

Dynamic Leadership Skills of School Heads in the Implementation of the Revised K-10 Curriculum in Elementary Education

Orland Cañas Silvestre

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: orland.silvestre@deped.gov.ph

Abstract— This study was conducted primarily to determine the relationship between the dynamic leadership skills of school heads and the implementation of the revised K10 curriculum in elementary education. Specifically, the research sought to assess the level of dynamic leadership across three core domains: instructional leadership, strategic leadership and adaptive leadership. Furthermore, the study examined the extent of the implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum. Ultimately, the research aimed to identify if instructional, strategic, and adaptive leadership significantly correlates with the implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum. To achieve these objectives, a descriptive method was used to analyze the data systematically. The research procedure involved the use of a questionnaire in the form of a checklist as the primary instrument for gathering data and was answered by 200 respondents. The data collected were then analyzed and interpreted using specific statistical tools, namely weighted mean and standard deviation to determine the levels of leadership and implementation, and Pearson Product Moment correlation to establish the significance of the relationships between the variables. The findings of the study revealed that the dynamic leadership skills of school heads were all rated Strongly Agree and verbally interpreted Very High. This indicates that school heads able to respond effectively to the changing demands of educational reforms. Likewise, the extent of implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum in elementary education were also rated Strongly Agree and verbally interpreted Always Observed. This implies that teachers consistently apply the curriculum standards and instructional practices necessary to achieve the objectives of the Revised K10 Curriculum. The study concludes that instructional, strategic, and adaptive leadership styles all maintain a significant relationship with the implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum, leading to the rejection of all stated null hypotheses. Regarding instructional leadership, this means that when leaders actively prioritize teaching quality, the transition to and execution of the new curriculum becomes more effective. Similarly, the significance of strategic leadership means that the ability of leaders to set long-term goals is a critical driver in operationalizing the curriculum's objectives. Finally, the impact of adaptive leadership this means that leaders who can navigate uncertainty and guide their staff through the inevitable challenges of systemic change are essential for the curriculum's long-term sustainability. Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, several recommendations are proposed to enhance the educational landscape. School heads should institutionalize teacher mentoring to improve classroom instruction and teaching practices, while also conducting regular analysis of student performance data and program evaluations to guide policy formulation and resource allocation for sustainable curriculum implementation. It is further recommended to maintain responsive leadership during emergencies to ensure school resilience amid educational challenges.

Keywords—Dynamic Leadership, Instructional Leadership, Strategic Leadership, Adaptive Leadership, Revised K10 Curriculum.

I. INTRODUCTION

The role of school leadership in the implementation of curriculum, its evolution in the Philippines, and education reforms are inter-related. School heads have continuously adapted with the changing educational landscape with the introduction of different reforms from the 2002 Basic Education Curriculum (BEC) to the 2013 K to 12 Program. With the recent implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum, with its goal of decongesting learning areas and facilitating literacy and numeracy, the school leaders must show their dynamic leadership skills.

One of the key challenges in implementing the Revised K10 Curriculum is the role of leadership in guiding and managing change (Ramos & Estrella, 2024; Garcia, 2024). School leaders, particularly principals, face difficulties in addressing resistance to change, ensuring effective teacher training, and fostering collaboration among stakeholders. Many teachers struggle with adapting to new teaching approaches due to a lack of comprehensive support and professional development. Effective leadership requires establishing coaching programs, providing continuous supervision, and encouraging flexibility in adopting new methodologies to ease the transition and improve implementation success

Adaptive leadership enables them to respond flexibly to emerging challenges by fostering resilience, collaboration, and innovative problem-solving, which help teachers navigate uncertainties, resource gaps, and evolving instructional demands. At the same time, instructional leadership emphasizes guiding teaching and learning through clear academic expectations, professional development, and continuous pedagogical support, thereby motivating teachers and enhancing their confidence and effectiveness in delivering the curriculum. Complementing these, strategic leadership allows school heads to align school goals with national reforms, manage resources efficiently, and design long-term plans that sustain instructional improvements. Together, these dynamic leadership skills equip school heads to create a more supportive and results-oriented environment. This study is significant as it provides insights into the leadership

competencies essential for the Revised K10 Curriculum’s success.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Problem/s which were addressed by the research

This study aims to examine the relationship between the dynamic leadership skills of school principals and the implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum in selected schools. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the level of dynamic leadership as to instructional leadership of school heads in terms of:
 - 1.1. Instructional Vision;
 - 1.2. Curriculum Management;
 - 1.3. Teacher Professional Development;
 - 1.4 Instructional Supervision; and
 - 1.5 Mentoring ?
2. What is the level of dynamic leadership as to strategic leadership of school heads in terms of:
 - 2.1 Policy Implementation;
 - 2.2 Resource Management;
 - 2.3 Stakeholder Engagement;
 - 2.4 Data-driven decision making; and
 - 2.5 Sustainable Development ?
3. What is the level of dynamic leadership as to adaptive leadership of school heads in terms of:
 - 3.1 Innovation;
 - 3.2 Crisis Management;
 - 3.3 Contingency Planning; and
 - 3.4 Feedbacking Practices?
4. What is the extent of implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of:
 - 4.1 Curriculum Alignment;
 - 4.2 Innovative Teaching Strategies;
 - 4.3 Assessment and Evaluation;
 - 4.4 Learning Resources and Materials;
 - 4.5 Student Engagement;
 - 4.6 Inclusivity and Differentiation;
 - 4.7 Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ?
5. Do the dynamic leadership as to instructional leadership significantly correlate to the implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum?
6. Do dynamic leadership as to strategic leadership significantly correlate implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum?
7. Do the dynamic leadership as to adaptive leadership significantly correlate implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum?

II. METHODOLOGY

A descriptive method was used to analyze the data systematically. The research procedure involved the use of a questionnaire in the form of a checklist as the primary instrument for gathering data and was answered by 200 respondents. The data collected were then analyzed and interpreted using specific statistical tools, namely weighted mean and standard deviation to determine the levels of leadership and implementation, and Pearson Product Moment

correlation to establish the significance of the relationships between the variables..

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part analyzes and interprets the data gathered that determined the relationship between dynamic leadership skills and the implementation of revised K10 curriculum in elementary education.

Level of Dynamic Leadership as to Instructional Leadership

The level of dynamic leadership skills in the implementation of revised K10 curriculum in elementary education specifically regarding the instructional, strategic, and adaptive leadership – was analyzed statistically using weighted mean and standard deviation.

Table 1 shows the level of dynamic leadership skills as to instructional leadership in terms of instructional vision, revealing an overall weighted mean of 6.56, which corresponds to a verbal interpretation of *Always Observed*. The statement "The school has a clear instructional vision that is well communicated to all teachers" received the highest mean of 6.67. This suggests that the leadership is highly effective in ensuring that every educator is informed and aligned with the school's core objectives. Similarly, the instructional vision’s reflection of the goals and priorities of the school community obtained a mean of 6.61, while its role as a strong guide in decision-making followed closely with a mean of 6.53. Both indicators were marked as *Strongly Agree*, highlighting a deep integration between the school's strategic vision and its daily operational choices.

Furthermore, the data shows that teachers and staff are consistently aligned with the instructional vision, as evidenced by a mean of 6.50.

Table 1. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Instructional Leadership in terms of Instructional Vision

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school has a clear instructional vision that is well communicated to all teachers.	6.67	0.58	Strongly Agree
The instructional vision reflects the goals and priorities of the school community.	6.61	0.57	Strongly Agree
The instructional vision provides a strong guide in decision-making related to teaching and learning.	6.53	0.68	Strongly Agree
Teachers and staff are aligned with the instructional vision.	6.50	0.68	Strongly Agree
The instructional vision is regularly reviewed and updated to meet learners’ needs.	6.49	0.67	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.56		
SD	0.51		
Verbal Interpretation			Always Observed

Even the lowest-rated item, which pertains to the vision being regularly reviewed and updated to meet learners’ needs, garnered a high mean of 6.49. This confirms that the leadership maintains a proactive and responsive approach to educational trends and student requirements. Overall, the consistently high means across all statements, coupled with the *Strongly Agree* remarks, suggest a unified and well-communicated leadership framework that effectively guides the school’s instructional practices.

According to Hallinger (2020), instructional vision is a fundamental component of instructional leadership that provides a clear roadmap for teaching and learning within a school. His research indicates that principals who articulate a strong instructional vision are more effective in aligning school goals, teacher practices, and student outcomes. These results indicate that the school’s leadership consistently maintains and promotes a clear, purposeful direction for the institution's academic growth.

Table 2. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Instructional Leadership in terms of Curriculum Management

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The curriculum is implemented effectively across grade levels.	6.67	0.57	Strongly Agree
Curriculum planning considers the needs and abilities of diverse learners.	6.64	0.55	Strongly Agree
Teaching resources and materials support curriculum implementation.	6.53	0.67	Strongly Agree
Teachers are provided with sufficient guidance in aligning lessons with the curriculum.	6.47	0.69	Strongly Agree
Curriculum evaluation and feedback mechanisms are consistently applied.	6.45	0.69	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.55		
SD	0.52		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 2 presents the level of dynamic leadership skills as to instructional leadership in terms of curriculum management, which yielded an overall weighted mean of 6.55 corresponding to a verbal interpretation of *Always Observed*.

In a detailed analysis of the individual indicators, the statement "The curriculum is implemented effectively across grade levels" received the highest mean of 6.67, with a remark of *Strongly Agree*. This is closely followed by the indicator regarding curriculum planning considering the needs and abilities of diverse learners, which garnered a mean of 6.64. Furthermore, respondents strongly agreed that teaching resources and materials effectively support curriculum implementation (Mean = 6.53) and that teachers are provided with sufficient guidance in aligning their lessons with the curriculum (Mean = 6.47), with both items remarks *Strongly Agree*. Notably, while the statement concerning the consistent application of curriculum evaluation and feedback mechanisms received the lowest mean of 6.45, it still falls within the highest scoring interval, signifying a remark of *Strongly Agree*.

Hill (2020) highlights that curriculum management includes continuous monitoring, teacher support, and data-driven decision-making. The study found that schools with structured curriculum management systems improved student achievement and instructional quality. These findings suggest that the school’s leadership consistently demonstrates a very high level of proficiency in managing, implementing, and supporting the academic curriculum across the institution.

Table 3 presents the level of dynamic leadership skills in terms of teacher professional development, revealing an overall weighted mean of 6.54 which corresponds to a verbal interpretation of *Very High*. These results indicate that the school leadership consistently prioritizes and implements

comprehensive growth opportunities for its teaching staff, ensuring that professional enhancement is a permanent fixture of the institutional culture.

Table 3. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Instructional Leadership in terms of Teacher Professional Development

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Professional development programs address the actual needs of teachers.	6.65	0.59	Strongly Agree
The school provides adequate opportunities for teachers to upgrade their skills.	6.61	0.59	Strongly Agree
Training and seminars are relevant and applicable to classroom practice.	6.55	0.68	Strongly Agree
Professional development activities encourage collaboration among teachers.	6.48	0.69	Strongly Agree
Participation in professional development improves teaching effectiveness.	6.46	0.70	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.54		
SD	0.53		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Individually, the highest-rated indicator is the alignment of professional development programs with the actual needs of teachers, which earned a mean of 6.65 and remarks *Strongly Agree*. This is closely supported by the school's provision of adequate opportunities for skill upgrades (Mean = 6.61) and the high relevance of training and seminars to actual classroom practice (Mean = 6.55), both receiving a remark of *Strongly Agree*. Furthermore, respondents consistently observed that professional development activities encourage collaboration among peers (Mean = 6.48) and that participation in these programs directly improves teaching effectiveness (Mean = 6.46).

Collectively, the narrow range of high mean scores across all statements suggests that the leadership successfully facilitates a supportive and relevant professional learning environment that teachers perceive as highly beneficial to their craft.

These programs consider individual differences among teachers and address their psychological needs, ultimately leading to improved teaching performance during their service.

Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Instructional Leadership in Terms of Instructional Supervision

Table 4 illustrates the level of dynamic leadership skills as to instructional leadership in terms of instructional supervision, yielding an overall weighted mean of 6.54 resulting in a verbal interpretation of *Very High*. These findings indicate that the school’s leadership maintains a consistent and systematic approach to overseeing classroom practices and supporting educator growth.

The highest mean score of 6.63 was obtained for the statement regarding instructional supervision being conducted regularly and systematically with a remark of *Strongly Agree*. This is closely followed by the observation that classroom visits are supportive rather than intimidating (Mean = 6.60), suggesting a positive and collaborative supervisory climate. Furthermore, participants strongly agreed that feedback from school heads effectively helps improve teaching performance (Mean = 6.53) and that school heads demonstrate a clear understanding of

effective teaching practices (Mean = 6.48). Finally, the indicator stating that instructional supervision contributes to student learning outcomes received a mean of 6.47, which all remains a firmly *Strongly Agree* category.

Table 4. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Instructional Leadership in terms of Instructional Supervision

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Instructional supervision is conducted regularly and systematically.	6.63	0.59	Strongly Agree
Classroom observations are supportive rather than intimidating.	6.60	0.58	Strongly Agree
Feedback from schoolheads helps improve teaching performance.	6.53	0.66	Strongly Agree
Schoolheads demonstrate a clear understanding of effective teaching practices.	6.48	0.68	Strongly Agree
Instructional supervision contributes to student learning outcomes.	6.47	0.51	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.54		
SD	0.51		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

The data suggests that instructional supervision in the institution is not merely a formality but a well-integrated process that fosters professional trust and directly supports the academic mission. Zepeda (2020) it must integrate coaching and mentoring components to address individual teacher needs. Her study found that personalized support increases teacher motivation and competence.

Table 5. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Instructional Leadership in terms of Mentoring

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Mentoring programs are available for new and experienced teachers.	6.60	0.63	Strongly Agree
Mentors provide meaningful guidance in lesson planning and classroom management.	6.61	0.58	Strongly Agree
Mentoring encourages professional growth and confidence.	6.52	0.67	Strongly Agree
Mentor-mentee relationships are positive and supportive.	6.47	0.68	Strongly Agree
Mentoring has improved your teaching practice.	6.46	0.68	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.53		
SD	0.52		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 5 presents the level of dynamic leadership skills as to instructional leadership in terms of mentoring, which yielded an overall weighted mean of 6.53 resulting in a verbal interpretation of *Very High*. These findings signify that mentoring is a deeply embedded practice within the institution, with leadership consistently providing structured support systems that foster both professional growth and instructional quality.

A detailed examination of the individual indicators reveals that mentors providing meaningful guidance in lesson planning and classroom management received the highest mean score of 6.61, with a remark of *Strongly Agree*. This is closely followed by the availability of mentoring programs for both new and experienced teachers, which garnered a mean of 6.60. Respondents also strongly agreed that mentoring encourages professional growth and confidence (Mean = 6.52) and that mentor-mentee relationships are characterized by a

positive and supportive atmosphere (Mean = 6.47). Finally, the assertion that mentoring has improved teaching practice achieved a mean of 6.46, remaining firmly within the remarks of *Strongly Agree* category.

The data indicates a highly successful mentoring framework where the focus on practical guidance and supportive relationships effectively enhances the overall competency of the teaching staff which supported by Hobson (2016) that effective mentoring involves emotional support, constructive feedback, and reciprocal learning. His study highlighted the mentor-mentee relationship as a factor influencing professional identity. Also, Ingersoll and Strong (2017) found that mentoring programs reduce teacher attrition and improve classroom management, lesson delivery, and student engagement. Their longitudinal study suggests that sustained mentoring yields long-term benefits, showing that instructional coaching and mentoring produce moderate-to-large effects on teaching quality and student outcomes.

The studies emphasize individualized support as key to teacher development.

Level of Dynamic Leadership as to Strategic Leadership

Table 6 presents the level of dynamic leadership skills as to strategic leadership in terms of policy implantation, yielding a weighted mean of 6.56, resulting in a verbal interpretation of *Very High*.

These findings indicate that the institution's leadership consistently and effectively integrates strategic mentoring as a core component of its policy framework to support educational quality.

Table 6. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Strategic Leadership in terms of Policy Implantation

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Mentoring programs are available for new and experienced teachers.	6.65	0.62	Strongly Agree
Mentors provide meaningful guidance in lesson planning and classroom management.	6.62	0.61	Strongly Agree
Mentoring encourages professional growth and confidence.	6.57	0.67	Strongly Agree
Mentor-mentee relationships are positive and supportive.	6.50	0.72	Strongly Agree
Mentoring has improved your teaching practice.	6.49	0.69	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.56		
SD	0.54		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

In a detailed analysis of the individual indicators, the availability of mentoring programs for both new and experienced teachers received the highest mean score of 6.65 with a descriptive remark of *Strongly Agree*. This is closely followed by the provision of meaningful guidance in lesson planning and classroom management by mentors, which earned a mean of 6.62. Respondents also strongly agreed that these mentoring policies encourage professional growth and confidence (Mean = 6.57) and foster positive, supportive mentor-mentee relationships (Mean = 6.50). Finally, the indicator regarding mentoring's role in improving teaching practice achieved a mean of 6.49, which remains firmly in the *Strongly Agree* remarks.

Overall, the data reflects that the leadership's approach to policy implementation successfully translates strategic goals into consistent, practical support that enhances teacher performance across the board.

According to Kushnir (2022) policy implementation has a big contribution on the complex process influenced by various factors, including political dynamics, stakeholder engagement, and the operational environment. The effectiveness of policy implementation can be significantly affected by the fidelity of execution, the roles of intermediaries, and the interplay between different levels of governance.

Table 7. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Strategic Leadership in terms of Resource Management

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Resources (human, financial, material) are allocated efficiently to support school programs.	6.57	0.67	Strongly Agree
Teaching and learning resources are sufficient to meet classroom needs.	6.54	0.65	Strongly Agree
The school ensures accountability and transparency in resource management.	6.48	0.72	Strongly Agree
Teachers are consulted regarding their resource requirements.	6.45	0.72	Strongly Agree
Resource management directly supports effective instruction and student learning.	6.45	0.71	Agree
Weighted Mean	6.50		
SD	0.56		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

This is closely followed by the sufficiency of teaching and learning resources to meet classroom needs (Mean = 6.54) and the school's commitment to ensuring accountability and transparency in resource management (Mean = 6.48), both of which were rated as *Strongly Agree*. Additionally, teachers are consistently consulted regarding their resource requirements, as evidenced by a mean of 6.45. While the final indicator—stating that resource management directly supports effective instruction and student learning—also earned a mean of 6.45 remains firmly within the *Strongly Agree* descriptive remarks. This data suggests that the leadership's strategic management of human, financial, and material resources is a highly visible and effective pillar of the school's operational success.

Bush (2020) emphasizes that educational leaders must align resources with pedagogical priorities to maximize learning outcomes. His findings show that resource misallocation often leads to inequities in student achievement. The above literature is related because school heads must prioritize instructional resources aligned with curriculum standards.

Table 8 presents the level of dynamic leadership skills as to strategic leadership in terms of stakeholder engagement, yielding an overall weighted mean of 6.49 verbally interpreted as *Very High*.

The results indicate that the school's leadership consistently prioritizes the cultivation of collaborative relationships, ensuring that both internal and external stakeholders are integral participants in the school's mission, vision and policy success.

Table 8. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Strategic Leadership in terms of Stakeholder Engagement

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Parents and community members are actively engaged in school programs and activities.	6.57	0.67	Strongly Agree
The school maintains strong partnerships with external stakeholders (e.g., LGUs, NGOs).	6.54	0.65	Strongly Agree
Stakeholders are regularly consulted in decision-making processes.	6.46	0.72	Strongly Agree
Stakeholder initiatives contribute to the success of school policies.	6.43	0.73	Strongly Agree
Communication between the school and stakeholders is open and collaborative.	6.42	0.72	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.49		
SD	0.56		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

In a detailed analysis of individual indicators, the active engagement of parents and community members in school programs received the highest mean score of 6.57, with a remark of *Strongly Agree*.

This is closely followed by the maintenance of strong partnerships with external stakeholders such as LGUs and NGOs (Mean = 6.54) and the regular consultation of stakeholders in decision-making processes (Mean = 6.46), both of which garnered a remark of *Strongly Agree*.

Furthermore, respondents consistently observed that stakeholder initiatives contribute significantly to the success of school policies (Mean = 6.43) and that communication between the school and its stakeholders remains open and collaborative (Mean = 6.42).

In relation, Epstein (2018) emphasizes that school, family, and community partnerships enhance student achievement and well-being. Her findings show that engaged stakeholders contribute to holistic education. This shows that the leadership successfully fosters a sense of shared responsibility and transparency, which strengthens the social capital of the institution.

The indicators shows that basing school decisions on accurate and up-to-date data received the highest mean score of 6.68, with a remark of "Strongly Agree". This is followed closely by the regular analysis of student performance data to improve instruction (Mean = 6.63) and the training of teachers and staff to use data in planning (Mean = 6.56), both of which were rated as "Strongly Agree". Furthermore, participants consistently observed that data-driven practices contribute to institutional accountability and transparency (Mean = 6.51) and that data is effectively used to evaluate school policies and programs (Mean = 6.49) which is all have a descriptive remark of *Strongly Agree*.

Table 9 presents the level of dynamic leadership skills as to strategic leadership in terms of data-driven decision making, revealing an overall weighted mean of 6.57 resulting in a verbal interpretation of "Very High" and a descriptive remark of "Strongly Agree". These findings indicate that the institution's leadership consistently utilizes empirical evidence and performance metrics to guide strategic planning and operational improvements.

Table 9. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Strategic Leadership in terms of Data-Driven Decision Making

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
School decisions are based on accurate and up-to-date data.	6.68	0.57	Strongly Agree
Students performance data are regularly analyzed to improve instruction.	6.63	0.60	Strongly Agree
Teachers and staff are trained to use data in planning and decision-making.	6.56	0.66	Strongly Agree
Data-driven practices contribute to accountability and transparency.	6.51	0.70	Strongly Agree
Data is effectively used to evaluate school policies and programs.	6.49	0.68	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.57		
SD	0.52		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

According to Mandinach and Gummer (2016), data-driven decision making (DDDM) involves collecting, analyzing, and using data to inform instruction and policy. Their study shows that data literacy empowers educators to improve outcomes. Marsh, Et. al. (2017) that integrating data with professional learning communities strengthens instructional alignment. Their study revealed that shared data interpretation enhances consistency. Their findings suggest that professional development is necessary for meaningful data use. The above literature is related because data literacy is essential in implementing outcome-based curricula. It suggests that the leadership has successfully cultivated a culture of evidence-based practice.

Table 10. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Strategic Leadership in terms of Sustainable Development

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school integrates environmental sustainability in its programs and policies.	6.63	0.59	Strongly Agree
Resource usage in the school considers long-term sustainability.	6.62	0.56	Strongly Agree
Teachers and students are encouraged to practice sustainability (e.g., waste reduction, energy conservation).	6.52	0.66	Strongly Agree
The school promotes awareness of sustainable development goals (SDGs).	6.49	0.66	Strongly Agree
Sustainability initiatives contribute positively to school and community development.	6.46	0.66	Agree
Weighted Mean	6.54		
SD	0.50		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Table 10 presents the level of dynamic leadership skills as to strategic leadership in terms of sustainable development, yielding an overall weighted mean of 6.54 verbally interpreted as *Very High*. These results indicate that the school's leadership consistently prioritizes long-term viability and environmental consciousness, ensuring that sustainability is integrated into the institutional culture and operational policies.

The integration of environmental sustainability into school programs and policies received the highest mean score of 6.63 with a remark of *Strongly Agree*. This is closely followed by resource usage considering long-term sustainability (Mean = 6.62) and the encouragement of students and teachers to practice sustainability through waste reduction and energy conservation (Mean = 6.52), both garnering a remark of

Strongly Agree. Furthermore, respondents consistently observed the promotion of awareness regarding Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with a mean of 6.49. While the final indicator regarding the positive contribution of sustainability initiatives to school and community development received a mean of 6.46 with a remark also *Strongly Agree*. This data suggests that the leadership's strategic focus on sustainable development successfully fosters an environmentally responsible and forward-thinking educational environment.

Wals (2020) argues that sustainability in education requires participatory learning and community partnerships. His study indicates that experiential learning builds lifelong environmental responsibility. The above literature is related because community-engaged education supports sustainable outcomes.

Level of Dynamic Leadership as to Adaptive Leadership

Table 11 presents the level of dynamic leadership skills as to adaptive leadership in terms of innovation, yielding an overall weighted mean of 6.54, resulting in a verbal interpretation of *Very High*. These findings indicate that the school leadership consistently fosters an environment where creative pedagogical approaches are encouraged and supported, ensuring that the institution remains responsive to modern educational challenges.

Table 11. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Adaptive Leadership in terms of Innovation

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school/organization encourages innovative teaching and learning practices.	6.66	0.55	Strongly Agree
Teachers are provided with opportunities to develop and test new ideas.	6.61	0.56	Strongly Agree
Innovation is supported through adequate resources and training.	6.48	0.66	Strongly Agree
Innovative practices are recognized and rewarded.	6.45	0.66	Strongly Agree
Innovation has improved the quality of teaching and student learning outcomes.	6.54	0.67	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.54		
SD	0.50		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

The highest mean score of 6.66 was obtained for the statement regarding the school or organization encouraging innovative teaching and learning practices with a remark of *Strongly Agree*. This is followed closely by the provision of opportunities for teachers to develop and test new ideas (Mean = 6.61) and the recognition that innovation has improved the quality of teaching and student learning outcomes (Mean = 6.54), both of which garnered a remark of *Strongly Agree*. Furthermore, respondents strongly agreed that innovation is supported through adequate resources and training (Mean = 6.48) and that innovative practices are consistently recognized and rewarded within the institution (Mean = 6.45). Collectively, the data suggests a robust culture of adaptive leadership where experimentation and the continuous improvement of instructional methods are deeply embedded in the school's daily operations.

According to Fullan (2020), innovation in education refers to the process of adopting new ideas, strategies, or technologies to improve learning outcomes and instructional practices. His study highlights that innovation thrives in schools where leaders foster collaboration, experimentation, and continuous improvement.

Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Adaptive Leadership in terms of Crisis Management

Table 12 presents the level of dynamic leadership skills as to adaptive leadership in terms of crisis management, revealing an overall weighted mean of 6.56 corresponding to a verbal interpretation of *Very High* and a descriptive remark of *Strongly Agree*. These findings indicate that the institution's leadership has established a highly reliable and responsive framework for handling emergencies, ensuring that safety and organizational stability are consistently maintained during periods of uncertainty.

Table 12. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Adaptive Leadership in terms of Crisis Management

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school has clear procedures for handling crises (e.g., natural disasters, emergencies).	6.68	0.56	Strongly Agree
Staff and students are trained on crisis response protocols.	6.62	0.58	Strongly Agree
Communication during crises is timely and effective.	6.54	0.67	Strongly Agree
The school leaders responds quickly and appropriately during crises.	6.50	0.68	Strongly Agree
Crisis management procedures help ensure the safety and security of students and staff.	6.46	0.69	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.56		
SD	0.52		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

In a detailed analysis of the individual indicators, the highest mean score of 6.68 was attained for the school having clear procedures for handling crises, such as natural disasters and emergencies with a remark of *Strongly Agree*. This is followed closely by the training of staff and students on crisis response protocols (Mean = 6.62) and the provision of timely and effective communication during such events (Mean = 6.54), both receiving a remark of *Strongly Agree*. Furthermore, respondents strongly agreed that school leaders respond quickly and appropriately during crises (Mean = 6.50) and that current management procedures effectively ensure the safety and security of the entire academic community (Mean = 6.46).

The data suggests a high level of institutional preparedness and confidence in the leadership's ability to navigate critical situations through structured protocols and decisive action. Ritchie et al. (2021) discovered that leadership behavior during crises—especially empathy, decisiveness, and collaboration—determines organizational recovery. The study indicates that participative leadership enhances collective resilience.

Table 13 details the level of dynamic leadership skills regarding adaptive leadership in terms of contingency planning, yielding a weighted mean of 6.50 indicating a verbal interpretation of *Very High*. The data suggests that the

leadership's commitment to preparedness is deeply integrated into the school's operational culture, ensuring that proactive measures are consistently in place to mitigate potential disruptions.

Table 13. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Adaptive Leadership in terms of Contingency Planning

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school has contingency plans in place for various emergencies.	6.60	0.62	Strongly Agree
Contingency plans are regularly updated based on new risks or experiences.	6.58	0.62	Strongly Agree
Teachers and staff are aware of their roles in implementing contingency plans.	6.48	0.70	Strongly Agree
The school conducts drills and simulations to practice contingency measures.	6.43	0.71	Strongly Agree
Contingency planning minimizes disruption to teaching and learning.	6.41	0.72	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.50		
SD	0.56		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Furthermore, individual indicators shows that the highest mean score of 6.60 was obtained for the school having contingency plans in place for various emergencies with a remark of *Strongly Agree*. This is closely followed by the regular updating of these plans based on new risks or experiences (Mean = 6.58) and the high level of awareness among teachers and staff regarding their specific roles in implementing these measures (Mean = 6.48). Moreover, the institution actively reinforces these protocols through drills and simulations (Mean = 6.43) and ensures that such planning effectively minimizes disruptions to teaching and learning (Mean = 6.41), both receiving a remark of *Strongly Agree*.

These findings underscore a robust adaptive leadership style that prioritizes institutional resilience and the continuous safety of the academic community. According to Fink (2020), contingency planning involves developing strategies and procedures to respond to potential disruptions and ensure continuity of operations. His study stresses that plans should be flexible, regularly reviewed, and tailored to institutional needs.

Table 14. Level of Dynamic Leadership Skills as to Adaptive Leadership in terms of Feedback Practice

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The school promotes a culture of constructive feedback among teachers and staff.	6.70	0.55	Strongly Agree
Feedback from schoolhead is clear, specific, and actionable.	6.62	0.56	Strongly Agree
Teachers are encouraged to provide feedback to their peers.	6.54	0.68	Strongly Agree
Feedback is regularly used to improve teaching performance and learning outcomes.	6.52	0.67	Strongly Agree
Feedback mechanisms are two-way, allowing both staff and leaders to share insights.	6.50	0.67	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.57		
SD	0.50		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 14 illustrates the level of dynamic leadership skills as to adaptive leadership in terms of feedback practice, revealing an overall weighted mean of 6.57 which corresponds to a verbal interpretation of *Very High*. These results

demonstrate that the institution has successfully cultivated a robust environment of open communication, where feedback is utilized as a consistent and vital tool for professional growth and institutional improvement.

In a detailed analysis of the individual indicators, the highest mean score of 6.70 was obtained for the school's promotion of a culture of constructive feedback among teachers and staff a remark of *Strongly Agree*. This is followed closely by the finding that feedback from school heads is clear, specific, and actionable (Mean = 6.62), emphasizing the quality and utility of administrative guidance.

Furthermore, respondents strongly agreed that teachers are encouraged to provide peer-to-peer feedback (Mean = 6.54) and that feedback is regularly utilized to enhance both teaching performance and student learning outcomes (Mean = 6.52). Finally, the indicator regarding two-way feedback mechanisms, which allow both staff and leaders to share insights, earned a mean of 6.50, remaining firmly in the *Strongly Agree* remarks.

This underscore an adaptive leadership style that values transparency and collaboration, effectively creating a continuous feedback loop that supports all members of the academic community. According to Hattie and Timperley (2017), effective feedback significantly enhances student learning by clarifying performance, guiding improvement, and promoting self-regulation. Their research shows that feedback is most powerful when it is specific, timely, and actionable.

The highest mean score of 6.52 was achieved for the curriculum encouraging the use of innovative and creative teaching strategies with a remark of *Strongly Agree*. This is closely supported by the integration of technology and new methods to align with curriculum goals (Mean = 6.48) and the relevance of the curriculum to the learners' specific needs and contexts (Mean = 6.42). Moreover, respondents strongly agreed that innovative teaching practices under this curriculum have improved student learning outcomes (Mean = 6.43) and that teaching practices are consistently adjusted to meet specific curriculum requirements (Mean = 6.41).

Extent of Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of Curriculum Alignment

Table 15 presents the extent of implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of curriculum alignment, revealing an overall weighted mean of 6.45. This result indicates a verbal interpretation of *Always Observed*. These findings suggest that the institution has successfully aligned its instructional practices with the new curricular standards, consistently ensuring that teaching strategies and technological integration are synchronized with the intended learning goals.

The results underscore a high level of institutional readiness and effective execution in transitioning to the revised K10 framework. That curriculum alignment ensures consistency between learning objectives, instructional strategies, assessments, and educational standards to optimize student learning is through curriculum alignment. He also defines curriculum alignment as the degree to which learning objectives, instructional methods, and assessments are

coordinated to enhance student understanding and achievement

Table 15. Extent of Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of Curriculum Alignment

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The curriculum encourages the use of innovative and creative teaching strategies.	6.52	0.69	Strongly Agree
Teachers integrate technology and new methods to align with curriculum goals.	6.48	0.69	Strongly Agree
Innovative teaching practices improve student learning outcomes.	6.43	0.73	Strongly Agree
Teaching practices are adjusted to meet curriculum requirements.	6.41	0.72	Strongly Agree
The curriculum is relevant to the learners' needs and context.	6.42	0.71	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.45		
SD	0.58		
Verbal Interpretation	Always Observed		

Table 16 illustrates the extent of implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of innovative teaching strategies, yielding an overall weighted mean of 6.53 corresponds to a verbal interpretation of *Always Observed*. These findings indicate that the institution has successfully institutionalized a culture of creative pedagogy, where modern methodologies and technological tools are consistently utilized to deliver the new curriculum effectively.

Table 16. Extent of Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of Innovative Teaching Strategy

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The curriculum encourages the use of innovative teaching strategies.	6.64	0.63	Strongly Agree
Teachers integrate technology and creative methods in lesson delivery.	6.57	0.64	Strongly Agree
Innovative practices support student-centered learning.	6.51	0.70	Strongly Agree
Training is provided to enhance teachers' innovative teaching skills.	6.48	0.70	Strongly Agree
Innovative strategies improve student learning outcomes.	6.46	0.70	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.53		
SD	0.54		
Verbal Interpretation	Always Observed		

The curriculum's role in encouraging the use of innovative teaching strategies received the highest mean score of 6.64, with a remark of *Strongly Agree*. This is followed by the integration of technology and creative methods in lesson delivery (Mean = 6.57) and the application of innovative practices to support student-centered learning (Mean = 6.51), both of which garnered high levels of agreement. Furthermore, respondents strongly agreed that sufficient training is provided to enhance these skills (Mean = 6.48) and that these strategies have led to improved student learning outcomes (Mean = 6.46).

The result demonstrate that the implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum is characterized by a strong emphasis on adaptive and modern instructional techniques that prioritize student engagement and outcome-based results.

Moreover, Hattie (2018) explains that innovative teaching strategies with the highest impact on student achievement

include feedback, formative assessment, and direct instruction. His meta-analysis identified that teachers who consistently use these evidence-based strategies foster deeper learning and critical thinking. By understanding what works best in the classroom, educators can adjust their methods to suit the needs of diverse learners.

Extent of Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of Assessment and Evaluation

Table 17 presents the extent of implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum specifically regarding assessment and evaluation. The data reveals an overall weighted mean of 6.56. This results in a verbal interpretation of *Always Observed*, indicating that the core components of the assessment framework are consistently and effectively integrated into the educational process. The relatively low standard deviation suggests a high level of consistency among respondents, reflecting a unified perception of how these evaluation standards are being met in the field. The highest-rated indicator focuses on the alignment of assessments with curriculum standards and competencies, which earned a mean score of 6.64 and a remark of *Strongly Agree*.

Table 17. Extent of Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of Assessment and Evaluation

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Assessments are aligned with curriculum standards and competencies.	6.64	0.61	Strongly Agree
Evaluation methods measure both knowledge and skills effectively.	6.63	0.58	Strongly Agree
Teachers use a variety of assessment tools (e.g., formative, summative, performance-based).	6.56	0.67	Strongly Agree
Assessment results are used to guide instructional improvements.	6.50	0.69	Strongly Agree
Students receive constructive feedback based on assessments.	6.49	0.69	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.56		
SD	0.53		
Verbal Interpretation	Always Observed		

This suggests that the foundational step of the evaluation process—ensuring that tests actually measure what students are supposed to learn—is being executed with a high degree of precision. Closely following this is the effectiveness of evaluation methods in measuring both knowledge and skills (6.63) and the use of diverse assessment tools such as formative, summative, and performance-based tasks (6.56). These scores imply that the implementation is not reliant on traditional testing alone but encompasses a holistic approach to tracking student progress.

Furthermore, the data shows that the practical application of assessment results remains a strong suit of the curriculum implementation. Using assessment data to guide instructional improvements (6.50) and providing students with constructive feedback (6.49) both received *Strongly Agree* remarks.

This applies the importance of aligning assessment and evaluation practices with intended learning outcomes. They argue that assessments should be valid, reliable, and fair, addressing both cognitive and affective learning domains. Their findings indicate that when assessment methods are

varied and aligned with objectives, they provide a more accurate picture of student achievement. (Nitko and Brookhart 2019).

Table 18. Extent of Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of Learning Resource Materials

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Learning resources are sufficient and aligned with the curriculum.	6.62	0.65	Strongly Agree
Teachers have access to digital and non-digital learning materials.	6.58	0.64	Strongly Agree
Instructional materials are updated and relevant to current learning needs.	6.50	0.72	Strongly Agree
Resource distribution is equitable across grade levels.	6.44	0.71	Strongly Agree
Learning materials enhance student understanding of lessons.	6.45	0.70	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.52		
SD	0.56		
Verbal Interpretation	Always Observed		

Table 18 presents the extent of implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum specifically regarding learning resource materials. The data reveals a highly positive reception among respondents, as evidenced by a weighted mean of 6.52. This score corresponds to a verbal interpretation of *Always Observed*, indicating that the provision and quality of educational materials are consistently maintained at an exceptional level.

Among the specific indicators, the highest mean score of 6.62 was recorded for the sufficiency and alignment of learning resources with the curriculum. This suggests that the materials provided are not only ample in quantity but are also pedagogically sound and strictly tailored to the standards of the K10 framework. Similarly, the accessibility of both digital and non-digital materials received a high mean of 6.58, highlighting a successful multi-modal approach to resource distribution that caters to various teaching environments. All these figures carry a remark of *Strongly Agree*, reinforcing the conclusion that the implementation is comprehensive and effective.

This supports that learning resources and materials are critical components of quality education, encompassing textbooks, digital materials, and supplementary learning tools that support teaching and learning. Their study found that adequate and well-aligned learning resources enhance student engagement and comprehension by providing structured pathways for content mastery. (OECD 2020).

Table 19 illustrates the extent of implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of Student Engagement. The data reveals an overall weighted mean of 6.23 yielding a verbal interpretation of "Always Observed". This result signifies that the curriculum consistently fosters an environment where students are deeply involved and motivated in their learning process. The highest mean score of 6.66 was obtained for the statement regarding curriculum activities promoting active student participation, which is further supported by a remark of "Strongly Agree". This suggests that the revised curriculum effectively moves away from passive instruction toward more interactive and participatory learning experiences. Closely following this is

the design of lessons to sustain student interest and motivation, which garnered a mean of 6.62. These figures indicate that the instructional design is highly successful in maintaining student focus and enthusiasm throughout the educational process.

Table 19. Extent of Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of Student Engagement

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Curriculum activities promote active student participation.	6.66	0.61	Strongly Agree
Lessons are designed to sustain student interest and motivation.	6.62	0.59	Strongly Agree
Students are encouraged to collaborate and work in groups.	6.56	0.69	Strongly Agree
The curriculum promotes critical thinking and problem-solving.	6.51	0.70	Strongly Agree
Engagement strategies lead to improved student performance.	6.50	0.71	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.23		
SD	0.99		
Verbal Interpretation	Always Observed		

Other key indicators, such as the encouragement of collaboration through group work (6.56), the promotion of critical thinking and problem-solving (6.51), and the link between engagement strategies and improved student performance (6.50), all received *Strongly Agree* remarks. These scores highlight a comprehensive approach to engagement that addresses both social-emotional and cognitive developmental needs.

As assert by Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris (2016) student engagement is a multidimensional construct encompassing behavioral, emotional, and cognitive components that influence learning outcomes. Their study suggests that when students are actively involved in classroom activities, demonstrate positive emotions toward learning, and invest effort in understanding content, their academic performance improves. The authors emphasize that engagement is both a process and an outcome of effective teaching practices.

Table 20. Extent of Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of Inclusivity and Differentiation

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
The curriculum addresses the needs of diverse learners.	6.63	0.61	Strongly Agree
Teachers adapt lessons to accommodate varying abilities and learning styles.	6.58	0.63	Strongly Agree
Inclusivity is practiced in classroom activities and assessments.	6.51	0.69	Strongly Agree
Support is available for learners with special needs.	6.48	0.69	Strongly Agree
Differentiated instruction contributes to better learning outcomes.	6.46	0.69	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.53		
SD	0.54		
Verbal Interpretation	Always Observed		

Table 20 presents the extent of implementation regarding the Revised K10 Curriculum, focusing specifically on inclusivity and differentiation. The data reveals weighted mean of 6.53 resulting in a verbal interpretation of *Always Observed*. This suggests that the core tenets of inclusive

education are not just present but are consistently integrated into the curriculum's practical application.

Among the specific statements evaluated, the highest mean score of 6.83 was recorded for the curriculum's ability to address the needs of diverse learners. This indicates a strong institutional alignment with modern educational standards that prioritize equity. Closely following this is the teachers' ability to adapt lessons to accommodate varying abilities and learning styles, which earned a mean of 6.58. These high scores reflect a high level of pedagogical competence and flexibility among educators in executing differentiated instruction.

Even the lowest-scoring indicators in the set support for learners with special needs (6.48) and the contribution of differentiated instruction to better learning outcomes (6.46) remain firmly within the "Strongly Agree" category.

Norwich (2020) stressed inclusive education and differentiation is grounded in the belief that all students, should learn together in mainstream settings. His findings show that successful inclusion depends on flexible curricula, differentiated teaching, and supportive school leadership.

Table 21. Extent of Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum in terms of Teacher Readiness and Adaptability

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Teachers are well-prepared to implement the curriculum.	6.64	0.62	Strongly Agree
Training and professional development increase teacher readiness.	6.60	0.61	Strongly Agree
Teachers adapt easily to curriculum changes and updates.	6.51	0.68	Strongly Agree
Teachers are confident in using new strategies and technologies.	6.49	0.68	Strongly Agree
Adaptability enhances effective curriculum implementation.	6.47	0.52	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	6.54		
SD	0.52		
Verbal Interpretation	Always Observed		

Table 21 shows the extent of implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum specifically focusing on teacher readiness and adaptability. The data reveals a weighted mean of 6.54, which corresponds to a verbal interpretation of "Always Observed". This suggests that the teaching workforce is exceptionally prepared and resilient in transitioning to the new curricular framework. Teachers being well-prepared to implement the curriculum garnered the highest mean of 6.64 with a standard deviation of 0.62. This is closely supported by the impact of training and professional development on teacher readiness, which recorded a mean of 6.60. These figures indicate that the institutional support mechanisms, such as seminars and workshops, have been highly effective in equipping educators with the necessary competencies to handle the revised curriculum.

Furthermore, the respondents strongly agreed that teachers adapt easily to curriculum changes (6.51) and maintain confidence in using new strategies and technologies (6.49). Even the indicator with the lowest mean—adaptability enhancing effective curriculum implementation at 6.47—still falls well within the *Strongly Agree* range.

Darling-Hammond (2017) emphasizes teacher readiness and adaptability is a multidimensional construct that includes

mastery of subject matter, pedagogical skills, and the ability to manage diverse classrooms effectively. Her research shows that teachers who undergo comprehensive pre-service preparation and continuous professional development demonstrate higher instructional quality and student achievement.

Significant Relationship of Dynamic Leadership to the Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum in Elementary Education

Table 22 presents the significant relationship between dynamic leadership as to instructional leadership in the implementation of the Revised K–10 Curriculum. All computed Pearson r values indicate positive correlations and are statistically significant at $p = .000$, suggesting meaningful associations across all variables.

For Instructional Vision, the results reveal a *moderate positive correlation* with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .679$).

High positive correlations were found with Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .736$), Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .745$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .757$), Student Engagement ($r = .722$), Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .892$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .783$). These findings indicate that stronger instructional vision is associated with stronger implementation across all instructional domains, particularly in inclusivity and differentiated practices. With respect to Curriculum Management, a *moderate positive correlation* was observed with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .697$) and Student Engagement ($r = .698$). High positive correlations were found with Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .728$), Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .751$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .744$), Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .894$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .751$).

Table 22. Significant Relationship of Dynamic Leadership as to Instructional Leadership to the Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum

Instructional Leadership		CA	ITS	A&E	LRM	SE	I&D	TR&A
Instructional Vision	Pearson R	.679**	.736**	.745**	.757**	.722**	.692**	.763**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Curriculum Management	Pearson R	.697**	.728**	.751**	.744**	.696**	.694**	.751**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Teacher Professional Development	Pearson R	.594**	.633**	.664**	.677**	.639**	.766**	.733**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Instructional Supervision	Pearson R	.675**	.699**	.688**	.741**	.726**	.765**	.790**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Mentoring	Pearson R	.693**	.707**	.699**	.817**	.772**	.782**	.808**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200

This suggests that effective curriculum management substantially supports multiple aspects of curriculum implementation, especially inclusive and differentiated instruction.

In terms of Teacher Professional Development, *moderate positive correlations* were identified with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .594$), Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .633$), Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .684$), and Student Engagement ($r = .639$). *High positive correlations* were found with Learning Resource Materials ($r = .877$), Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .766$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .733$). These findings imply that professional development initiatives are strongly linked to improvements in instructional resources, inclusivity, and teacher adaptability.

For Instructional Supervision, *moderate positive correlations* were found with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .675$) and Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .688$). High positive correlations were observed with Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .699$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .741$), Student Engagement ($r = .728$), Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .765$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .790$).

This indicates that effective instructional supervision is closely associated with improved instructional practices and teacher responsiveness.

Lastly, Mentoring demonstrated *moderate positive correlations* with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .693$) and Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .699$). *High positive correlations* were found with Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .707$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .817$), Student Engagement ($r = .772$), Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .782$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .808$). These results suggest that mentoring plays a substantial role in strengthening curriculum implementation, particularly in teacher readiness and resource utilization.

Overall, the findings consistently show moderate to high positive correlations between dynamic leadership dimensions and instructional leadership practices in the implementation of the Revised K–10 Curriculum. Since all relationships are statistically significant at the 0.05 level, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between dynamic leadership as to instructional leadership in the implementation of the Revised K–10 Curriculum is *rejected*.

Thus, it can be concluded that dynamic leadership significantly influences and is positively associated with the implementation of Revised K10 curriculum in elementary education.

Table 23 presents the significant relationship between dynamic leadership as to strategic leadership in the implementation of the Revised K–10 Curriculum. All Pearson r values indicate positive correlations and are statistically significant at $p = .000$, demonstrating meaningful associations across all variables.

Table 23. Test Relationship of Dynamic Leadership as to Strategic Leadership to the Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum

Strategic Leadership		CA	ITS	A&E	LRM	SE	I&D	TR&A
Policy Implementation	Pearson R	.665**	.656**	.701**	.766**	.753**	.683**	.740**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Resource Management	Pearson R	.620**	.659**	.719**	.723**	.726**	.660**	.650**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Stakeholder Engagement	Pearson R	.623**	.690**	.669**	.735**	.672**	.702**	.735**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Data Driven Decision Making	Pearson R	.681**	.675**	.820**	.735**	.694**	.713**	.740**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Sustainable Development	Pearson R	.718**	.783**	.830**	.824**	.705**	.729**	.791**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200

For Policy Implementation, *moderate positive correlations* were found with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .665$) and Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .656$). High positive correlations were observed with Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .701$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .766$), Student Engagement ($r = .753$), Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .683$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .740$). These findings indicate that stronger policy implementation is associated with improved curriculum practices, particularly in learning resources and student engagement.

With respect to Resource Management, *moderate positive correlations* were noted with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .620$), Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .659$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .650$). *High positive correlations* were found with Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .718$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .723$), Student Engagement ($r = .726$), and Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .860$). This suggests that effective management of resources strongly supports inclusive practices and overall instructional delivery.

In terms of Stakeholder Engagement, *moderate positive correlations* were observed with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .623$), Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .690$), Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .689$), Student Engagement ($r = .672$), and Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .702$). *High positive correlations* were identified with Learning Resource Materials ($r = .735$) and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .735$).

These results imply that active stakeholder involvement contributes substantially to improved instructional resources and teacher adaptability.

For Data-Driven Decision Making, moderate positive correlations were found with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .681$), Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .675$), Student Engagement ($r = .694$), and Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .713$). High positive correlations were observed with Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .820$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .735$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .740$). This indicates that the use of data in decision-making is strongly associated with enhanced assessment practices and improved instructional support systems.

Lastly, Sustainable Development demonstrated high positive correlations with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .718$), Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .783$), Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .830$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .824$), Student Engagement ($r = .705$), Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .728$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .781$). These findings reveal that sustainability initiatives are consistently and strongly linked to all dimensions of curriculum implementation.

Overall, the results consistently show moderate to high positive correlations between dynamic leadership and strategic leadership dimensions in the implementation of the Revised K–10 Curriculum. Since all computed correlations are statistically significant at the 0.05 level, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between dynamic leadership and strategic leadership in the implementation of the Revised K–10 Curriculum is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that dynamic leadership significantly influences and is positively associated with strategic leadership practices in curriculum implementation.

Table 24 presents the significant relationship between dynamic leadership and adaptive leadership in the implementation of the Revised K–10 Curriculum. Based on the prescribed interpretation scale, all Pearson r values indicate positive correlations and are statistically significant at $p = .000$, demonstrating meaningful relationships among the variables.

For Innovation, high positive correlations were observed with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .700$), Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .780$), Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .784$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .777$), Student Engagement ($r = .715$), Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .800$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .749$). These results indicate that innovation as an adaptive leadership dimension is strongly associated with all areas of curriculum implementation, particularly inclusivity and differentiated practices.

With respect to Crisis Management, moderate positive correlations were found with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .634$), Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .689$), Student Engagement ($r = .651$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .676$). High positive correlations were observed with Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .793$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .710$), and Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .817$). These findings suggest that effective

crisis management contributes substantially to strengthening inclusive practices and instructional strategies.

Table 24. Test Relationship of Dynamic Leadership as to in Adaptive Leadership to the Implementation of Revised K10 Curriculum

Adaptive Leadership		CA	ITS	A&E	LRM	SE	I&D	TR&A
Innovation	Pearson R	.709**	.760**	.784**	.777**	.715**	.690**	.749**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Crisis Management	Pearson R	.634**	.793**	.669**	.710**	.651**	.617**	.676**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Contingency Planning	Pearson R	.809**	.614**	.600**	.673**	.643**	.653**	.658**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
Feedback Practice	Pearson R	.645**	.680**	.705**	.765**	.786**	.714**	.740**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200

In terms of Contingency Planning, high positive correlations were noted with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .809$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .673$), and Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .853$). Moderate positive correlations were observed with Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .614$), Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .600$), Student Engagement ($r = .643$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .658$). This indicates that proactive contingency planning is strongly linked to curriculum alignment and inclusive practices, while maintaining moderate associations with other instructional domains.

Lastly, Feedback Practice demonstrated high positive correlations with Curriculum Alignment ($r = .645$), Innovative Teaching Strategies ($r = .680$), Assessment and Evaluation ($r = .763$), Learning Resource Materials ($r = .765$), Student Engagement ($r = .786$), Inclusivity and Differentiation ($r = .714$), and Teacher Readiness and Adaptability ($r = .740$). These results reveal that consistent feedback mechanisms are strongly associated with improved instructional processes and teacher adaptability.

The findings consistently demonstrate moderate to high positive correlations between dynamic leadership and adaptive leadership dimensions in the implementation of the Revised K–10 Curriculum. Since all computed correlations are statistically significant at the 0.05 level, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between dynamic leadership and adaptive leadership in the implementation of the Revised K–10 Curriculum is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that dynamic leadership significantly influences and is positively associated with adaptive leadership practices in curriculum implementation.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

There is a significant relationship between instructional leadership and the implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum. Thus, the null hypothesis stated is rejected; this means that when leaders actively prioritize teaching quality

and teacher development, the transition to and execution of the new curriculum becomes more effective.

Also a significant relationship between strategic leadership and the implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum. Hence, the null hypothesis stated is rejected; this means that the ability of leaders to set long-term goals and align resources is a critical driver in successfully operationalizing the curriculum’s objectives.

Similarly, adaptive leadership was found to have a significant relationship with the implementation of the Revised K10 Curriculum. Therefore, the null hypothesis stated is rejected; this means that leaders who can navigate uncertainty and guide their staff through the inevitable challenges of systemic change are essential for the curriculum's sustainability.

On the basis of the foregoing findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are hereby proposed:

School heads may have institutionalize mentoring of teacher to help teachers effectively deliver instruction and improve teaching practices in the classroom.

School heads may have regular analysis of student performance data, teacher feedback, and program evaluations should be used as bases for policy formulation, resource allocation, and long-term planning to ensure sustainability of curriculum implementation.

School heads may encourage innovative teaching approaches and maintaining responsive leadership during emergencies will help schools remain resilient amid educational changes and challenges.

Teachers may continue engaging in training, collaboration, and reflective practice that will enhance their readiness, adaptability, and confidence in implementing innovative teaching strategies aligned with the Revised K10 Curriculum.

Department of Education (DepEd) may provide adequate learning resources and professional development opportunities to maintain the high level of curriculum implementation observed across all indicators.

Future researchers may conduct further studies using qualitative or mixed-method approaches to gain deeper insights into the influence of dynamic leadership on curriculum implementation and student achievement across different educational settings..

REFERENCE

- [1]. Bush, T. (2020). Theories of educational leadership and management (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- [2]. Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 291–309. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1315399>
- [3]. Epstein, J. L. (2018). *School, family, and community partnerships* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- [4]. Fink, S. (2020). *Crisis management: Planning for the inevitable* (Rev. ed.). AMACOM.
- [5]. Fullan, M. (2020). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- [6]. Garcia, R. M. (2024). Navigating curriculum change: The role of school heads in managing the transition to the Revised K10 framework. *Philippine Journal of Education Studies*, 8(1), 112–129.
- [7]. Hallinger, P. (2020). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in*

- Schools, 19(2), 198–219. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2019.1659132>
- [8]. Hattie, J. (2018). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 1,500 meta-analyses relating to achievement* (2nd ed.). Routledge. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429485488>
- [9]. Hill (2020). *Bridging the gap between standards and achievement: The imperative for professional development in education*. Washington, DC: Institute for Learning.
- [10]. Hobson, A. J. (2016). Judgementoring and how to avert it: Introducing ONSIDE mentoring for beginning teachers. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 5(2), 87–110.
- [11]. Ingersoll, R., & Strong, M. (2017). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 201–233. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311403323>
- [12]. Kushnir (2022). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103. (6), 1013-1055.
- [13]. Mandinach, E. B., & Gummer, E. S. (2016). What does it mean for teachers to be data literate? *Educational Researcher*, 45(3), 194–197. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16649961>
- [14]. Marsh, J. A., Pane, J. F., & Hamilton, L. S. (2017). Making sense of data-driven decision making in education: Evidence from recent RAND studies. RAND Corporation.
- [15]. Nitko, A. J., & Brookhart, S. M. (2019). *Educational assessment of students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
- [16]. Norwich, B. (2020). Conceptualizing inclusive education and contextualizing it within the education system. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 50(1), 1–15 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2019.1702620>
- [17]. Ramos, E. T., & Estrella, J. B. (2024). Leadership dynamics and institutional readiness in the implementation of the MATATAG curriculum: A case study of Philippine public schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 12(2), 45–62.
- [18]. Ritchie, B. W., Jiang, Y., & Miller, D. (2021). Leadership in crisis: Emerging insights. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 29(3), 281–292. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12314>
- [19]. Wals, A. E. J. (2020). Sustainability-oriented education: Learning our way out of unsustainability. *Sustainability*, 12(6), 2484.
- [20]. Zepeda, S. J. (2020). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (5th ed.). Routledge.