 3.32 | | 3.40 | | 3.24 | | 3.32 | |
| Overall Mean | | 3.24 | NET | 3.39 | NET | 3.18 | NET | 3.27 | NET |
| Domain 5 Parent Involvement & Community Partnership | | | | | | | | | |
| Strand 5.A | Parental Involvement | 3.37 | NET | 3.44 | NET | 3.26 | NET | 3.36 | NET |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| Strand 5.B | External Community Partnership | 3.30 | NET | 3.37 | NET | 3.26 | NET | 3.31 | NET |
| Overall Mean | | 3.33 | NET | 3.40 | NET | 3.26 | NET | 3.33 | NET |
| Domain 6 School Management And Operations | | | | | | | | | |
| Strand 6.A | Managing School Operations | 3.34 | NET | 3.47 | NET | 3.23 | NET | 3.34 | NET |
| Strand 6.B | Fiscal Management | 3.47 | NET | 3.48 | NET | 3.26 | NET | 3.40 | NET |
| Strand 6.C | Use of technology in the Management Operations | 3.25 | NET | 3.36 | NET | 3.30 | NET | 3.30 | NET |
| Overall Mean | | 3.35 | NET | 3.44 | NET | 3.26 | NET | 3.35 | NET |
| Domain 7 Personal & Professional Attributes and Interpersonal Effectiveness | | | | | | | | | |
| Strand 7.A | Professionalism | 3.54 | CST | 3.54 | CST | 3.34 | NET | 3.47 | NET |
| Strand 7.B | Communication | 3.50 | NET | 3.51 | CST | 3.31 | NET | 3.44 | NET |
| Strand 7.C | Interpersonal Sensitivity | 3.42 | NET | 3.49 | NET | 3.34 | NET | 3.42 | NET |
| Strand 7.D | Fairness, Honesty & Integrity | 3.48 | NET | 3.49 | NET | 3.37 | NET | 3.44 | NET |
| Overall Mean | | 3.48 | NET | 3.50 | NET | 3.34 | NET | 3.44 | NET |
| Grand Mean | | 3.34 | NET | 3.43 | NET | 3.24 | NET | 3.34 | NET |

Legend:

| Range of Mean Values | Qualitative Label | Descriptor |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| 3.50 – 4.00 (Doing it well and can lead others do the same) | Can Support Training (CST) | Competencies in this range are strong qualities/abilities that may enable him/her to help in the professional development of colleagues |
| 2.50 – 3.49 (Doing it but need to improve) | Need Enhancement Training (NET) | Competencies in this range are secondary needs for professional development |
| 1.50 – 2.49 (Doing a little of this and need to learn more) | Strong Need for Training (SNT) | Competencies in this range are priority needs for professional development |
| 1.00 – 1.49 (Not doing this yet) | Urgent Need for Training (UNT) | Competencies in this range are priority needs for professional development |

Comparison on the Self-Evaluation of the School Heads the Evaluation of their Teachers and Immediate Supervisors Regarding their Level of Competence

Presented in this section of the study are the results on the test of differences on the self-evaluation of the school heads, their teachers and supervisors regarding their level of competence on the different domains that comprised their competencies which include: school leadership; instructional leadership; creating a student-centered learning climate; human resource management and professional development; parental involvement

and community partnership; school management and operations; and personal and professional attributes and interpersonal effectiveness.

Domain 1. School Leadership

The results presented in Table 3 on the analysis of variance of the school heads, teachers, and supervisors' evaluation on the level of competencies.

Domain 2. Instructional Leadership. The obtained mean ratings from the school heads, teachers, and supervisors are significantly different as shown in Table 4

Table 3: Analysis of variance on the ratings of the school heads, teachers, and supervisors on the school heads' level of competence along school leadership

| (I) Respondents | (J) Respondents | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Significance |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| School Heads | Teachers | -.059* | .021 | .039 |
| (Mean=3.35; NET) | Supervisors | .042 | .115 | .731 |
| Teachers | School Heads | .059* | .021 | .039 |
| (Mean= 3.42; NET) | Supervisors | .101 | .122 | .445 |
| Supervisors | School Heads | -.042 | .115 | .731 |
| (Mean=3.20; NET) | Teachers | -.101 | .122 | .445 |

*significant at the .05 level of significance

Table 4: Analysis of variance on the ratings of the school heads, teachers, and supervisors on the school heads' level of competence along instructional leadership

| (I) Respondents | (J) Respondents | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Significance |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| School Heads | Teachers | -.087 | .051 | .186 |
| (Mean=3.24; NET) | Supervisors | .172* | .050 | .042 |
| Teachers | School Heads | .087 | .051 | .186 |
| (Mean= 3.39; NET) | Supervisors | .260* | .007 | .000 |
| Supervisors | School Heads | -.172* | .050 | .042 |
| (Mean=(3.15; NET) | Teachers | -.260* | .007 | .000 |

*significant at the .05 level of significance

Domain 3. Creating a Student-Centered Learning Climate. The ratings of the school heads, teachers and supervisors are not significantly different as reflected in Table 5

Domain 4. Human Resource Management and Professional Development.

The results shown in Table 6 on the test of difference of the school heads, teachers, and supervisors' evaluation on the level of competence of the school heads along human resource management and professional development indicate that they differ significantly.

Domain 5. Parent Involvement and Community

Table 5: Analysis of variance on the ratings of the school heads, teachers, and supervisors on the school heads' level of competence along creating a student-centered learning climate

| (I) Respondents | (J) Respondents | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Significance |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| School Heads | Teachers | -.056 | .056 | .500 |
| (Mean=3.42; NET) | Supervisors | .159 | .091 | .329 |
| Teachers | School Heads | .056 | .056 | .500 |
| (Mean= 3.48; NET) | Supervisors | .215 | .035 | .103 |
| Supervisors | School Heads | -.159 | .091 | .329 |
| (Mean= 3.28; NET) | Teachers | -.215 | .035 | .103 |

*ns - not significant

Table 6: Analysis of variance on the ratings of the school heads, teachers, and supervisors on the school heads' level of competence along human resource management and professional development

| (I) Respondents | (J) Respondents | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Significance |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| School Heads | Teachers | -.098 | .094 | .406 |
| (Mean= 3.24; NET) | Supervisors | .149 | .061 | .134 |
| Teachers | School Heads | .098 | .094 | .406 |
| (Mean= 3.39; NET) | Supervisors | .247* | .051 | .041 |
| Supervisors | School Heads | -.149 | .061 | .134 |
| (Mean= 3.18; NET) | Teachers | -.247* | .051 | .041 |

*significant at the .05 level of significance

Partnership. Based on the obtained results of the analysis of variance done to test the differences between and among the evaluations of the school heads, teachers, and

supervisors on the level of competence of the school heads, it was indicated that the ratings of the three groups of respondents are the same

Table 7: Analysis of variance on the ratings of the school heads, teachers, and supervisors on the school heads' level of competence along parent involvement and community partnership

| (I) Respondents | (J) Respondents | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Significance |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| School Heads | Teachers | -.072 | .008 | .067 |
| (Mean= 3.33; NET) | Supervisors | .066 | .030 | .274 |
| Teachers | School Heads | .072 | .008 | .067 |
| (Mean= 3.40; NET) | Supervisors | .138 | .023 | .105 |
| Supervisors | School Heads | -.066 | .030 | .274 |
| (Mean= 3.33; NET) | Teachers | -.138 | .023 | .105 |

*ns- not significant

Domain 6. School Management and Operations. The results of the test of differences between and among the ratings of the school heads, the teachers, and supervisors on the level of competence of the school along school

management and operations reveal that they have similar ratings. Hence, their evaluation on the school heads' level of competence is homogeneous.

Domain 7. Personal and Professional Attributes and

Table 8: Analysis of variance on the ratings of the school heads, teachers, and supervisors on the school heads' level of competence along school management and operations

| (I) Respondents | (J) Respondents | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Significance |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| School Heads | Teachers | .050 | .120 | .716 |
| (Mean= 3.35; NET) | Supervisors | .243 | .075 | .083 |
| Teachers | School Heads | -.050 | .120 | .716 |
| (Mean= 3.44; NET) | Supervisors | .193 | .046 | .053 |
| Supervisors | School Heads | -.243 | .075 | .083 |
| (Mean= 3.3; NET5) | Teachers | -.193 | .046 | .053 |

*ns- not significant

Personal Effectiveness. Shown in Table 9 are the results of the test of differences between and among the evaluations of the school heads, teachers and supervisors

on the school heads' level of competence in terms of personal and professional attributes and interpersonal effectiveness.

Table 9: Analysis of variance on the ratings of the school heads, teachers, and supervisors on the school heads' level of competence along personal and professional attributes and interpersonal effectiveness

| (I) Respondents | (J) Respondents | Mean Difference (I-J) | Standard Error | Significance |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| School Heads | Teachers | -.029 | .015 | .161 |
| (Mean=3.48; NET) | Supervisors | .172* | .021 | .004 |
| Teachers | School Heads | .029 | .015 | .161 |
| (Mean= 3.50; NET) | Supervisors | .201* | .031 | .007 |
| Supervisors | School Heads | -.172* | .021 | .004 |
| (Mean= 3.34; NET) | Teachers | -.201* | .031 | .007 |

* *significant at the .05 level of significance

Content Validity of the Capability Enhancement Plan for School Heads in the Province of Ilocos Norte

This section presents validation of the proposed CEP which was done by a team of experts composed of

three Senior Education Program Specialists Education Program Supervisors, School Principals and Head Teacher that are responsible for the administrative and instructional supervision of the school.

Table 10: Summary of the panel of experts' evaluation of the proposed capability enhancement plan

| Components | Composite Mean | Descriptive Interpretation |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| A. Areas of Concern | 4.97 | VSA/VHV |
| B. Objectives | 5.00 | VSA/VHV |
| C. Strategies/Activities | 5.00 | VSA/VHV |
| D. Persons and Agencies Involved | 4.96 | VSA/VHV |
| E. Time Frame | 5.00 | VSA/VHV |
| F. Budgetary Requirements | 4.72 | VSA/VHV |
| G. Expected Outcomes | 5.00 | VSA/VHV |
| Overall Mean | 4.95 | VSA/VHV |

Legend:

Range of Mean Values

4.50 – 5.00

3.50 – 4.49

2.50 – 3.49

1.50 – 2.49

1.00 – 1.49

Descriptive Interpretation

Very Strongly Agree (VSA)/ Very Highly Valid (VHV)

Strongly Agree (SA) / Highly Valid (HV)

Agree (A) / Valid (V)

Strongly Disagree (SD) / Needs Some Improvement (NSI)

Very Strongly Disagree (VSD) / Must be Changed (MC)

DISCUSSION

Level of Competence of School Heads

Today's school administrators must play a crucial role in fostering a district culture of integrity that maximizes the moral growth of pupils. They must provide an educational atmosphere that serves the broader goals of public education, which must include a solid foundation in academics. But it also entails educating instructors and students with an internalized, consistent sense of ethics and values-based critical thinking tools to address the difficult concerns of the twenty-first century (Mirk, 2019).

These results indicate that the school heads have not yet reached their maximum performance along the domains required of a school head. As a school head, they are accountable for the quality of education provided by their school. They are responsible in making decisions that are more responsive to local conditions and needs. Further, the school heads are accountable and responsible in setting the mission, vision, goals, and objectives of the school and creating an environment within the school that is conducive to teaching and learning. They must implement the school curriculum and be accountable for higher learning outcomes, develop the school improvement plan, offer educational programs, projects and services which provide equitable opportunities for all learners of the community, introduce new innovative modes of instruction to achieve higher learning outcomes, and administer and manage all personnel, physical and fiscal resources of the school. Hence, a capability enhancement plan can be formulated to enhance their knowledge, skills, attitudes, traits, and qualities for them to lead their teachers, staff, community members and other stakeholders to improve the quality of education.

Comparison on the Self-Evaluation of the School Heads the Evaluation of their Teachers and Immediate Supervisors Regarding their Level of Competence

Domain 1. School Leadership. Higher rating was given by the teachers compared to the school heads' rating. This signifies that the school heads under-marked their level of competency while their teachers over-marked them. Tan and Keat (2005) as cited by Natividad (2018) mentioned that the magnitude of under-marking by self-evaluation is greater than the magnitude of over-marking while a reverse trend happens for peer evaluation.

On the other hand, similar ratings were indicated by the school heads with that of the supervisors' rating implying that the way the school heads perceived their level of performance along school leadership is in the same way as how their supervisors see them perform their functions and roles in terms of school leadership. Again, Natividad (2018) cited the position of Tan and Keat (2005) indicating that self-ratings can be more accurate than peer ratings. In this case the ratings of the school heads which is lower than the ratings of their teachers is more accurate which in turn was also confirmed by the supervisors' ratings.

Domain 2. Instructional Leadership. Result implies that the evaluation of the three groups of respondents on the level of competencies of the school heads in terms of instructional leadership are not consistent, they vary significantly among the respondents. The teachers rated the school heads the highest which is significantly different from the ratings of the school supervisors but not different from the school heads' rating. Thus, similar ratings were noted between the evaluations of the school heads and the teachers on the school heads' level of competence along instructional leadership.

The similar ratings of the school heads and the teachers on the school heads' level of competence along instructional leadership could be supported by the fact that the school heads had already attended various trainings along this domain as presented in the professional qualifications of the school heads. Further, the school heads' rating is also different from the rating of the supervisors. The lowest rating along this competency was from the supervisors. Therefore, there are variations between the evaluations of the school heads and the supervisors.

Domain 3. Creating a Student-Centered Learning Climate. The ratings of the school heads, teachers and supervisors are not significantly different as reflected in Table 2.3. This implies that the ratings of the respondents are consistent.

Domain 4. Human Resource Management and Professional Development. The differences in the ratings were noted between the teachers and supervisors' ratings wherein higher rating was noted from the teachers' evaluation compared to the supervisors' evaluation. However, the school heads rating and the supervisors' rating are the same. Therefore, these group of respondents are consistent in terms of their ratings.

Domain 5. Parent Involvement and Community Partnership. Based on the obtained results of the analysis of variance done to test the differences between and among the evaluations of the school heads, teachers, and supervisors on the level of competence of the school heads, it was indicated that the ratings of the three groups of respondents are the same. This implies that the respondents gave parallel ratings that the school need enhancement training along parent involvement and community partnership.

Domain 6. School Management and Operations. The results of the test of differences between and among the ratings of the school heads, the teachers, and supervisors on the level of competence of the school along school management and operations reveal that they have similar ratings. Hence, their evaluation on the school heads' level of competence is homogeneous.

Domain 7. Personal and Professional Attributes and Personal Effectiveness. The result revealed significant differences between the ratings of the supervisors and school heads and between the ratings of the supervisors and teachers. The supervisors gave the lowest rating. However, the ratings of the school heads and the teachers are consistent. The reason why the ratings of the school heads and the teachers are almost the same and higher than that of the supervisors' ratings is that the school heads and the

teachers are staying in the same workplace or station and that they deal and spend longer time together. As such, the teachers have more opportunities to observe and see the way the school heads exemplify the competencies along personal and professional attributes and effectiveness. Therefore, the school administrators' evaluation, which was validated by the teachers' rating, is more acceptable than the supervisors' rating on this area.

Content Validity of the Capability Enhancement Plan for School Heads in the Province of Ilocos Norte

The overall obtained in the evaluated capability enhancement plan, reflects and confirms the positive evaluation of the panel of experts on the proposed capability enhancement plan. The team of experts expressed their very strong agreement to all the different components of the capability enhancement plan. Hence, they are all very valid.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concludes that school heads can perform their roles and functions as school heads. However, they still need to undergo enhancement training in all the strands of the different domains specified in the NCBSSH-TDNA to achieve a very competent level of performance. Significant differences exist on the evaluations done by the three groups of respondents as per their perceptions on the competence of the school heads, particularly in the domains of school leadership, instructional leadership, human resource management, and professional development, and personal and professional attributes and interpersonal effectiveness. The panel of experts' evaluating the essential elements of the Capability Enhancement Plan is highly valid. Hence, it can be implemented to enhance the performance of the school heads.

REFERENCES

- Baptista, E. (2019). Secondary School Heads' Competencies: Basis for the Development of a Capability Building Program. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts*, 3(8).
- Bottoms, G., & Schmidt-Davis, J. (2010). The Three Essentials: Improving Schools Requires District Vision, District and State Support, and Principal Leadership. *Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)*.
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). School leadership study: Developing successful principals (review of research).
- Denmark, V. (2012). Transformational leadership: A matter of perspective. *Transforming Schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.advanc-ed.org/source/transformational-leadership-matter-perspective>
- DepEd Order 32, s. (2020). National Adoption and Implementation of National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads. www.deped.gov.ph
- Doyle, M. & Burton, G. (2018). The school principal as change agent. <https://www.nextgenlearning.org/articles/the-school-principal-as-change-agent>
- Fox, W. & Bayat, M.S. (2009). A guide to managing research. *Juta Publications*, 45
- Frez, C.C. (2015). Philippine accreditation system of basic education (PASBE) self-assessment of public secondary schools: basis of a development framework. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Divine Word College of Laoag, Laoag City.
- Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and policy in schools*, 4(3), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/157007605000244793>
- Jenlink, P.M., (2010). Marching into a new millennium. Lanham, MD: *Scarecrow*.
- Leithwood, K., & Seashore-Louis, K. (2011). *Linking leadership to student learning* (1 edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals (2018). New Principals and Instructional Leadership: 4 Skills to Grow, <https://www.naesp.org/resource/new-principals-and-instructional-leadership-4-skills-to-grow/>
- Pont, B; Nusche, D; and Moorman, H. (2010). *Improving school leadership*, 1, 1-100.
- Reeves, D. B. (2008). Reframing teacher leadership to improve your school. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Robinson, V. (2011). *Student-centered leadership* (1st Edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Santos, J. & Villanueva, J., (2020). School principals as instructional leaders: an investigation of school leadership capacity and effectiveness of instructional supports.
- Schmidt-Davis, J., & Bottoms, G. (2011). Who's Next? Let's Stop Gambling on School Performance and Plan for Principal Succession. *Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)*.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. (2011). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective*, 4th edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Serpell, Z. & Bozeman, L. (2009). *Beginning teacher induction: A report on beginning teacher effectiveness and retention*. Washington, DC: National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching.
- Seyfarth, J. T. (2009). The principalship: New leadership for new challenges. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Timperley, H. (2011). Realizing the power of professional learning. New York, NY: *Open University Press*.
- Ubben, G. C.; Hughes, L. W.; and Norris, C. J. (2011). *The principal: Creative leadership for effective schools*, 4th edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Weimer, M. (2012). Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice. *San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers*.
- Wilhelm, T. (2014). *Principal as instructional coach: AP leadership and teacher evaluations*. <https://education.cu-portland.edu/blog/leaders-link/ap-leadership-teacher-evaluations/>