# Rating Practices of Results-Based Performance Management System: Basis for Proposed Improvement Plan

Marion Cresencio EdD[1], Arzel John Ruedas[2]

**Abstract**

This study examined the Rating Practices of the RBPMS in public secondary schools of three divisions. Utilizing a descriptive research design, the study assessed the rating practices of RBPMS in the four phases, through the perspectives of public secondary teachers, master teachers, and head teachers. Respondents' profiles were also analyzed based on their age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, length of service and position. Findings revealed that most respondents were experienced, married female educators aged 31–45, with pursuing graduate-level education. Findings indicated a high rating practices and satisfaction across the four RBPMS phases. Statistical analysis showed no significant differences in performance ratings across most demographic variables, although higher educational attainment and length of service were significantly associated in specific phases. Despite high implementation, several challenges were identified, including the lack of regular feedback, weak integration of performance with rewards, inadequate rater accountability, and low transparency. The study concluded that the RBPMS is implemented in terms of performance planning, monitoring, review, and rewards among teachers and instructional leaders. Even though it's implemented, there were identified challenges such as feedback provision, accountability, transparency, and a reward system. Despite the demographic profile factors such as age, gender, civil status, and position showed no significant impact on performance ratings across the four phases, though higher educational attainment and length of service were linked to more favorable experiences in certain RBPMS phases. An improvement plan is proposed to address the findings and challenges encountered by the teachers and instructional leaders.

**Keywords:** *Results-Based Performance Management System, Improvement Plan, Rating Practices, Implementation, Open University System.*

## Introduction

Implementing a Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) by instructional leaders is crucial for enhancing monitoring and evaluation tools in education systems worldwide. Such a system allows educators and administrators to track student progress, evaluate the effectiveness of instructional methods, and make data-driven decisions to improve educational outcomes. In the United States, the implementation of Results-Based Performance Management Systems by instructional leaders varies across states and districts due to the decentralized education system. Some states have adopted value-added models (VAMs) and student growth measures to evaluate teacher effectiveness (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2018). While, Singapore is recognized for its strong education system and has implemented a comprehensive Results-Based Performance Management System for instructional leaders. It focuses on continuous monitoring and evaluation of teaching practices, student achievement, and school performance. The system integrates data from various sources, including assessments, classroom observations, and feedback from students and parents (Ministry of Education Singapore, 2016). The Philippines, in line with this global shift, implemented the K to 12 Curriculum through the "Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013," aiming to enhance the mastery of knowledge and skills and holistically develop 21st-century Filipino learners (DepEd, 2017). The Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) in the Philippines has been implemented

---

[1] Polytechnic University of the Philippines, Sta. Mesa, Manila, Philippines, Email: macresencio@pup.edu.ph, 0000-0003-1024-1759

[2] Bacong Ilaya Elementary School, General Luna, Quezon, Philippines, Email: arzeljohn.ruedas@deped.gov.ph, 0009-0002-5167-2897

to evaluate teacher performance and align it with the objectives of key result areas (KRAs) (Department of Education, 2015). It has four phases: performance planning and commitment, performance monitoring and coaching, performance review and evaluation, and performance rewarding and development planning.

Regions such as Visayas, explored the implementation of RBPMS, and it was found that teachers identified concerns, including a lack of accountability among teachers (Dizon et al. 2018). Meaning that teachers are not evaluated nor given accurate feedback about their performance. Teachers felt that the system lacked mechanisms to ensure that their efforts were recognized and addressed. Along with this, researchers investigated the same in Metro Manila. Their findings revealed inconsistent implementation of RBPMS, especially by raters, many of whom lack proper training. Identified misalignment between performance targets and actual classroom realities lead to increased teacher stress and perceived unfairness (Mamauag and Antonio, 2022). Ormilla (2021) on the other hand, conducted a similar study in the Cordillera Administrative Region. He found that the Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) was highly implemented across public elementary schools in the Schools Division of Ifugao. However, a lack of a second review and infrequent feedback from raters are the findings of his study.

## Results-Based Performance Management System

Refers to the structured system used by the Department of Education (DepEd) to evaluate, monitor, and improve the performance of its personnel, particularly teachers and school leaders, based on their individual commitments, outputs, and actual accomplishments aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and organizational goals. The RPMS-PPST Manual outlines key result areas (KRAs), objectives, and performance indicators that serve as bases for rating educators (Department of Education, 2020). However, inconsistencies in rating practices, often caused by unclear guidelines or lack of training, have led to concerns regarding fairness and objectivity in performance appraisal.

## Performance Planning and Commitment

First phase in the Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) of the Department of Education (DepEd). Entails drafting, discussing, and signing the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF), which describes the teacher's responsibilities, anticipated results, and performance cycle success indicators. Performance planning involves setting specific, quantifiable goals that are in line with institutional objectives, commitment shows how motivated and accountable an individual is to be reaching those goals (Armstrong, 2014).

## Performance Monitoring and Coaching

It involves ongoing process by which school heads and instructional leaders observe, guide, and support teachers throughout the performance cycle to ensure they are on track with their agreed-upon goals and Key Result Areas (KRAs). It involves regular observation, feedback, and support to enhance professional growth and improve teaching and learning outcomes (DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015). Instructional leaders' coaching sessions were crucial in assisting teachers in comprehending the RPMS framework, which in turn enhanced their performance and compliance (Mamauag and Antonio, 2022).

## Performance Review and Evaluation

The systematic process of assessing the extent to which a teacher has achieved the agreed-upon performance objectives and indicators set during the planning phase. This phase ensures that there is an objective and evidence-based appraisal of how well teachers and school personnel have performed their Key Result Areas (KRAs), objectives, and success indicators over the performance period (DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015). Armstrong (2014) highlighted that goal alignment, objective evaluation, and actionable feedback are essential components of a systematic performance management process that support institutional success and employee development.

## Performance Rewards and Evaluation

Final stage of the RPMS cycle, which entails evaluating a teacher's performance using specified Key Result Areas (KRAs), Objectives, and Means of Verification (MOVs), and providing suitable praise and rewards considering the evaluation's findings. This phase determines the level of effectiveness and accomplishments of individuals, which becomes the basis for rewards, incentives, recognition, or developmental interventions (DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015). One important part of the IPCRF is

performance rewards, which are meant to inspire workers by acknowledging and rewarding their accomplishments. Performance-based incentives have a positive effect on teachers' motivation and job satisfaction, according to research by Dizon (2019).

## Purpose of the Research

The aim of the study is to examine the rating practices of Results-Based Performance Management System in the Department of Education in Quezon Province (Division of Lucena City, Division of Tayabas City and Division of Quezon Province).

This research intends to investigate the rating practices of RBPMS among the respondents. Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

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

2. age

3. gender

4. civil status

5. highest educational attainment

6. length of service

7. position

8. How do the respondents assess the rating practices of the Results-Based Performance Management System in the following phases:

9. Performance Planning and Commitment;

10. Performance Monitoring and Coaching;

11. Performance Review and Evaluation; and

12. Performance Rewards and Development Planning?

13. Is there a significant difference in the rating practices of RBPMS when respondents are grouped according to profile?

14. What are the challenges in the implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System?

## Methodology

### Research Design

The researcher used a quantitative approach, descriptive design through survey method to provide a general picture of the implementation of RBMPS, particularly in rating practices in secondary schools in the Department of Education in Quezon Province (Division of Lucena City, Division of Tayabas City, and Division of Quezon Province).

### Participants

The population of the study consisted of selected secondary school teachers and instructional leaders from three Schools Division Offices (SDOs) in school year 2023-2024. There were 368 total respondents of the study.

**Table 1.** Respondents of the Study

| 15. Schools Division Offices | 16. Number of Secondary Schools | 17. Total Population | 18. Target Population Size |
|---|---|---|---|
| 19. Lucena City | 20. 15 | 21. 590 | 22. 26 |
| 23. Tayabas City | 24. 11 | 25. 351 | 26. 16 |
| 27. Quezon Province | 28. 562 | 29. 7,512 | 30. 326 |

| 31. **TOTAL** | 32. **588** | 33. **8,453** | 34. **368** |

Table 1 shows the target population of secondary school teachers, Master Teachers, and Head Teachers across three schools division. The schools Division of Lucena City included 15 secondary schools with a total of 590 teachers. The Schools Division of Tayabas City was composed of 11 secondary schools with a total teacher population of 351. The Schools Division of Quezon Province had the largest number of schools and teachers, divided into four congressional districts, consisting of 562 secondary schools with a total population of 7,512 teachers.

## Instrument

The instrument used in this research was a questionnaire to gather data. The survey questionnaire was composed of three (3) parts. The first part was the demographic profile of the respondents, including age, gender, civil status, highest educational attainment, length of service, and position. The second part was the respondent's assessment in rating practices of the RBPMS in four different phases: a) performance planning and commitment, b) performance monitoring and coaching, c) performance review and evaluation, and d) performance rewards and development planning. Each phase was composed of 10 items, with a total of 40 items. The third part of the survey questionnaire described the challenges in the implementation of the RBPMS. This section consisted of twenty (20) items.

The Likert scale in second part of questionnaire has a point scale with range of 1 to 5 where 5 is the highest and has a verbal interpretation of to a very great extent followed by 4 with verbal interpretation of to a great extent then 3 with verbal interpretation of to a little extent, 2 with verbal interpretation of to a very little extent and lowest is 1 with verbal interpretation of no extent at all. On the other hand, part 3 of the questionnaire pertained to the challenges in the implementation of the RBPMS used point scale with range of 1 to 5 where 5 is the highest and has a verbal interpretation of highly evident, 4 with verbal interpretation of evident, followed by 3 with verbal interpretation of moderately evident, then 2 with verbal interpretation of slightly evident and lowest is 1 with verbal interpretation of not evident.

For interpretation of the finding, a weighted mean of 4.20 to 5.00 was given a verbal interpretation of to a very great extent, a weighted mean 3.40 to 4.19 was given a verbal interpretation of to a great extent, a weighted mean 2.60 – 3.39 was given a verbal interpretation of to a little extent, a weighted mean 1.80 – 2.59 was given a verbal interpretation of to a very little extent, and a weighted mean 1.00 – 1.79 was given a verbal interpretation of not extent at all.

## Data Analysis Framework

The descriptive research method was used in this study. The locale of this study is in Quezon Province ( Division of Lucena City, Division of Tayabas City, and Division of Quezon Province). These divisions represented a range of educational settings, urban, semi-urban, and rural, providing a comprehensive perspective on the rating practices and perception of performance management systems in secondary education. The researcher employed stratified random sampling. Stratification was based on school category (mega, large, medium, and small), allowing for proportional representation across different school sizes. The 368 secondary teachers were chosen out of 8,453 using the Raosoft sample size calculator.

The PPTS resource package for instructional leaders served as the basis for the items on each questionnaire, especially those related to the four RBPMS phases. The researchers' questionnaire was validated by five (5) experts in the field of education. Reliability coefficients were analyzed to determine the consistency of the measurement instrument, yielding a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.950.

To facilitate the gathering of data, the researchers sought the approval of UREC before conducting the research questionnaire. Upon approval, the researcher secured a permit to conduct the research from the Schools Division Superintendents to obtain pertinent data from the Division's Planning Office for the accurate number of public secondary school teachers and instructional leaders for the study. Upon approval of the request, the researcher distributed the questionnaires to the respondents through hard copies and online using Google Forms. After administering the survey questionnaire, the researcher retrieved the questionnaires, tallied the data, and analyzed the results. Moreover, respondents were properly informed about the research objectives and assured that their identities would be kept confidential and that the results would be utilized solely for academic purposes. The

data gathered, tabulated, and analyzed by using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Weighted average mean, kruskal wallis test and interpretive analysis were used as statistical tools.

## Results and Discussions

This section discusses the data gathered, its analysis and its interpretation from questionnaires completed by educators about implementation of results-based performance management system.

**Table 2.** Assessment of Rating Practices of Results-Based Performance Management System in Performance Planning and Commitment.

| Performance Planning and Commitment | Mean | Std. Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The rater explains thoroughly the importance of the Results-Based Performance Management System. | 4.49 | 0.63 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 2. The rater discusses methodically different steps in accomplishing the Commitment Form. | 4.39 | 0.67 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 3. The rater assists with the ratee in formulating performance objectives. | 4.38 | 0.67 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 4. The rater and the ratee both agree on the performance targets written in the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF). | 4.50 | 0.62 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 5. The rater checks analytically the performance indicators written in each key result area. | 4.46 | 0.62 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 6. The rater ensures that the performance objectives are aligned with the duties and responsibilities of the ratee. | 4.50 | 0.61 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 7. The rater ensures that the performance targets can be measured by the performance indicators set. | 4.49 | 0.62 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 8. The rater ensures that the performance objectives can be attained within the rating period. | 4.46 | 0.62 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 9. The rater ensures that the performance objectives are given reasonable corresponding weights (percentage). | 4.51 | 0.61 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 10. The rater ensures that the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form is accomplished before the start of the rating period. | 4.46 | 0.65 | To a Very Great Extent |
| Overall | 4.47 | 0.54 | To a Very Great Extent |

Table 2 shows the rating practices of RBPMS in Performance Planning and Commitment. With an overall mean of 4.47 and a standard deviation of 0.54, the assessment's findings show that respondents believe Performance Planning and Commitment under the RBPMS is rated to "to a very great extent" across all evaluated indicators. This underlines the ability of school administrators to hold equitable, transparent, and interactive planning sessions with teachers and points to a robust and steady application of best practices in the organization's performance planning and commitment procedures. The highest mean score ($\bar{x}$ = 4.51, SD = 0.61) was attributed to ensuring that performance objectives are given reasonable corresponding weights. Moreover, the results indicate that raters also received high marks for ensuring that objectives were in line with the ratee's duties and responsibilities ($\bar{x}$ = 4.50, SD = 0.62) and reaching mutual agreement on performance targets. Also notable are the consistently

high ratings in communication clarity indicators, such as the rater's detailed explanation of RBPMS ($\bar{x}$ = 4.49) and the methodical discussion of the steps in completing the IPCRF ($\bar{x}$ = 4.39). Additionally, the results demonstrate that raters guarantee the measurability ($\bar{x}$ = 4.49) and attainability ($\bar{x}$ = 4.46) of performance goals. , the indicator that raters make sure the IPCRF is finished prior to the rating period beginning ($\bar{x}$ = 4.46, SD = 0.65), which shows time management and organizational readiness.

**Table 3**. Assessment of Rating Practices of Results-Based Performance Management System in Performance Monitoring and Coaching

| Performance Monitoring and Coaching | Mean | Std. Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The rater provides key input about the ratee's performance during the performance monitoring. | 4.49 | 0.62 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 2. The rater directs the ratee's performance at certain frequencies, not just once. | 4.39 | 0.66 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 3. The rater clearly defines opportunities for improvement of the ratee. | 4.45 | 0.67 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 4. The rater asks the ratee for the evidence supporting the latter's performance. | 4.50 | 0.65 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 5. The rater practices the STAR (Situation, Task, Action, and Results) Approach. | 4.33 | 0.77 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 6. The rater asks the ratee to track the latter's performance against the targets. | 4.35 | 0.69 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 7. The rater provides coaching to the ratee to improve work performance and behavior. | 4.42 | 0.70 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 8. The rater records the critical incidents of the ratee on the Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form. | 4.42 | 0.68 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 9. The rater explains the impact of the critical incidents on the job/action plan of the ratee. | 4.43 | 0.68 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 10. The rater ensures that there is a two-way discussion between him and the ratee. | 4.48 | 0.69 | To a Very Great Extent |
| Overall | 4.43 | 0.59 | To a Very Great Extent |

Table 3 shows the rating practices on the implementation of RBPMS in Performance Monitoring and Coaching. The overall mean of 4.43, with a standard deviation of 0.59, suggests that there is a strong culture of ongoing performance engagement, feedback, and developmental support in the observed schools. School-based raters, such as heads and master teachers, are perceived to implement performance monitoring and coaching practices "to a very great extent." Among the indicators, the rater's ask for performance evidence from the ratee had the highest mean ($\bar{x}$ = 4.50). Closely following is the rater's efforts to guarantee two-way feedback and dialogue ($\bar{x}$ = 4.48) and explain important performance inputs ($\bar{x}$ = 4.49) come in close succession. Notably, raters are not only evaluators but also learning leaders, as evidenced by their practice of coaching to improve behavior and performance ($\bar{x}$ = 4.42) and identifying areas for improvement ($\bar{x}$ = 4.45. Additionally, the data show that performance tracking mechanisms (e.g., STAR method – $\bar{x}$ = 4.33; tracking targets – $\bar{x}$ = 4.35) are used in a moderately strong manner. Their comparatively lower scores may indicate areas that require additional training or reinforcement, even though they are still rated "to a very great extent." . Tracking performance against targets (x 4.35, SD = 0.69) and recording critical incidents (x = 4.42, SD = 0.68) are also important elements of a good performance monitoring system. Moreover, the explanation of the effects of critical incidents on job performance (x = 4.43, SD = 0.68) helps in transparency and accountability. Lastly, the rater's attempt to document critical incidents ($\bar{x}$ = 4.42) and describe how they affected performance ($\bar{x}$ = 4.43) highlights a dedication to data-informed coaching and documentation, which raises the legitimacy and utility of monitoring reports.

Table 4 shows the rating practices of RBPMS in Performance Review and Evaluation. the overall mean of 4.50 (SD = 0.58) represents a "very great extent" of rating practices' implementation under the RBPMS's Performance Review and Evaluation component. "The rater focuses on the performance issue, not on the person" and "The rater ensures that the evaluation is based on evidence" are the

indicators with the highest means (4.55). Furthermore, the high scores for "The rater is fair and objective in evaluating the performance" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.51) and "The rater discusses strengths and improvement needs" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.53) demonstrate the existence of a formative evaluation culture. The statements "The rater and the ratee adopt a joint problem-solving approach" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.43) and "The rater focuses on solving problems or correcting a behavior" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.44) received moderate but still high scores. The practice of encouraging self-appraisal ($\bar{x}$ = 4.49) and managing performance review meetings in a supportive atmosphere ($\bar{x}$ = 4.50) indicates a deliberate effort to involve ratees in reflective practice.

**Table 4.** Assessment of Rating Practices of Results-Based Performance Management System in Performance Review and Evaluation

| Performance Review and Evaluation | Mean | Std. Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The rater manages meeting with the ratee. | 4.50 | 0.66 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 2. The rater creates the right atmosphere during the meeting. | 4.50 | 0.65 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 3. The rater focuses on the performance issue, not on the person. | 4.55 | 0.65 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 4. The rater encourages the ratee to do self-appraisal. | 4.49 | 0.64 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 5. The rater is fair and objective in evaluating the performance of the ratee. | 4.51 | 0.67 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 6. The rater ensures that the evaluation is based on evidences. | 4.55 | 0.63 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 7. The rater focuses on solving problems or correcting a behavior. | 4.44 | 0.66 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 8. The rater and the ratee adopt a joint problem-solving approach. | 4.43 | 0.68 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 9. The rater evaluates the manifestations of each of the ratee's competencies. | 4.48 | 0.66 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 10. The rater discusses strengths and improvement needs. | 4.53 | 0.63 | To a Very Great Extent |
| Overall | 4.50 | 0.58 | To a Very Great Extent |

**Table 5.** Assessment of Rating Practices of Results-Based Performance Management System in Performance Rewards and Development Planning

| Performance Rewards and Development Planning | Mean | Std. Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The rater and the ratee identify development needs. | 4.46 | 0.63 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 2. The rater asks for the rate to prepare action plans to meet development needs. | 4.44 | 0.68 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 3. The rater links the ratee's performance rating to the Performance Based Incentive System, Performance Based Bonus, and Step Increment. | 4.43 | 0.70 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 4. The rater recommends attending the ratee to seminars and workshops for professional development. | 4.40 | 0.71 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 5. The rater discusses and provides qualitative comments, observations, and recommendations to the ratee. | 4.46 | 0.67 | To a Very Great Extent |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6. The rater considers the rates with high performance as candidates for promotion. | 4.46 | 0.65 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 7. The rater assigns the ratee a high-performance rating to task forces, committees, or special projects. | 4.40 | 0.69 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 8. The rater introduces enhancements to the job of the ratee. | 4.43 | 0.64 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 9. The rater employs appropriate developmental intervention. | 4.42 | 0.65 | To a Very Great Extent |
| 10. The rater recognizes the high performance rating of the ratee. | 4.47 | 0.69 | To a Very Great Extent |
| Overall | 4.44 | 0.59 | To a Very Great Extent |

Table 5 shows an overall weighted mean of 4.44 and a standard deviation of 0.59, which suggests that the RBPMS's Performance Rewards and Development Planning procedures are implemented to a high degree. Consistent with the RBPMS and Performance-Based Bonus (PBB) framework, this outcome shows that raters in the Department of Education, actively identify, reward, and plan ratees' development based on their performance. Recognizing exceptional performance is crucial, as evidenced by the highest-rated indicator, "The rater recognizes the high performance rating of the ratee" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.47). Additionally, "The rater and the ratee identify development needs" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.46), "The rater considers ratees with high performance as candidates for promotion" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.46), and "The rater discusses and provides qualitative comments, observations, and recommendations" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.46) all exhibit the same degree of emphasis. These procedures show a strong fit with the developmental goal of performance management systems, which address career advancement and growth in addition to evaluation. Furthermore, the indicator "The rater links the ratee's performance rating to the Performance-Based Incentive System, PBB, and step increment" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.43) shows that raters understand and apply the reward mechanisms embedded in the Philippine Civil Service System, linking performance to tangible incentives. On the development side, high scores for indicators such as "The rater recommends seminars/workshops" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.40) and "The rater assigns high-performing ratees to special projects" ($\bar{x}$ = 4.40) imply that teachers are not only evaluated but also given opportunities to lead and grow through task enhancements. Even though every indicator was rated "to a very great extent," the comparatively low means in professional development and intervention suggest that structured development programs need to be strengthened even more.

**Table 6**. Significant Difference in the Rating Practices of RBPMS when grouped according to Age

| RPMS Phases | Kruskal Wallis H- Value | p-value | Decision | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Planning and Commitment | 6.5778 | 0.3617 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Monitoring and Coaching | 3.6112 | 0.7291 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Review and Evaluation | 6.4351 | 0.3763 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Rewards and Development Planning | 5.5302 | 0.4778 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |

Table 6 shows the significant difference in rating practices of RBPMS when grouped according to age. Among different age groups, shows no significant differences in any of its four phases: Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, Performance Review and Evaluation, and Performance Rewards and Development Planning. The decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis (Ho) is made because all p-values during these phases are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that the RBPMS's rating procedures do not differ significantly among age groups. This suggests that teachers and instructional leaders use the rating processes consistently and uniformly, irrespective of respondents' ages.

**Table 7.** Significant Difference in the Rating Practices of RBPMS when grouped according to Gender

| RPMS Phases | Mann-Whitney U-value | p-value | Decision | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Planning and Commitment | 2089.5000 | 0.6250 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Monitoring and Coaching | 1983.5000 | 0.3312 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Review and Evaluation | 2009.0000 | 0.3856 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Rewards and Development Planning | 2024.5000 | 0.4229 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |

Table 7 shows the significant difference in the rating practices of RBPMS when grouped according to gender. The respondents indicated that there is no statistically significant difference observed regarding the rating practices of RBPMS between genders in all four phases: Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, Performance Review and Evaluation, and Performance Rewards and Development Planning, as evidenced by the p-values exceeding the 0.05 level of significance across all RBPMS phases.

**Table 8.** Significant Difference in the Rating Practices of RBPMS when grouped according to Civil Status

| RPMS Phases | Kruskal Wallis H-Value | p-value | Decision | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Planning and Commitment | 0.4818 | 0.7859 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Monitoring and Coaching | 0.8741 | 0.6459 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Review and Evaluation | 0.0383 | 0.9810 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Rewards and Development Planning | 0.3063 | 0.8580 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |

Table 8 shows a significant difference in the rating practices of RBPMS when grouped according to civil status. The results show that in all four RBPMS phases, Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, Performance Review and Evaluation, and Performance Rewards and Development Planning, p-values were all above the common significance difference of 0.05, which means that the civil status groups does not significantly affect of RBPMS differently at the statistical level.

**Table 9.** Significant Difference in the Rating Practices of RBPMS when grouped according to Highest Educational Attainment

| RPMS Phases | Kruskal Wallis H-Value | p-value | Decision | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Planning and Commitment | 6.7517 | 0.1496 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Monitoring and Coaching | 12.6564 | 0.0131 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Performance Review and Evaluation | 17.4018 | 0.0016 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Performance Rewards and Development Planning | 5.4649 | 0.2428 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |

Table 9 shows the significant difference in the rating practices of RBPMS when grouped according to educational attainment. The findings reveals both non-significant and significant findings across different RBPMS phases. Based on the results, there are statistically significant differences in two RBPMS phases: Performance Monitoring and Coaching and Performance Review and Evaluation. However, there are no significant differences in the other two phases. Performance Monitoring and Coaching show a significant difference, p-value = 0.0131, which shows that educational attainment, especially for those with earned units leading to a doctorate degree, might positively affect the way teachers and instructional leaders were engaged with monitoring and coaching. Similarly, Performance Review and Evaluation, which recorded a p-value is highly significant at 0.0016. Thus, it seems that respondents holding doctorate degrees are relatively perceptive of performance reviews than other educational groups, as their critical and evaluative skills are more mature. The main findings on Performance Monitoring and Coaching and Performance Review and Evaluation indicate that respondents with higher attainment may be more responsive to the processes for performance management in comparison to their less-educated counterparts.

**Table 10.** Significant Difference in the Rating Practices of RBPMS When Grouped According To Length of Service

| RPMS Phases | Kruskal Wallis H-value | p-value | Decision | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Planning and Commitment | 1.4065 | 0.4950 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Monitoring and Coaching | 6.2512 | 0.0439 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Performance Review and Evaluation | 2.5365 | 0.2813 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Rewards and Development Planning | 1.0597 | 0.5887 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |

Table 10 shows the significant difference in rating practices of RBPMS when grouped according to length of service. The respondents indicated that there is no considerable difference across groups of varying periods of length of service (0-3 years, 4-10 years, and more than 10 years). The p-value was 0.4950, failing to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, Performance Planning and Commitment tend to be uniform for every teacher and instructional leader. A lack of variation may even be considered indicative of the absence of influence exerted by tenure over the planning process, since all personnel involved in the process must follow the same procedure regardless of the amount of experience they have. The outcome of the Performance Monitoring and Coaching phase is statistically significant with a p-value of 0.0439, thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. The Performance Review and Evaluation had no statistical difference at p-value = 0.2813, indicating consistency in the review process with regards to length of service, implying that evaluation systems are the same for both lengths of service, with a possible application of one single system with equality in terms of reviews applied on the personnel regarding fair judgment and assessments. The Performance Rewards and Development Planning had no statistical difference at p-value = 0.5887, indicating that school personnel who served the organization for 10 more years enjoyed equal reward and chances of development.

**Table 11.** Significant Difference in the Rating Practices of RBPMS when grouped according to Position

| RPMS Phases | Kruskal Wallis H-value | p-value | Decision | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Planning and Commitment | 9.6437 | 0.4723 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Monitoring and Coaching | 16.4264 | 0.0881 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Review and Evaluation | 16.2135 | 0.0937 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |
| Performance Rewards and Development Planning | 10.0845 | 0.4331 | Fail to Reject Ho | Not Significant |

Table 11 shows the significant difference in rating practices of RBPMS when grouped according to position. The results indicated that there is no significant difference in rating practices of RBPMS regarding the respondent's position. In which the p-value for all categories such as the performance planning and commitment, monitoring and coaching, reviewing and evaluation, rewards and development planning also exceeds the established significance difference at 0.05. Specifically, the performance planning and commitment, the results found that p-value is 0.4723 and showed that there is no significant difference in the different teaching positions' perspective in the implementation of RBPMS. All these trends of performance areas: monitor and coach; review and evaluate; rewards, and development planning have the p-values at 0.0881; 0.0937; and 0.4331; respectively. These findings indicated that the respondents, regardless of position, have similar experiences and levels of engagement with the RBPMS.

Table 12 shows the challenges in the implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System. Implementation of RPMS in educational institutions present a series of challenges that may limit the perceptions and potential of the program. From the data displayed below, it is evident that several of these challenges leave a slightly evident that impact on the overall process, as indicated by the average mean (x=1.86; SD= 0.90) across the various challenges.

One of the challenges is the rare provision of feedback for rating. In the mean score it is 1.95 along with a standard deviation of 1.12; it has a rating of being slightly evident. The lack of thorough assessments (x=1.93) and the lack of linkage between performance and rewards (x=1.97) indicate that the system is not totally integrated with other organizational processes like compensation, development, or internal staffing. The absence of accountability from raters(x=1.85), suggests a minimal mechanism in place to make raters responsible for accurate evaluations. Additionally, some raters, having a relatively high average score of 2.00, do not perform cross-comparison side-by-side, which otherwise would have aided in evaluating fairly and consistently. While raters cannot be said to be consistent with each other (x=1.89). One of the significant barriers is that the assessment process is covered in mystery (x= 2.20), which hinders transparency. There is a result that processes are sometimes lengthy, and many raters opt to use last year's ratings for convenience because of extensive documentation (x = 1.80). It follows that there may be inefficiency and further disengagement in the performance management process (Goldring et al., 2015). The lack of adequate training for instructional leaders scores a mean 1.69, as well as the emphasis on historical performance (x=1.76), which resulted in not being evident.

Table 12. Challenges in the Implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System

| Challenges | Mean | Std. Deviation | Verbal Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Assessments are kept secret - Even though a ratee's performance rating might be shown publicly, the details of their performance appraisals are usually kept private. This secrecy can sometimes allow the raters to show favoritism, discriminate, or be overly subjective. By keeping these ratings hidden, raters can avoid having honest conversations about fairness. | 2.20 | 1.37 | Slightly Evident |

Table 13 shows the findings of rating practices of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) according to demographic profile, for several phases, such as length of service and

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. Cross comparisons are not required - the system does not require raters to do a side-by-side comparison, comparing each ratee with one another. | .00 | .16 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 3. Disconnected from rewards - getting a merit raise, bonus, or promotion is completely disconnected from an employee's performance appraisal scores. | .97 | .11 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 4. Infrequent feedback - no formal feedback is given to the ratee periodically. | .95 | .12 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 5. No comprehensive FGD assessment - although ratees in the school are assessed, there is no simultaneous overall assessment of the teachers. | .93 | .04 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 6. A focus on the squeaky wheel - the system focuses on weak performers. | .91 | .07 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 7. No second review - even though the process may have impact on salary, job security, and promotion, the assessment is done by a single rater only. | .91 | .11 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 8. Inconsistency across raters - Some raters are naturally more generous, while others are stricter. As a result, ratees with more generous raters might have a better chance of being promoted because they receive higher ratings. Without clear benchmarks to follow, these differences can lead to inconsistencies. | .89 | .10 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 9. No integration - the process is not fully integrated with compensation, development, or staffing (internal movement). | .89 | .08 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 10. High anxiety - uncertainty can cause many ratees high levels of anxiety weeks before the evaluation process. | .88 | .08 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 11. Lack of accountability - raters are not measured or held accountable for providing accurate feedback. | .85 | .06 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 12. Recency errors - raters, especially those who don't consult employee files and data, tend to evaluate based primarily on events that occurred during the last few months (rather than over the entire year). | .81 | .01 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 13. Many possible emotional consequences - if performance appraisal is blotched, there is a possibility of decrease in ratee engagement, trust, rater brand strength, teamwork, and innovation contribution. | .80 | .01 | 1 | Slightly Evident |
| 14. A time-consuming process - most of the documents are incredibly long and slow. As a result, some raters routinely recycle "last year's" evaluations. | .78 | .99 | 0 | Not Evident |
| 15. One-way communication - some raters simply give the employee the form to quickly sign, and they don't even solicit feedback. Ratees are intimidated by raters and the process, and as a result, they say nothing during or after the appraisal. | .78 | .03 | 1 | Not Evident |
| 16. It is historical - the focus is on feedback in the past. | .76 | .03 | 1 | Not |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Evident |
| 17. The process is managed by raters who have no complete understanding of performance and productivity. | .74 | 1.04 | Not Evident |
| 18. No appeal process – a ratee who disagrees with his appraisal is seldom given the opportunity to challenge the results with a neutral party. | .73 | 0.95 | Not Evident |
| 19. No alerts - the ratees are not notified midstream should their performance change to the point where it was suddenly dramatically below standards. | .71 | 0.97 | Not Evident |
| 20. Instructional leaders are not trained - raters are not trained in how to assess and give honest feedback. | .69 | 1.01 | Not Evident |
| Overall | .86 | 0.90 | Slightly Evident |

highest educational attainment. As presented in the table, there were corresponding p-values (all < 0.05), which means that rejecting the null hypothesis (Ho) in every examined relationship suggests that these demographic characteristics have a statistically significant impact on respondents' ratings of RBPMS. Respondents' evaluation of monitoring and coaching varies greatly depending on their level of education. Respondents with the highest education, particularly in earned units leading to a doctorate degree, might be more familiar with professional feedback procedures and performance systems.

Table 13. Summary of Findings on Rating Practices of RBPMS when grouped according to Demographic Profile

| RBPMS Phases | Demographic Profile | Mean | p-value | Decision | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Monitoring and Coaching | Highest Educational Attainment | 4.68 | 0.0131 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| | Length of Service | 4.49 | 0.0439 | Reject Ho | Significant |
| Performance Review and Evaluation | Highest Educational Attainment | 4.82 | 0.0016 | Reject Ho | Significant |

There is also a notable variation according to the length of service. Teachers with greater experience, particularly more than 10 years, may be better able to evaluate the coaching and monitoring phase since they are more familiar with the RBPMS cycle. The highest educational attainment demonstrated a significant influence on the rating of the review and evaluation phase.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

The characteristics of the respondents indicate a veteran and educated group of educators. Most participants were aged between 31–35. The overwhelming majority were female and married, corresponding to the general demographics of teachers. Academically, a large percentage of the respondents were postgraduate students, which demonstrates how professional development is well valued. And with a majority having accumulated over 10 years of experience in the teaching profession. The findings indicated that RBPMS's Performance Planning and Commitment procedures are open and successfully applied across all metrics. The consistently high ratings imply that raters (school heads, head teachers, and master teachers) are highly capable of working with teachers to jointly establish performance goals that are reasonable, equitable, and clear. Schools employ coaching and

performance monitoring practices with a high degree of consistency and efficacy, based on professional development, objective documentation, and teamwork.

In addition to evaluating performance, raters (particularly master teachers, head teachers, and school heads) also serve as developmental coaches, offering insightful criticism and direction in line with RPMS-PPST guidelines. The somewhat lower scores in structured performance tracking tools indicate areas that may require additional support or upskilling, even though the majority of practices are implemented with strength. It is clear that the RBPMS's rating practices in Performance Review and Evaluation procedures are methodical, developmentally targeted, and demonstrate a high degree of professionalism, fairness, and transparency. By focusing feedback on observable performance data and keeping evaluations nonjudgmental, raters are putting best practices into practice. Also, concluded that the concepts of motivation, acknowledgment, and career progression are closely related to RBPMS rating procedures in the rewards and development phase. Raters successfully recognize exceptional work, connect achievements to professional advancement, and pinpoint areas in need of development. Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) across several demographic groups indicated that performance evaluations were generally consistent, regardless of age, gender, civil status, and position. Statistically revealed that there are no significant differences across all RBPMS.

The result concluded that educational attainment may have influenced perceptions of specific RBPMS components, particularly Performance Monitoring and Coaching and Performance Review and Evaluation. And study found that the duration of service had a small but significant impact on performance perceptions within the RBPMS. The successful implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) in educational institutions was hampered by structural and procedural difficulties that undercut its intended purpose. One of the most serious issues had been a lack of feedback to ratees, which was critical for directing performance development and aligning individual efforts with institutional goals. Inconsistent ratings, performance integration with rewards, a lack of transparency, and perceived partiality further undermined the credibility and fairness of the RBPMS process.

The researchers also suggest on the following (a) further strengthen and institutionalize the Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) by determining best practices of raters in performance planning, monitoring, evaluation, and rewards; (b) 2.        Future research may explore the influences and factors that affect the educational attainment and length of service in specific areas of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS), particularly Performance Monitoring and Coaching, and Performance Review and Evaluation.

# REFERENCES

[1]   Armstrong, M. (2014). Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice (13th ed.). Kogan Page.
[2]   Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015: Guidelines on the establishment and implementation of RPMS in the Department of Education. Department of Education.
[3]   Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 4, s. 2017: Guidelines on the adoption of the RPMS for teachers using the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. Department of Education.
[4]   Department of Education. (2020). RPMS-PPST manual for teachers and school heads. Department of Education.
[5]   Dizon, A. M. (2018). The impact of fair performance rating practices on teacher motivation. Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, 4(1), 55–70.
[6]   Dizon, A. M. (2019). The impact of performance coaching on teacher motivation and efficiency. Journal of Educational Leadership and Practice, 6(1), 33–45.
[7]   Mamauag, M. A., & Antonio, R. (2022). Implementation and impact of RPMS-PPST on teacher performance. Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies.
[8]   Ministry of Education, Singapore. (2016). Performance management and evaluation of educators, students, and schools. https://www.moe.gov.sg
[9]   National Conference of State Legislatures. (2018). Student growth models in teacher evaluations. https://www.ncsl.org/research/education/student-growth-models-in-teacher-evaluations.aspx
[10]  Ormilla, R. C. G. (2021). The implementation of Results-Based Performance Management System in public elementary schools. Management Research Journal, 10(1), 13–23. https://doi.org/10.37134/mrj.vol10.1.2.2021

**Statements And Declarations**

Ethical Approval: This study was conducted in strict adherence to ethical research standards. The researcher ensures that no participants were harmed in any way during the conduct of the study, and all procedures were carried out with respect for the rights, dignity, and well-being of the individuals involved.

Declaration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Scientific Writing: Writing the manuscript is not generated in AI tools.