

Effectiveness of Management Strategies of School Heads

Cristina Enorme-Lopera, Virginia Pinca-Atutubo
Sorsogon State College, School of Graduate Studies
Sorsogon City, Philippines
drvpinca@gmail.com

Abstract

This study determined the level of effectiveness of management strategies of school heads in Donsol Districts, Donsol, Sorsogon, School Year 2018-2019, along instructional management and assessment for learning. The respondents were 46 school heads and 354 teachers in Donsol Districts, Donsol, Sorsogon. The descriptive-quantitative approach was used in this study. Survey-questionnaire based on the National Competency-Based Standards for School Heads – Training and Development Needs Assessment (NCBSSH-TSNA) and Structured Interview were used in gathering the needed data. The data gathered were tabulated, analyzed and interpreted using frequency count, weighted mean and Chi-square method. The hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significance. The findings revealed that the average level of effectiveness of management strategies of school heads along instructional management and assessment for learning based from their own perceptions and teachers' perceptions is more effective (ME). There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the teachers and the school heads on the instructional management strategies and assessment for learning. The proposed output based from the result of the study is a Seminar Workshop on the Least Practiced Management Strategies of School Heads. Conclusions were drawn that the school heads and teachers have similar perceptions in terms of their beliefs and understanding on the level of management strategies along instructional management and assessment for learning. There is no significant difference on their perceptions. A Seminar Workshop on the Least Practiced Management Strategies of School Heads focusing on Action Research with sample module was the proposed out of this study. Recommendations were presented that the same perceptions of teachers on school heads' management strategies along instructional management and assessment for learning must be maintained and if possible be strengthened. Seminar Workshop on the Least Practiced Management Strategies must be conducted to improve and enhance the level of effectiveness of management strategies of school heads.

Keywords: Effectiveness, Management Strategies, School Heads, Instructional Management, Assessment for Learning

1. Introduction

School needs a leader. Without a leader, it never functions properly. It cannot serve its main purpose systematically. It will never become efficient and effective in providing education to children. The leader in a school is usually called school head or principal most especially in the basic education. They possess qualities of managing the whole system of education. They are expected to be knowledgeable or expert on their different roles. They are likely familiar of the management strategies they must apply or utilize in handling a school and its organization.

Management strategies of school heads depend on the different roles or functions. These things help them become more efficient and effective leader in school for the achievement of its goals and targets. These strategies grant them right direction towards having quality service in education. These are the measures to address appropriately the needs of the school system.

This interest stems from a belief that school leadership can influence the quality of teaching and learning in schools and student achievement. These are done by improving the working conditions of their teachers, and the climate and environment of their school (Alexandrov, 2012).

With familiarity and expertise in management strategies, school heads certainly becomes successful in achieving the mission, vision, and goals of education. They can be great advocate of change not just in the school, but also in the community and country. It has unwaveringly revealed that school heads play a substantial role in school reforms and achievement. They were believed to be the key to effective schools. They held unique position, as persons in schools responsible for and empowered to oversee the entire schools and operations.

Batas Pambansa 232, also known as the Education Act of 1982 established the basic policy and objectives for education. It established the rights, duties and obligations of those in the education community (e.g. parents, students, teachers, principals, non-academic staff etc.) as it also regulates the Philippine education system. Section 4(m) of the Republic Act 9155 defined what is a school Head with the corresponding powers, duties, and functions stated in Section 7-e. A School Head is a person responsible for the administrative and instructional supervision of the school or cluster of schools.(RA 9155,Sec.4m)

The school heads survey show that effective schools rely on the high level of teaching expertise, demonstrating a significant proportion of the highest and first category teachers (41%

and 43%, respectively). The proportions of highly qualified teachers in ineffective schools are somewhat lower (38% and 41%). The percentage of teachers with no category at all was found to be 21% in ineffective schools, which is much more than in effective schools (16%). Thus, the principal is a key to a school's successful transition into an institution that will adequately prepare students based upon an existing system of education. (Arnn, John W. & John N. Mangieri, 1988)

According to McJillet. al (1992) building learning organizations require that leaders develop employees who see their organizations a system, who can develop their own personal mastery, and who learn how to experiment and collaboratively reframe problems. In many countries, school leaders have served more as elected managers of their schools or been showing promoted from among them. While this has served schools well in maintaining efficient coordination of operations during times of relative stability, it has hindered them in contexts of rapid change which call for administrators to behave more as leaders who are responsible for changing the practices, relationships and cultures of those who they represent (Bolivar and Moreno, 2006).

Sapre (2002) defines management as a series of actions and tasks relevant to highly well-organized and effectual application of resources within the organization in order to attain organizational objectives. This definition gives a clear understanding of the focus of this study.

Saeed et.al (2014) states, managers who perceived to exhibit more on transformational leadership style adopted integrating and obliging style of conflict management. Those perceived to exhibit more on transactional style opted for compromising style of conflict management. Whereas, managers perceived to exhibit laissez-faire leadership style adopted avoiding style to manage conflicts with subordinates. Styles of the person in authority may compromise the system. These may contribute conflicts and difficulties on the entire members. As styles is interrelated to strategies this insight lead to be significant to this present study.

According to Notman and Henry (2010), effective principals use multiple leadership strategies for leading teachers to raised levels of student achievement. The following are leadership strategies used by principals. (a) vision and purpose, (b) focus on student achievement, (c) school improvement practices, (d) consultation with teachers and community, (e) employment of quality staff, (f) strong senior leadership team, (g) personnel support systems, (h) integration of different cultures, (i) growing other leaders, (j) and "hands on

the turbine" (i.e. ecosystem). This literature bear significance to the present study for it dealt on the strategies that an effective principal used to assist school and facilitate a warmer and healthier school environment.

Olaeye and Arogundade (2013) argued that different management strategies may lead to either desirable or undesirable outcomes depending on their effectiveness or ineffectiveness, respectively. Effective management strategy may result in desirable outcome such as smooth management, enhanced discipline, and effective management of time, team spirit, and effective use of resources, achievement of goals, good relationships and great value by stakeholders.

Calleja (2010) concluded that the selected National Secondary School Heads in the First District of Albay were competent as to administrative function as perceived by the school heads themselves and the teachers under supervision as far their socio-academic profile was concerned but were "moderately capable" and coordinating. The study of Calleja about the level of capabilities of the selected Secondary School Heads was significant to the present study since the method used in gathering data was through the perceptions of the teachers and school heads themselves. However, the study was focused on the Administrative Capabilities of Secondary School Heads in the First District of Albay, while the latter focused on the Management Strategies of School Heads along instructional management and assessment for learning.

Carbillon (1999) assessed the managerial effectiveness of public secondary principals in the Province of Albay. It was analyzed that the extent of performance of the public secondary principal in terms of managerial functions covers the following: planning, organizing, directing, controlling and communication and relationship. The study bear similarity to the present study because it dealt on the extent of performance of school principals which was also the focused of the present study to measure the level of effectiveness of management strategies of school heads. The distinction lies on the locale and the respondents since the former focused on the management effectiveness of public secondary principals in the Province of Albay, the latter focused on the elementary school heads of Donsol Districts.

Looking into the effectiveness of management strategies of school heads along instructional management and assessment for learning viewed to improve learner- outcomes. This situation is evidential in Donsol Districts, which motivated the researcher to undergo the study that expected to be exemplified the responsibilities of the school heads in managing the academic

affair of every school. However, there were school mismanagement noted from those school heads who performed less than expected. On the other hand, this is one way of the researcher to encourage fellow teachers to help the school-heads better perform on the expected responsibilities to look into the management strategies on instruction and assessment.

2. Objectives

1. What is the level of effectiveness of the management strategies of school heads as perceived by the teachers and school heads themselves along instructional management and assessment for learning?

2. Is there a significant difference in the perceptions of the two groups of respondents along the identified variables?

3. What can be proposed based on the result of this study?

3. Research Methodology

This study determined the effectiveness of management strategies of school heads in Donsol Districts, Donsol, Sorsogon, School Year 2018-2019. In this study, descriptive-quantitative approach was used in consolidating data in order to test the hypothesis or to answer the questions concerning the level of effectiveness of management strategies of school heads. The total number of respondents of this study was 400, which was composed of 46 school heads and 354 teachers of Donsol Districts. A survey-questionnaire was constructed and conducted to gather the necessary data from the sample. Structured interview with the use of the constructed interview schedule was employed in the study. The data gathered from the sample was treated using the frequency count, weighted mean and chi-square.

4. Result and Discussion

Level of effectiveness of the management strategies of school heads

Instructional Management. Table 2A shows the level of effectiveness of the management strategies of the school heads along instructional management.

It is revealed that indicator under instructional management which is *prepares and implements an instructional supervisory plan* got the weighted mean of 4.59 and 4.23 which is interpreted very effective and more effective of both school heads and teachers respectively while *conducts the instructional supervision using appropriate strategy* 4.50 and 4.21, interpreted as very effective and more effective of both school heads and teachers. All the indicators under instructional management got the average rating of 4.29 and 4.16 interpreted as more effective by the school heads and teachers respectively.

The findings revealed that school heads and the teachers acknowledge and are familiar to this management strategy for instructional delivery since this is one of their responsibilities as school managers. Moreover, they both know these indicators since this is part of their daily routine that means both of them always do this consciously.

The school heads prepared, communicated and conducted the supervisory plan regularly. This finding can be supported with result of the interview conducted by the researcher to the teachers that *“Our school head has instructional supervisory plan prepared at the beginning of the school year with the daily schedule of the school head, as well as the schedule of class observations. Before the implementation, the school head communicated and have met first in the meeting with the teachers on the contents of his plan.”*

TABLE 2A

Level of Effectiveness of the Management Strategies of the School Heads along Instructional Management

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	D	WM	D
1. Manages the curriculum initiatives in line with DepEd policies	4.35	ME	4.21	ME
2. works with teachers in curriculum review	4.13	ME	4.20	ME
3. enriches curricular offerings based on local needs	4.17	ME	4.19	ME
4. manages curriculum innovation and enrichment with the use of technology	4.22	ME	4.18	ME

5. organizes teams to champion instructional innovation programs toward curricular responsiveness	4.37	ME	4.11	ME
6. prepares and implements an instructional supervisory plan	4.59	VE	4.23	ME
7. provides the collegial manner timely, accurate and specific feedback to teachers regarding their performance	4.35	ME	4.18	ME
8. provides expert technical assistance and instructional support to teachers	4.33	ME	4.15	ME
9. adapts a research based school program	4.07	ME	4.02	ME
10. develops a culture of functional literacy	4.13	ME	4.10	ME
11. assists in implementing an existing, coherent and responsive school-wide curriculum	4.33	VE	4.14	ME
12. addresses deficiencies and sustain successes of current programs in collaboration with teachers and learners	4.28	ME	4.19	ME
13. conducts the instructional supervision using appropriate strategy	4.50	VE	4.21	ME
Average Rating	4.29	ME	4.16	ME

Legend: VE – Very Effective WM – weighted mean

ME – More effective D – Description

However, some teachers revealed that their school heads implemented supervisory plan and conducted instructional supervision rarely. This is attested in the interview made with the teacher that their school head prepared and implemented instructional supervisory plan, some uttered “*Not really, kahitakohindikorinalam, yung plan niyakasihindinaman posted kaya hindinaminalam usually sinasabiniyana lang.*” (Not really, and I don’t know, his plans since those are not posted so we do not know). But when the researcher clarified on how his/her school head managed to ensure delivery of quality instruction, they were saying that “*Nagtatanongsiya*

kung kamustasaloob ng classroom, mayroon din namangpagkakataonna through observation, peroang observation nayun ay seldom.” (The school heads asked our classrooms, also there are times he seldom observes classes). This study means that the perceptions of the two group of respondents were different since teachers have no evidences on school heads supervisory plan, no conduct of instructional supervision with appropriate strategy. On the other hand, when school head asked about their supervisory plan and other responsibility that accorded to them their response is a resounding yes.

This study implies that in order to make the supervisory plan of the school heads visible and functional there is a need for them to have formal communication to be forwarded, accepted and signed by the teachers.

The result is in consonance with the study of Maliyamkono (1991) concluded that the inability to perform task assigned, unauthorized absenteeism, setting unrealistic targets for teachers, setting goals that are not specific, engaging teachers in crash programs where they have to cover wide section of syllabuses in a fraction time, careless in implementation of school policies, unreasonable demands by school administrator and carelessness among teachers are the major source of conflict in schools.

Furthermore, with regards to the lowest level but interpreted as more effective (ME) in their instructional management, the data show that school heads perceived among themselves in terms of indicator 9- *adapts a research based school program* with 4.07 WM which is highly supported by teachers observation with 4.02 WM as it has received the lowest weighted mean.

The result concluded that school heads barely initiate programs that are research based. This can be supported by the result of the interview conducted by the researcher as the teacher responded to the questions, did your school head conduct researches prior to school innovation? If not, where did your school head base the school programs and projects? *“Walapo, sinusunodlangpo kung anoangnakalagaysa calendar of activities, adaptation nalangpo ng given program and projects ng DepEd.”* (none, we just follow whats on the calendar of activities, just adaptation of DepEds given programs and projects). This means that most of the programs and projects in the school were adapted from the memo and programs and projects given by the Department of Education.

There were some schools however, who conduct researches prior to school innovations or programs as the teacher says that “*Actually mayroon kami ngayongihahatidsa D.O. na action plan and research para pa-aprobahan, kapagna-aprobahanmaaaringipagpatuloy para magamit next year. It concerns about the participation, we would like to maximize the participation of the parents to the different activities of the school, kasinakita naming kumukunti o nagwe-weak naang participation ng ilang parents kaya gusto naming matugunanangproblemangyun*”. (Actually we have action plans to be submitted for approval in the D.O. when approved, we may continue it next year. It concerns about participation, we would like to maximize the participation of the parents to different school activities because we noticed their participation decreases and weaken so we want to address this problem). But most of the responses of teachers were on the adaptation of research based school program and not the conduct of researches before initiating and implementing a school innovations. This was the reason why this indicator 9- ***adapts a research based school program*** received the lowest rate in the instructional management.

The findings supports that of Dhuey and Smith, (2014) that school heads need to motivate their staff to the point that their personal goals and the school goals are one and the same. Background does a motivational value.

Assessment for Learning. Table 2B shows the level of effectiveness of the management strategies of the school heads along assessment of learning.

It was revealed that indicator under assessment for learning which is ***manages the procedure in monitoring student achievement*** got the weighted mean of 4.50- very effective and 4.17- more effective as interpreted of both school heads and teachers respectively.

While the indicator ***creates a school process to ensure student progress is conveyed to the students and parents/guardians regularly*** 4.43 and 4.25 interpreted as more effective by the school heads and teachers respectively, whereas ***evaluates lesson plans as well as classroom and learning management*** got 4.41 and 4.26 interpreted also as more effective by the school heads and teachers, respectively. All the indicators under assessment for learning got the average rating of 4.34 and 4.20 interpreted as more effective by the school heads and teachers respectively.

The result shows that the rating of school heads based on their perceptions is higher than the rating to them of teacher respondents. This implies that school head thought that they were

effective in doing the management strategies along assessment for learning based on their self-preservation as they rated themselves higher in every indicator.

TABLE 2B

Level of Effectiveness of the Management Strategies of the School Heads along Assessment for Learning

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers	
	WM	D	WM	D
1. Manages the procedures in monitoring student achievement	4.50	VE	4.17	ME
2. ensures the utilization of a range of assessment processes to assess student performance	4.20	ME	4.17	ME
3. assesses the effectiveness of curricular/co-curricular programs and/or instructional strategies	4.24	ME	4.14	ME
4. utilizes assessment results to improve learning	4.24	ME	4.20	ME
5. creates a school process to ensure student progress is conveyed to the students and parents/guardians regularly	4.43	ME	4.25	ME
6. evaluates lesson plans as well as classroom and learning management	4.41	ME	4.26	ME
Average Rating	4.34	ME	4.20	ME

*Legend: VE – Very Effective WM – weighted mean
ME – More effective D – Description*

However, teachers’ perceptions on school heads level of effectiveness of management strategies along assessment for learning was lower than the school heads perceptions. This can be supported by the result of the interview conducted by the researcher to teachers. In the interview conducted most of teachers responded to the question on how did their school head track and monitor the pupils’ progress and achievement, through checking of class record and school forms, collecting diagnostic test and tracking of test results. However, there were some teachers

that responded negatively to the question, saying that “*Walanamanpo, hindinamansiya nag check-check*” (there is none, he doesn’t check) and other responding “*He have not asked the teachers to submit the reports or forms, but he do ask casually how the pupils perform in class.*”

This recommends that assessment for learning must be done in a more improved way where school head must involve themselves in tracking and monitoring pupils’ progress and achievement.

The difference of the top two highest-level indicators in the management strategies along assessment for learning in school heads and teachers’ perceptions showed that assessment focus is unclear. Yet, this view revealed that assessment for learning by school heads might usually happened through monitoring of students’ achievement, parents/guardians involvement in school activities, evaluation of teaching-learning process, and classroom management. Maybe because school heads usually transfer to another station after a length of 2 or 3 years stay hence, teachers cannot easily distinguish the definite management strategies of their school heads along assessment of learning.

This study supports that of Robbins et al (2004) argue that a manager enhances the positive aspects of motivation so that employees feel impelled to perform their work and eliminate those conflicts that may inhibit employee’s performance. School heads are responsible for implementation of education policy and keeping track of all activities within the school and ensuring that the school runs smoothly.

Difference between the Perceptions of the Respondents on the Level of Effectiveness of the Management Strategies of the School Heads

Table 3 reveals the difference between the perceptions of the teachers and the school heads on the management strategies of the latter in terms of instructional management and assessment of learning. The data in this section were analyzed using chi-square test for homogeneity.

Instructional Management. At 0.05 level of significance and 2 degrees of freedom, the critical value of chi-square for homogeneity is 5.991, which is greater than the computed chi-square value of 2.933. Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Therefore, there is no

significant difference between the perceptions of the teachers and the school heads on the latter’s instructional management strategies.

This means that the two groups of respondents have similar perceptions in terms of their beliefs and understanding on the instructional management strategies of the school heads.

This result support the self-preservation of the school heads in rating themselves higher on their effectiveness on management strategies along instructional management which was also supported by the summarized responses of the teachers.

TABLE 3
Difference between the Perceptions of the Respondents on the Level of Effectiveness of the Management Strategies of the School Heads

Statistical Bases	Statistical Analyses	
	Instructional Management	Assessment of Learning
Level of Significance	0.05	0.05
Degree of freedom	2	2
Critical x^2 value	5.991	5.991
Computed x^2 value	2.933	3.252
Decision on Null	Do not Reject	Do not Reject
Conclusion	Not Significant	Not Significant

Most teachers responded, that their school head discusses things they have noted during their MANCOM and meetings, DepEd Orders and Memos which further clarifies teachers roles, duties and responsibilities. Some stated DepEd updates, scheduled school plans of activities, reports to be submitted especially along curriculum implementation and management. Most teachers answered, that their school head called for the meeting depends on the urgency of matters and updates. Some said they have twice a month, monthly or quarterly scheduled meetings and others said, every after the MANCOM or district staff conference.

Most of the school heads conduct classroom observation using standard forms as basis for providing feedback and technical assistance to teachers. School heads provide post conference to

talk about their teaching and providing some comments, suggestions and recommendations. Others have answered, their school heads do informal observations, interviews and checking of LPs/DLLs and forms. Most teachers were observed at least once a month as scheduled and per target observation per month of their school heads.

Based on the teacher's responses, most of the school heads do not have school-based researches to base their school innovations and plans for improvement. However, all of the teachers answered positively, that their school heads allow and encourage them to conduct and initiate classroom-based researches as bases for classroom initiatives and programs and projects and solve common classroom and school problems.

Most of the school heads do instructional supervision by conducting classroom observations, checking of LPs and DLLs including instructional materials, checking attendance of teachers and pupils and other stakeholders when necessary. The school keeps records and forms which was based on DepEd forms.

It concludes that perceptions of school heads and teachers on management strategies along instructional management are immensely connected merely in planning, supervision, and organization. This is deemed to contribute a lot to the realization of mission, vision, and goals of the department of education.

The findings of the present study are supported by Kegan and Lahey (2002) who stated that changes occurring in teachers' and administrators' sense of efficacy result from changes in practice and changes in student learning. Changes occur in the structure, processes, and norms around which the work of adults and students is organized

Assessment for Learning. At 0.05 level of significance and 2 degrees of freedom, the critical value of chi-square for homogeneity is 5.991, which is greater than the computed chi-square value of 3.252. Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the teachers and the school heads on the latter's management strategies along assessment of learning. This means that the two groups of respondents have similar perceptions in terms of their beliefs and understanding on the assessment for learning management strategies of the school heads.

It revealed that the school heads perceptions of rating themselves based on their self-preservation was relevant to teachers' perceptions. This can be supported by the summarized responses of the teachers in the structured interview conducted by the researcher.

Most school head track learner's performance by letting the teachers submit their class records and performance level of learners for each quarter. Some conducts informal meetings to gather data and monitor the learner's progress and achievement. Other forms such as records of attendance and lesson plans are submitted on a daily or weekly basis.

School heads most of the time call for teachers' conference to ask submission of pupils' records and performance documents. It is the time the school head is informed of their good achievers and pupils needing more instruction and supervision. Plans of actions are also crafted for these findings. The school head then calls for general PTA meeting to relay this information and update them every quarter of how their pupils perform in class. The school also conducts recognitions and awarding for curricular and co-curricular activities.

The school heads make their supervisory plans and checking of LP/DLLs are included in it. The manner, as revealed by the teachers responses include school heads scheduling a daily, twice a week or weekly checking of lesson plans. School heads usually checks the alignment of objectives, strategies and lesson procedures and assessment. Some teachers also noted that they received feedback on the format of DLL, teaching strategies and results of evaluation.

This concludes that management strategies on assessment for learning by school heads are mainly centered on class observation, checking and monitoring of class record, lesson plans (DLLs/LPs) and other school forms.

The result of the present study is in consonance with the study of DoFour, 2002 that principals need to know about the principles of student assessment, assessment procedures with emphasis on alternative assessment methods, and assessment that aims to improve student learning. Also, the findings was affirmed by Johnsons, 1996 when he suggests that a principal is not fully equipped if he or she does not have a deep understanding of human learning.

Proposed activity based from the results of the study

Based on the findings of the study, Seminar Workshop on the Least Practiced Management Strategies of School Heads focusing on Action Research with sample module were

made by the researcher as an output of this study. It may be given consideration by the Department of Education, local and national agencies in addressing and enhancing the least level of effectiveness of management strategies of school heads along instructional management and assessment of learning. The Seminar Workshop on the Least Practiced Management Strategies consists of action plan, training design and a sample module. The sample module is about action research which aims to identify the nature and characteristics of an action research, determine the steps in conducting an action research and explain the importance of an action research. This sample module is one of the topic in the action plan and training design formulated for this study. This topic was chosen by the researcher for it was the indicator that received the lowest rating and address the need of the school heads in regards to adaption of research based school programs.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

From the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. School heads and the teachers acknowledge and are familiar to management strategy for instructional delivery since this is one of their responsibilities as school managers.
2. School heads rate themselves highest along instructional management and assessment for learning since it goes with their self-preservation which means that as school heads they must be best.
3. School heads are barely initiating programs that are research based.
4. The focus of management strategies of school heads along assessment for learning is unclear. Yet, this view revealed that assessment of learning by school heads might usually happened through monitoring of students' achievement, parents/guardians involvement in school activities, evaluation of teaching-learning process, and classroom management.
5. The school heads and teachers have similar perceptions in terms of their beliefs and understanding on the management strategies along instructional management and assessment for learning. In short, there is no significant difference in their perceptions.
6. Perceptions of school heads and teachers on management strategies along instructional management are much connected merely in planning, supervision, and organization. There is no significant difference.

7. Management strategies on assessment for learning by school heads are mainly centered on class observation, checking and monitoring of class record, lesson plans (DLLs/LPs) and other school forms.

8. A seminar workshop on the least practiced management strategies of school heads was proposed.

6. Recommendations

From the aforementioned findings and conclusions, the following recommendations were presented:

1. School heads and teachers familiarity of the management strategy for instructional delivery must be maintained and if possible be strengthened.

2. School heads must not always consider self-preservation but rather consider the perceptions and suggestions from colleagues.

3. School heads must be more objective in gathering data to base their school innovations and improvement plans, programs and projects to ensure it is needs based and applicable to their locale.

4. School heads should have a more vivid and concrete action toward managing assessment of learning so that teachers will be able to distinguish this clearly.

5. The same perceptions of teachers on school heads' management strategies along instructional management and assessment for learning must be maintained and if possible be strengthened.

6. Management strategies along instructional management must not be limited only in planning, supervision, and organization but also include innovations from the results of monitoring and evaluation activities.

7. Management strategies on assessment for learning by school heads must not just be centered on class observation, checking and monitoring of class record, lesson plans (DLLs/LPs) and other school forms but also include formal and informal teacher observation and students feedbacks.

8. Analysis and evaluation on school heads' management strategies along instructional management and assessment for learning must be given more emphasis to address their needs in terms of management.

9. A Seminar Workshop on the Least Practiced Management Strategies can be proposed.

10. Other researches about the effectiveness of school heads' management strategies must be done for validation.

References

- Alexandrov D. (2012) Immigrant Children in Russian Schools. Equalizing Children's Chances for Quality Education, Moscow: NRU HSE, pp. 48-54
- Arnn, John W. & John N. Mangieri, (1988). Effective Leadership for Effective Schools: A Survey of Principal Attitudes. Sage Journals. <https://doi.org/10-1177/019263655507250502>
- Bolivar, A. and J.M. Moreno (2006), "Between Transaction and Transformation: The Role of School Principals as Educations' Leaders in Spain." *Journal of Educational Change*, Vol.7, No. 1-2, pp. 19-31
- Calleja, Christian C., "Administrative Capabilities of Selected National Secondary School Heads in the First District of Albay," (Unpublished Masters' Thesis, Bicol University, Legaspi City, 2010)
- Carbillon, Mercy P., "Management Effectiveness and Performance of Public Secondary School Principal in the Division of Albay," (Bicol University, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Legaspi City, 1999)
- DuFour, R. (2002) Learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership* 59 (8), 12-15.
- Malinyamkono, T.L. (1991). Higher education in Eastern and Southern Africa. *Prospect* 3: 351-362
- McJill, M., et.al (Summer 1992). Management practices in learning organizations. *Organizational Dynamics* Volume 21, Issue 1, pages 5-17.
- Notman, R., & Henry, A.D. (2010). Building and sustaining successful school leadership in New Zealand. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 10(4), 375-394,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2011.610555>
- Olaleye, F.O. & Arogundade B.B. (2013). Conflict Management Strategies University Administrators in South-West Nigeria.
- Republic act No. 9155. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
<https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph>

Robbins, S.P. & Decenzo, D.A. (2004). *Fundamental of management essential Concepts and application*, (4thed). NJ: Pearson prentice hall.

Saeed, T., et.al (2014). Leadership Styles: Relationship with Conflict Management Styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management* 25(3), 214-225, 2014.

Sapre, P. (2002). Realizing the Potential of Educational Management in India, *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 30(1). 101-108.