



Level of Practice in the Implementation of DepEd's Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS)

Deo Pasion Urbano PhD^{a}, Melanie G. Gurat PhD^{a*}*

^a Department of Education, Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines

^b Saint Mary's University, Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.4.823.50165>

ABSTRACT

This quantitative study assessed the implementation of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) in evaluating teachers' performance in the Department of Education (DepEd) Schools Division of Nueva Vizcaya. Data were gathered through a survey, and the findings revealed that coaches and raters implemented RPMS to a very great extent, likely motivated by the Performance-Based Incentive System (PBIS). However, certain indicators showed incomplete implementation. The study highlights the importance of orientation, training, and strengthening recognition programs to enhance RPMS implementation.

Keywords: coaching, monitoring, planning, review, rewarding

1. INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Teachers play a pivotal role in shaping the educational landscape and nurturing the future generation's intellectual and socio-economic development. Recognizing the dynamic global trends and demands of the 21st century, educational systems worldwide have undergone significant transformations to equip learners with the essential skills and competencies needed to thrive in the modern world (Quilang, 2017). 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 (Lazaro, 2017; SEAMEO, 2012).

While the curriculum shift holds great promise for educational advancement, it is essential to examine its effectiveness and impact on teacher performance. Assessing teacher performance is crucial for ensuring the quality of education and improving instructional practices (Barber & Moushed, 2007; Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2009). In the Philippines, the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) has been implemented to evaluate teacher performance and align it with the objectives of key result areas (KRAs) (Department of Education, 2015). It has four phases, namely performance planning and commitment, performance monitoring and coaching, performance review and evaluation, and performance rewarding and development planning.

The foundation of the RPMS can be linked to expectancy theory and goal-setting theory. Expectancy theory posits that individuals are motivated to perform well when they believe their efforts will lead to desired performance outcomes (Vroom, 1964). In the context of RPMS, teachers are encouraged to set clear and challenging performance commitments (goals) during the initial phase, where they define their objectives and align them with the school's overall goals (Department of Education, 2015). This goal-setting process fosters a proactive approach to professional development, as teachers are more likely to be motivated to achieve their commitments when they believe their efforts will be recognized and rewarded.

During the performance monitoring and coaching phase, the principles of expectancy theory come into play again. Teachers' progress and adherence to their performance commitments are regularly monitored and evaluated. Coaching and feedback are provided to support teachers in enhancing their instructional practices and addressing any challenges that may arise (Department of Education, 2015). The continuous monitoring and feedback mechanisms reinforce the teachers' belief that their efforts and improvements in performance will lead to better outcomes and recognition.

The performance review and evaluation phase further aligns with both expectancy theory and goal-setting theory. The assessment of teachers' competencies and effectiveness in achieving their set goals provides valuable insights into their strengths and areas for improvement (Department of Education, 2015). When teachers receive constructive feedback and recognition for their achievements, it reinforces their motivation to continue striving for excellence in their instructional practices and professional growth.

In the final phase of RPMS, acknowledging and rewarding exemplary performance, teachers are recognized and incentivized for their outstanding achievements (Department of Education, 2015). This aligns with the principles of expectancy theory, as teachers who have demonstrated high

performance and commitment are more likely to believe that their efforts will be appropriately acknowledged and rewarded. Moreover, the formulation of development plans to address any identified areas of improvement provides teachers with clear guidance and support for continuous growth and development.

Notably, Dizon et al. (2018) explored the implementation of RPMS, and it was found that teachers identified concerns, including lack of accountability. Meaning, that teachers are not evaluated nor given accurate feedback about their performance. Along with this, Mamaug and Antonio (2022) investigated the same in Metro Manila while Ormilla (2021) conducted a similar study in the Cordillera Administrative Region. Their studies found that teachers posed challenges in the implementation of RPMS. While the aforementioned studies were conducted before the pandemic, it is equally important to investigate the implementation of RPMS during times of pandemic. Therefore, this study aimed to assess the level of practice in evaluating teachers' performance within the RPMS framework.

The research findings are expected to provide valuable insights into optimizing the RPMS implementation in the Philippines. By fostering an environment of continuous improvement and support for educators, the study aspires to contribute to the overall quality of education and ultimately benefit the academic achievements of Filipino students in the 21st century.

Theories of Performance Management and the RPMS in the Department of Education (DepEd)

Performance management is a continuous activity that aims to improve employee performance. It has been identified as a system that creates a context for continuous monitoring and measuring activities of individual employees in an organization (Bhattacharya, 2016). In an educational organization, an effective performance management approach is important for the rigorous and demanding nature of the teaching profession (Van Waeyenberg et al., 2020). Further, Steers et al. (2004) mentioned that performance management is underpinned by the expectancy theory.

The Expectancy Theory was introduced by Vroom (1964). According to Hoy and Miskel (2012), this theory is the most valid and dependable conversation regarding motivating individuals to work. Moreover, it provides a general framework for assessing, interpreting, and evaluating employee behavior, as Smith and Rupp (2003) revealed. Notably, researchers used this theory in educational settings, particularly among teachers (Argon, 2015). Purvis et al. (2015) recognized that to be motivated, an individual must think that a given level of effort leads to performance, that performance leads to specific benefits, and that the rewards gained outweigh the costs connected with the effort. The Expectancy Theory has these three major components called valence, instrumentality, and expectancy, hence, it is known as the VIE Theory.

The individual's idea that effort will result in the desired performance goals is referred to as expectancy (Williams, 2020). Accordingly, the notion that "I can achieve this" is referred to as expectancy. This notion is often based on a person's prior experience, self-confidence, and the perceived difficulty of the performance standard or objective. Competence, goal complexity, and control are factors related to an individual's expectation perception.

Moreover, Battacharya (2016) affirmed that expectancy is determined by a person's conviction that engaging in a given sort of behavior would undoubtedly assist the individual in achieving desired performance objectives. As a result, this feature assists individuals in judging if they have the necessary skill sets to do a task correctly.

On the other hand, the assumption that you will obtain a practical consequence if you perform effectively is referred to as instrumentality. It is the process of giving a reward to the desired performance outcome. In order to have a favorable influence on someone's future efforts at work, a reward should adhere to fundamental guidelines, according to Indeed Editorial Team (2021). Firstly, the incentive that a team member can expect should be expressed properly. Secondly, individuals should trust that their employer or supervisor will appropriately reward them for their efforts. Lastly, employees should have clear expectations regarding their remuneration.

Valence is the distinctive value that an individual places on a certain result (Davis, 2020). It is the value that a person sets on the rewards (Davis, 2013). Accordingly, individuals are linked with valence when they sincerely seek the desired outcome.

The Expectancy Theory analyzes organizational development outcomes and measures employee performance in relation to organizational goals (Hillman & Dalziel 2003). This approach focuses on analyzing individuals' unique behavior based on their expectation calculations (Battacharya, 2016). It is worth noting that the theory also holds the notion that various people expect different things from their organization.

As mentioned earlier, this theory is being used to assess teachers through employee performance in the educational organization. In the Philippines, the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) is used to assess performance management among public school teachers in the Department of Education (DepEd) to ensure access, promote equity and improve the quality of basic education in the country. The RPMS is an organization-wide process that ensures workers' work activities are directed toward attaining the DepEd vision, mission, values, and strategic goals (Dizon et al., 2018). Moreover, it was stipulated in DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015 that this is a framework for managing, monitoring, and measuring performance and identifying human resource and organizational development needs.

The Individual Performance Commitment Review Form (IPCRF) is used in Philippine public schools to evaluate performance. According to Sabio and Manalo (2020), it acts as a guide for teachers and should be written before the start of classes and implemented and evaluated at the end of the school year. There are two competencies included in IPCRF: functional and core behavioral competencies.

Along with the RPMS in DepEd, the country has Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) from the Civil Service Commission (CSC). SPMS is the basis of RPMS in measuring the performance of government employees and the basis for performance-based tenure and incentives. In relation to this, DepEd observes the Program to Institutionalize Meritocracy and Excellence in Human Resource Management (PRIME-HRM), inculcating

meritocracy and excellence in public service human resource management through a reward program, recognition, empowerment, and continuous development. RPMS has four phases: performance planning and commitment, performance monitoring and coaching, performance review and evaluation, and performance rewarding and development planning.

As a result of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, the demand for teaching and learning was altered for the School Year 2020-2021. The DepEd has changed its focus to providing education remotely via different distance learning delivery modalities (DLDMs). The Department's current efforts and those of its schools and workforce are aimed at generating learning resources and upskilling and retooling teachers to support the DLDMs chosen by schools. As learning delivery evolves, so do teachers' responsibilities to their students and their expected performance. Teachers' expectations must be reflected in their performance evaluations through a more contextualized RPMS.

As indicated in the DM-PHROD-2021-0010 of the department, Phase 1, which is Performance Planning and Commitment entails the capacity building activities and presentation of RPMS tools in the time of COVID-19 pandemic. Along this phase, teachers are expected to perform self-assessment and formulate initial development plans.

During the second phase: *performance monitoring and coaching*, school heads and raters are expected to perform their duties as coaches who give feedbacks on ratees' (teachers) current performance. In like manner, the school head together with raters and ratee undergo mid-year review with development planning, aiming to further assist ratee towards the desired goals of the department.

Meanwhile, a year-end review is conducted a week after graduation for Phase 3, *Performance review and evaluation*. It is the phase where means of verifications of teachers aligned with the desired objectives of performance cycle are collected and compiled in a portfolio. This is reviewed by the raters and final ratings of the ratees are computed by the raters.

Lastly, Phase 4, or *performance rewarding and development planning* entails ways forward in development planning based on the result of the performance review and evaluation. The changes to RPMS, including its tools, processes, and protocols, for SY 2020-2021 capture the current DepEd system that governs teachers' functions.

2. METHODOLOGY

In achieving the objectives of this study, the researcher employed a quantitative research approach. The descriptive type of research was utilized to assess the level of practice in evaluating teachers' performance along with the four phases of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS).

For the first phase, secondary teachers in the SDO – Quirino served as respondents of the pilot study who were selected through a simple random sampling technique. Participation of teachers in SDO – Quirino helped determine the reliability of the questionnaire on the level of practice in the implementation of the RPMS. Teachers in SDO – Quirino were chosen to be respondents of the pilot study because they have the same rank or *plantilla* position.

For the second phase, proficient teachers in all secondary public high schools of the SDO Nueva Vizcaya served as respondents of the main study identified through simple random sampling.

Questionnaire on the Implementation of RPMS This part of the survey questionnaire was adapted from Dizon et al. (2018) to assess the extent how raters have employed RPMS to the ratees or proficient teachers. This questionnaire comprises items on implementing four phases of RPMS: performance planning and commitment, performance monitoring and coaching, performance review and evaluation, and performance rewarding and developmental planning. It was modified by the researcher and further aligned with Department Order No. 2, series of 2015. The questionnaire on the Implementation of Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) has a Cronbach alpha of 0.942. The computed Cronbach alpha were reported excellent by Fleiss (1971) and almost perfect by Landis and Koch (1977).

The level of practice in the implementation of the four phases of the RPMS is presented in tabular form utilizing mean, standard deviation, and adjectival rating. Table 1 presents the level of practice in evaluating teachers' performance on the four phases of RPMS together with its description adapted from Dizon et al. (2018).

Table 1. The Level of Practice in the Implementation of the Four Phases of the RPMS

Mean	Adjectival Rating	Description
4.500-5.000	To a Very Great Extent	Indicator of phases of RPMS is being implemented at all times.
3.500-4.499	To a Great Extent	Most of the time, the indicator of phases of RPMS is being implemented.
2.500-3.499	To a Little Extent	There are several times that indicator of phases of RPMS is being implemented.
1.500-2.499	To a Very Little Extent	Indicator of phases of RPMS is rarely or almost not being implemented.
1.000-1.499	No extent at all	Indicator of phases of RPMS is not implemented at all times.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) is an organizational-wide procedure that ensures employees' work activities are directed toward achieving the Department of Education's mission, vision, values, and strategic goals. Based on DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015, the RPMS has four

phases designed to assess the development of teachers' performance from (a) performance planning and commitment, (b) monitoring and coaching, (c) review and evaluation, and (d) rewards and development planning. The level of practice in the implementation of the four phases of RPMS in evaluating teachers' performance is presented in Sections 3.1 to 3.4.

3.1. The Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Planning and Commitment

As presented, the first phase of the RPMS is Performance Planning and Commitment. It consists of eight indicators, which are composed of the following: (a) accomplishment of the Self-Assessment Tool (SAT), (b) presentation of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS), (c) accomplishment of Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF), and (d) coming up with development plans. The mean, standard deviation, and qualitative description of the level of implementation in evaluating teachers in the performance planning and commitment are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Planning and Commitment

Indicators of Performance Planning and Commitment	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. The rater checks that the ratee has accomplished the Self-Assessment Tool (SAT).	4.55	0.55	To a Very Great Extent
2. The rater discusses the results of the ratee's Self-Assessment Tool (SAT) for the development plan.	4.47	0.58	To a Great Extent
3. The rater discusses with the ratee the capacity building activities or presentation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the time of COVID-19 (S.Y. 2020-2021).	4.50	0.60	To a Very Great Extent
4. The rater discusses the different parts and steps in accomplishing the Individual Performance Review and Commitment Form (IPCRF) methodically (teacher's profile, set of competencies, rating, and development needs).	4.51	0.62	To a Very Great Extent
5. The rater ensures that the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) is accomplished before the start of the rating period/opening of classes.	4.49	0.64	To a Great Extent
6. The rater ensures that the performance targets and development plans are based on the results of the Self-Assessment Tool (SAT).	4.53	0.61	To a Very Great Extent
7. The rater and ratee agree on the initial developmental planning.	4.51	0.57	To a Very Great Extent
8. The rater facilitates the upgrading and review of the D.P. with the ratee; and the ratee upgrades his/her D.P. based on the IPCRF	4.49	0.60	To a Great Extent
Overall Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Planning and Commitment	4.51	0.52	To a Very Great Extent

It can be gleaned in Table 2 that the level of practice in the implementation in the second phase of the RPMS has a mean range from 4.47 to 4.55 with a standard deviation range from 0.55 to 0.64. This implies that raters and coaches perform their duties in performance planning and commitment to at least a great extent. Among the eight indicators under this phase, the indicator with the highest mean ($M=4.55$, $SD=0.55$) on the level of practice in the implementation of performance planning and commitment is indicator 1, "the rater checks the ratee has accomplished the Self-Assessment Tool (SAT)". This may suggest that the most implemented indicator, among other indicators under this phase, is that raters or coaches assure that teachers accomplish their SAT. Also, this may mean that teachers rate themselves at the start of the performance cycle, making an informal self-reflection to clarify performance expectations and determine which functional and core behavioral competencies to prioritize.

The SAT is a common tool for evaluating teacher performance (The RPMS Manual for Teachers and School Heads, 2021). Moreover, it can be used as a starting point for informal self-reflection to clarify performance expectations and determine which competencies to prioritize. It can also be used to track the progress or improvement of teacher competencies and to determine whether the interventions offered are effective (DM-PHROD-2021-0498). SAT can be used to guide discussions about goal-setting and professional development requirements. It can be noted that indicator 1 of this phase has the lowest standard deviation, equal to 0.55. This suggests that it has points relatively close to the computed mean than other indicators in this phase.

On the other hand, indicator 2, "discussion of the result of SAT for proficient teachers' development plan by the raters" has the lowest computed mean on the level of practice in the implementation of performance planning and commitment ($M=4.47$, $SD=0.58$). This implies that the least implemented indicator points to the fact that the rater discusses the results of ratee's SAT for the development plans. Further, this indicator has been implemented by raters in the performance cycle most of the time.

Indicator 6 of phase 1, "the rater ensures that the performance targets and development plans are based on the results of the SAT" is the indicator with the second-highest computed mean on the level of practice in the implementation of performance planning and commitment ($M=4.53$, $SD=0.61$). This means that the development plans or target performance of proficient teachers are aligned with the results of the SAT. Further, it can be assumed that the desired activities to address teachers' development needs could possibly be met because of their alignment with the SAT.

Also, indicator 6 has the greatest number of teachers ($n=105$) who revealed that their raters and coaches implement this indicator to a great extent during the first phase of the performance cycle. Equivalently, this manifests that more raters always implement this indicator than those who almost do not implement it during the rating period.

It can also be gleaned from Table 2 that raters of proficient teachers in the SDO Nueva Vizcaya explain the importance of the RPMS thoroughly to a very great extent. This is a manifestation that teachers are guided in the implementation of RPMS. On the cover page of IPCRF, it was indicated that DepEd had implemented a RPMS aligned with its philosophy to (a) connect teachers' accomplishments and make a significant contribution to the achievement of the institution's vision and mission, (b) encourage individual, and team development, participation, and commitment, and (c) develop teachers, both professionally and personally. It is a collaborative effort between the superior and the employee that allows for an open discussion of job expectations, key performance indicators, objectives, and how these relate to overall departmental goals. It provides a forum for agreement on performance and behavior standards that lead to professional and personal growth within the organization.

Interestingly, two indicators have the same mean ($M=4.51$) in phase 1 of RPMS but with different computed standard deviations. These indicators are indicator 4, "the rater discusses the different parts and steps in accomplishing the Individual Performance Commitment Review Form (IPCRF) methodically" ($SD=0.62$) and indicator 7, "the rater and ratee agree on the initial developmental planning" ($SD=0.57$). It exemplifies that proficient teachers are guided in filling out the required data on IPCRF, and teachers with their immediate supervisors agree on their initial plans for their professional development needs to a very great extent. It is apparent that these two indicators are revealed to be implemented at almost all times.

The result on the level of practice in the implementation of indicator 4 of the performance planning and commitment differs from the study of Dizon et al. (2018). They identified that teachers in SDO Gapan, Nueva Ecija implemented this indicator to a little extent. Whereas, it was found in this study that teachers in SDO Nueva Vizcaya implement the indicator to a very great extent.

It is shown in Table 2 that indicator 3, "the rater discusses with the ratee the capacity building activities or presentation of RPMS in the time of COVID-19" (S.Y. 2020-2021) has a mean equivalent to 4.50, labeled as very great extent with a standard deviation of 0.60. This reveals that raters generally implemented this indicator of performance planning and commitment at all times.

It can also be noted that indicators 5 and 8 ("the rater ensures that the IPCRF is accomplished before the start of the rating period or opening of classes" and "the rater facilitates the upgrading and review of the development plan with the ratee and the ratees upgrade their development plans based on IPCRF") have equal computed means ($M=4.49$). Interestingly, these indicators are generally implemented to a great extent where it can be assumed that these are almost implemented most of the time. It is evident that raters facilitate the upgrading and review of the initial development plans, which serves as a guide for proficient teachers to modify their development or action plans. It can be assumed that upgrading the development needs aligned with the suggestions of raters may increase the chance of attaining the target performance of teachers.

Also, it is good to note that the ratee sees to it that IPCRF is being accomplished before the start of classes to ensure that teachers understand their target performance and they can perform it aligned with the desired professional development needs or target performance. It can be hypothesized that when teachers know what to perform during the performance cycle, there is a possibility that they may attain all their development needs and could provide means of verifications (MOVs) for their functional competencies. Apparently, this can result in high performance during the evaluation of the RPMS portfolio in phase 4 of the RPMS.

Generally, the level of practice in the implementation of the first phase of the RPMS: performance planning and commitment, has a mean of 4.51 and a standard deviation equal to 0.52. This means that the performance planning commitment phase of the RPMS is implemented among teachers to a very great extent. Equivalently, it implies that indicators of the first phase of RPMS are relatively observed at all times. A low standard deviation may suggest that the overall level of implementation in evaluating teachers in the first phase of RPMS is relatively close to the computed mean.

The level of practice in the implementation of the first phase of RPMS in SDO Gapan is to a great extent, as identified by Dizon et al. (2018). In comparison, this study revealed that it was implemented to a very great extent. Subsequently, this may tell us that raters and coaches in SDO Nueva Vizcaya are more compliant in portraying their duties in the first phase of RPMS than in SDO Gapan.

In line with this, the first phase of the RPMS supports the Goal Setting Theory of Locke (1968). The IET (2021) expouse that the desired goal should be identified – and this was done in the RPMS, particularly the identification of an action plan aligned with the results of SAT. In addition, it follows the SMART model utilized in Goal-Setting Theory, where it is assured that action plans are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and time-bound. In crafting development or action plans for proficient teachers, resources are being identified together with the timeline when activities to meet the development are indicated considering the SMART model.

3.2 The Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Monitoring and Coaching

There are 26 indicators in this phase of RPMS, which involves the following main activities: (a) coaching and mentoring, (b) classroom observation, (c) conduct of Learning Action Cell (LAC), and (d) mid-year review and assessment. Table 3 presents the calculated standard deviation, mean, and qualitative description of the level of practice in the implementation of the second phase of RPMS: performance monitoring and coaching.

Table 3. The Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Monitoring and Coaching

Indicators of Performance Monitoring and Coaching	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. The rater monitors ratee using the Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form (PMCF).	4.49	0.58	To a Great Extent
2. The rater identifies a performance gap or an opportunity to improve teachers' performance using the Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form (PMCF).	4.50	0.57	To a Very Great Extent

Indicators of Performance Monitoring and Coaching	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
3. The coach (rater/observer) gives feedback on the performance of the coachee (teacher). Coach and coachee discuss and agree on problems to be fixed and on the opportunity to move job performance to a higher notch.	4.51	0.59	To a Very Great Extent
4. Coach and coachee work and agree on the action plan or development plan to address the gap and sustain good performance.	4.48	0.58	To a Great Extent
5. The coach sets follow-up sessions to check on the status of the agreed-upon action plan.	4.45	0.60	To a Great Extent
6. The rater discusses with the ratee the general guidelines for the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) Alternative Classroom Observation in the time of COVID-19 (S.Y. 2020-2021).	4.51	0.57	To a Very Great Extent
7. The rater and ratee agree on the mode of observation in the conduct of Alternative Classroom Observation.	4.56	0.58	To a Very Great Extent
8. The observer sees to it that teacher was observed twice (Alternative Classroom Observation) during School Year 2020-2021, excluding formative observations.	4.59	0.55	To a Very Great Extent
9. The observer sees to it that only one mode of observation is used by the teacher in observing the two (2) Alternative Classroom Observation for the entire School Year 2020-2021.	4.53	0.58	To a Very Great Extent
10. The observer sees to it that the first classroom observation is conducted between January and March 2021 and the second classroom observation is conducted between April and May 2021.	4.56	0.55	To a Very Great Extent
11. The observer (rater) rates the teacher (ratee) using the classroom observation rubrics appropriate to teacher's level. Only those indicators expected to be observed in an observation period specified on the table of list of indicators are rated.	4.60	0.54	To a Very Great Extent
12. The observer confers with the teacher to discuss the (1) schedule of the learning action cell (LAC) session intended for demonstration teaching, (2) online observation, or (3) submission of the video lesson.	4.54	0.56	To a Very Great Extent
13. During observation, observers sit at any available seats in the learning action cell (LAC) session or classroom. In the conduct of video lesson, the observer watches the video lesson after submission.	4.53	0.56	To a Very Great Extent
14. The rater observes the teacher the entire class period during a classroom observation.	4.61	0.53	To a Very Great Extent
15. The observer records all observations on the Observation Notes Form.	4.64	0.54	To a Very Great Extent
16. Observers give ratings for the teacher for the conducted lesson delivery through the elected modality.	4.60	0.53	To a Very Great Extent
17. Observers discuss the rating with fellow observers and agree with the final rating.	4.55	0.66	To a Very Great Extent
18. Teacher's strengths and areas for improvement are identified and recommendations are given to improve performance guided by the rubrics for the conduct of classroom observation.	4.59	0.56	To a Very Great Extent
19. The observer conducts a post-conference to discuss with the teacher his or her performance data, including strengths and weaknesses, and agree on the ratings.	4.60	0.54	To a Very Great Extent
20. The observer assists the teacher in preparing development plans after the classroom observation.	4.51	0.63	To a Very Great Extent
21. The rater guides the teacher in preparing documents for the Mid-year Review and Assessment.	4.48	0.63	To a Great Extent
22. The ratee checks the authenticity of the Means of Verifications (MOVs) submitted for Mid-year Review aligned with the objectives per Individual Performance Commitment Review Form (IPCRF).	4.54	0.60	To a Very Great Extent
23. The rater conducts mid-year review and assessment. Rater assesses the teacher's portfolio using the Midyear Survey Form.	4.53	0.59	To a Very Great Extent
24. The rater conducts mid-year review conference to discuss and give feedbacks on initial ratings with the ratee.	4.53	0.56	To a Very Great Extent
25. The rater discusses and provides qualitative comments, observations, and recommendations to the ratee after the mid-year review.	4.55	0.56	To a Very Great Extent
26. The rater and the ratee discuss and prepare initial action plans to meet the development needs of the teacher, aligned with the results of the midyear review.	4.55	0.57	To a Very Great Extent
Overall Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Monitoring and Coaching	4.54	0.49	To a Very Great Extent

Among the 26 indicators, indicator 15, “*the observer records all observations on the observation notes form*”, has the highest computed mean ($M=4.64$, $SD=0.54$). This suggests that this has been the most practiced indicator among all indicators of phase 2 of RPMS. Moreover, it was reported in that this indicator has the greatest number of teachers who identified that indicators of the fourth phase are practiced to a very great extent.

On the other hand, indicator 5, “*the coach sets follow-up sessions to check on the status of the agreed-upon action plan*”, has the lowest computed mean ($M=4.45$, $SD=0.57$), although still considered to have been implemented to a very great extent. Having the lowest computed mean implies indicator 5 is the least implemented indicator during the performance monitoring and coaching phase.

One of the activities that raters do during this phase of RPMS is to “*monitor the ratee using their Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form*” (indicator 1). The computed mean for this indicator on how raters implement this during the performance cycle is 4.49 ($SD=0.58$). This implies that raters generally implement this indicator most of the time in the school. The primary goal of performance monitoring and coaching is to improve teachers' work performance by assisting them in selecting diverse experiences to gain necessary skills applicable to the learning environment. Therefore, it is important to observe this indicator during the performance cycle so that raters can assist in identifying an employee's growth as well as planning and developing new skills (OPM, n.d.). Accordingly, employees and supervisors could collaborate to create plans that may include training, new assignments, job enrichment, self-study, or work details during performance coaching.

There are four other indicators related to this, including indicator 2, “*the rater identifies a performance gap or an opportunity to improve teachers' performance using the PMCF*” which has a weighted mean of 4.50 ($SD=0.57$). It is interesting to note that using the PMCF, most proficient teachers ($n=174$) revealed that their immediate supervisors could be able to identify their needs or weaknesses and opportunities are provided to them to improve their performance during the cycle further.

Another indicator related to indicators 1 and 2 is indicator 3, “*the coach gives feedback on the performance of the coachee (teacher), and they discuss and agree on problems to be fixed and on the opportunity to move job performance to a higher notch*”. The mean for this indicator has a value of 4.51 ($SD=0.59$). It suggests that coaches generally discuss the observed opportunities for coaches to attain higher performance. After that, it is reported that “*the coach and coachee work and agree on the action or development plan to address the gap and sustain good performance*” (indicator 4) was rated to a great extent ($M=4.48$, $SD=0.58$). This hints that aside from identifying some problems to be fixed by proficient teachers, raters practice aiding teachers in crafting development plans most of the time.

After an action plan has been developed, “*the coach sets up follow-up sessions to check on the agreed-upon action plan*” (indicator 5) to observe whether the listed activities and timeline are met during the performance cycle. Based on Table 3, this has been observed to a great extent ($M=4.48$, $SD=0.58$). Further, this indicator of the second phase of RPMS is being implemented most of the time.

Indicator 6 of the second phase, “*the rater discusses with the ratee the general guidelines for the RPMS Alternative Classroom Observation (C.O.) in the time of COVID-19 (S.Y. 2020-2021)*”, has a mean of 4.51 ($SD=0.57$), labeled to a very great extent. Due to the absence of or limited capacity for face-to-face learning, alternative classroom observations for RPMS were only considered for S.Y. 2020-2021. Teachers could choose any of the following: (a) online observation, (b) observation of video lesson, and (c) observation of a demonstration teaching via learning action cell (DepEd, 2020). For the entire school year, only two observations were required to be conducted between January and March 2021 (CO1); and between April and May 2021 (CO2). The computed mean for indicator 6 means that the guidelines and protocols for alternative classroom observations were generally presented by raters to proficient teachers.

In totality, it can be inferred that teachers are well-informed on the conduct of the classroom observations, considering guidelines and protocols. Along with this, there are some considerations that raters have to consider: indicators 7, 8, 9, and 10. The computed mean for the level of practice in the implementation of RPMS in evaluating teachers' performance for these four indicators range from 4.53 to 4.59, and its standard deviation is relatively low. This means that the ratings given by proficient teachers to their raters on how they implement these indicators are relatively around the computed mean.

The computed mean greater than 4.50 indicates that indicators 7, 8, 9 and 10 are evident in schools in the division, in particular,” the *rater and ratee on the mode of observation in the conduct of alternative classroom observation*” (indicator 7). Furthermore, this suggests that using online observation, observation of teachers' video lessons, and demonstration teaching via LAC is agreed among raters and teachers in the schools of SDO Nueva Vizcaya.

As mentioned earlier, there were two classroom observations during the school year, wherein two observations were supposed to utilize the same mode of observations. It means that the modality being used during the second classroom observation must be like what was used during the first observation. With the computed values, it is evident that these are being realized in secondary schools of the division. Also, the expected date for the classroom observation was generally implemented during the earlier specified date. However, five proficient teachers identified that the schedule of observations was being met to a less extent. This suggests that there might be instances when the classroom observations were not implemented during scheduled dates mandated by the DepEd. Possibly, dates were not followed because of the restrictions in school reporting.

One of the indicators to be observed during the classroom observation is indicator 11, “*the rater rates the teachers using the classroom observation rubrics appropriate to the teacher's level. Only those indicators expected to be observed in an observation period specified on the table of the list of indicators are rated*”. It is believed that this was strictly observed during the classroom observation, having a computed mean equal to 4.60 ($SD=0.54$). Notably, this indicator has the second-highest mean computed for the level of practice in the implementation of the second phase of the RPMS.

Related to this are indicators 12 to 20 of the second phase of the RPMS. Indicator 12 pertains to how the observer confers with the teacher to distance the schedule of the LAC session for demo teaching, online observation, or submission of the video lesson. According to respondents, this has been employed among them to a great extent, with a computed mean of 4.54 (SD=0.56). It can be assumed that observers clearly defined how the alternative demonstration teaching was to be implemented before the schedule.

During the alternative classroom observation, “*it is expected that the observers sit at any available seats in the LAC session or the observers watch the video lesson after submission*” (indicator 13), and “*the rater observes the teacher the entire class period*” (indicator 14). Interestingly, these indicators were generally practiced by observers to a very great extent.

It is reflected in Table 3 that the computed mean of the level of practice in the implementation for indicator 16, “*observers give ratings for teacher for the conducted lesson delivery through the elected modality*”, is 4.60 (SD=0.53). Notably, the computed mean and standard deviation for indicators 11 and 16 are the same. This implies that these indicators are equally implemented during phase 2 of RPMS, and the scale for the level of how teachers were guided by their raters is relatively close to the computed mean. This also suggests that the given ratings align with how teachers performed the alternative classroom observation. After the conduct of the classroom observation, the observers held a post-conference with the proficient teachers observing indicators 18, 19, and 20.

Prior to the post-conference, “*teachers' strengths and areas for improvement are identified and recommendations are given to improve performance guided by the rubrics for the conduct of classroom observation*” (indicator 18). This was practiced to a very great extent, or it has been employed in their schools almost all the time.

During the post-conference, the “*observer discusses with the teacher his performance data, including strengths weaknesses, and agree on the ratings*” (indicator 19), and “*assists the teacher in preparing development plans*” (indicator 20). These indicators (19 and 20) are employed to proficient teachers almost all the time, like indicator 18.

It can be noted that the conduct of post-conference is one of the observations of the division, as proficient teachers are being assisted in understanding their performance so that they can adopt a new strategy or retain their best methodologies in teaching. The conduct of the post-conference also serves as an avenue for coaches or observers to share their ideas in teaching pedagogy that could help proficient teachers better implement the intended curriculum. Similarly, it was revealed by Foster (2013) that during post-conference, the coach shares information, provides feedback, and encourages the teacher to reflect on the lesson during the post-conference to build the teacher's capacity.

It was elucidated by Diaz (2020) that the process of providing feedback on a teacher's classroom practice is known as classroom observation. Feedback provides quality input for continuous improvement of teacher practice, opportunities to share ideas and expertise, and promotes mentoring and coaching among colleagues. It also encourages teachers to reflect on and become more aware of their practice by providing evidence of actual teacher performance, strengths and areas for development, and the impact of the practice.

Rhode Island Department of Education (2014) noted that when giving feedbacks to the observed teacher, it should be concise and specific, citing specific examples from the observation. Further, there must be a positive reinforcement before giving constructive feedback. Notably, observer Doni listed positive points and areas for improvements in the instruction employed by teacher Froilan. This should be consistently implemented in the department, especially that time spent on teacher coaching, evaluation, and program development at the school predicts positive achievement level (Grissom et al., 2013).

Another activity under the performance monitoring and coaching phase of the RPMS is the conduct of the mid-year review (indicators 21 to 26). During its conduct, “*the rater is expected to guide teachers in preparing documents for the review*” (indicator 21). Based on Table 3, it is shown that the level of practice has a mean of 4.48 (SD=0.63), which means that this is practiced by raters in SDO Nueva Vizcaya to a great extent. On the other hand, a very great extent level (M=4.54, SD=0.60) was found when proficient teachers were asked how their “*raters check the authenticity of the MOVs submitted in the review, and further checked their alignment with IPCRF*” (indicator 22). Also, it was found that teachers observe indicator 23, “*rater assesses teachers' portfolios using the Midyear Survey Form (MSF)*” to a very great extent (M=4.53, SD=0.59). This means that raters utilize the MSF in assessing the portfolio of teachers during this phase of RPMS at all times.

After evaluating teachers, it is expected that “*raters conduct mid-year reviews and conferences to discuss and give feedback on initial ratings with the ratee*” (indicator 24), and “*the rater discusses and provides qualitative comments, observations, and recommendations to the ratee after the mid-year review*” (indicator 25). The computed mean for these indicators has values equal to 4.53 (SD=0.56) and 4.55 (SD=0.56), respectively. The computed means suggest that raters implement these to a very great extent. Furthermore, it also suggests that the rater conducts a post-conference to reveal the findings of the mid-year review. It is evident that raters discuss the evaluation result and provide qualitative comments, observations, and recommendations to the ratee. It is expected that feedback given to learners be observed in the remaining months of the performance cycle.

As shown in Table 3, all indicators of phase 4, *performance monitoring and coaching*, are being practiced to a very great extent in general, with a mean equal to 4.54 (SD=0.49). This might imply that raters generally implemented all these indicators almost all the time. The computed standard deviation tells us that the computed mean ratings given by proficient teachers to their raters and coaches, in terms of the indicators in this phase of RPMS, are generally close to the mean.

Comparing the result of this study with that of Dizon et al. (2018), there were indicators of this phase that were implemented by teachers in SDO Gapan to a little extent (weighted mean). This may suggest that although the curriculum has been implemented during a pandemic, a piece of evidence is shown that the current situation is not a hindrance to the implementation of the second phase of RPMS. Interestingly, it was shown that there

is a better practice on how RPMS has been implemented in SDO Nueva Vizcaya. However, these data must be interpreted with caution because of some considerations. For example, (1) the RPMS has been modified, realigning to the pandemic situation, and (2) the time when it was conducted.

3.3. The Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Review and Evaluation

There are five indicators in the performance review and evaluation phase of RPMS that are composed of the following: (a) accomplishment of means of verifications (MOVs) to be included in RPMS portfolio, (b) evaluation of RPMS portfolio, and (c) formulation of initial action or development plans. Table 4 shows the computed standard deviation, mean, and its qualitative description of the level of practice in the implementation of the third phase of RPMS: performance review and evaluation.

Table 4. The Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Review and Evaluation

Indicators of Performance Review and Evaluation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. The rater guides the teacher in preparing documents and in organizing the latter's portfolio for the year-end review and assessment.	4.49	0.62	To a Great Extent
2. The rater checks the authenticity of the means of verifications (MOVs) submitted for the year-end review aligned with the objectives per Individual Performance Commitment Review Form (IPCRF).	4.59	0.55	To a Very Great Extent
3. The rater conducts a year-end review conference to appraise the performance of teachers.	4.56	0.55	To a Very Great Extent
4. The rater discusses with the ratee his/her (ratee) respective performance concerns after year-end review. Equivalently, the rater discusses and provides qualitative comments, observations, and recommendations to the ratee.	4.52	0.56	To a Very Great Extent
5. The rater and the ratee discuss and prepare initial action plans to meet the development needs of the teacher after the year-end review.	4.50	0.57	To a Very Great Extent
Overall Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Review and Evaluation	4.53	0.52	To a Very Great Extent

It can be seen from Table 4 that indicator 2 of the third phase of RPMS, “*the rater checks the authenticity of the MOVs submitted for the Year-end Review aligned with the objectives of IPCRF*”, has the highest mean of 4.59 with a standard deviation of 0.55. This means that immediate supervisors of proficient secondary teachers in SDO Nueva Vizcaya implement indicator 2 to a very great extent. This further implies that raters and coaches implement this indicator almost all the time.

Consistently, raters check the authenticity of documents included in the RPMS portfolio of teachers aligned with the desired objectives of functional competencies. This manifests that school heads, head teachers, master teachers, and school-in-charge religiously evaluate teachers' portfolios, considering the veracity of MOVs aligned with their scores in IPCRF.

In the study of Dizon et al. (2018), it was revealed that during the evaluation of documents, raters ensured that these are based on evidence, which is implemented to a great extent, while in the study, it was found that teachers of SDO Nueva Vizcaya observe it to a very great extent. It can be deduced that raters in SDO Nueva Vizcaya implement better the checking of the authenticity of MOVs than the raters at SDO Gapan.

Next to indicator 2, the indicator with the highest computed mean is indicator 3, “*the rater conducts a year-end review conference to appraise the performance of teachers*” (M=4.56, SD=0.55). It is observed that raters have implemented this indicator to a very great extent, which means raters do this almost all the time a conference is held in phase 3 of RPMS. The conduct of conference serves as a platform for the teachers to be enlightened on the result of the performance review and evaluation. In addition, it serves as an opportunity to raise questions or any concerns that might challenge them in the review and evaluation phase of RPMS, including its first two phases. Interestingly, indicators 2 and 3 have the same computed standard deviation (0.55) suggesting that the variability or ratings given by proficient teachers to their raters on these two indicators are close to the computed mean.

Thirdly, indicator 4, “*the rater discusses with the ratee their respective performance concerns after the year-end review*”, has a calculated mean of 4.52 (S.D.), labeled as to a very great extent. This means that raters and coaches consistently discuss and provide qualitative comments, observations, and recommendations to the ratee during this phase of RPMS.

It is good to note that the indicator 5 under this phase of RPMS, “*the rater and ratee discuss and prepare initial action plans in order to meet the development needs of the teacher after the year-end review*”, has a mean of 4.50 (SD=0.57), that is qualitatively described as to a very great extent. This could be why proficient teachers in the division have at least a very satisfactory rating in their functional competencies because they are guided with initial plans on meeting their professional development needs for the next school year. It can be inferred that through this initial activity they have planned, there are more opportunities and time for the teacher to look for activities like seminars and trainings to attend to fulfill their development needs. Moreover, there will be a higher possibility of providing required MOVs and a higher chance of attaining their development plans.

The indicator with the lowest computed mean and performance review and evaluation is indicator 1, “*the rater guides the teacher in preparing documents and organizing the latter's portfolio for the year-end review and evaluation*” (M=4.49, SD=0.62). Notably, this indicator has the most scattered ratings when proficient teachers were asked how these indicators of the third phase of RPMS had been implemented as it has the highest computed standard

deviation, although considered close to its computed mean. Consequently, it is still considered that raters in the division implement this indicator to a great extent, which means that raters implement this indicator most of the time. This may mean that indicator 1 is the least prioritized indicator in implementing the performance review and evaluation.

On the whole, the overall level of practice in the implementation of the third phase of RPMS has a mean of 4.53 with a standard deviation of 0.52. This demonstrates that raters have generally implemented all performance review and evaluation indicators to a very great extent, or they practically always observe each of the indicators.

Comparing how raters in SDO Nueva Vizcaya rated the extent of how the third phase of RPMS has been implemented in other divisions like SDO Gapan, and SDO Ifugao, the SDO Nueva Vizcaya performs better than these two SDOs. It was found by Dizon et al. (2018) and Ormilla (2021) that SDOs Gapan and Ifugao implement the performance review and evaluation to a great extent, while this study revealed that it is observed to a very great extent.

3.4. The Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Rewarding and Development Planning

There are four indicators in this phase of RPMS where the identification of teachers' strengths and development needs is met along with the development of action or development plans and giving rewards to outstanding performance. The computed standard deviation, mean, and its qualitative description of the level of implementation in evaluating teachers' performance, along with the fourth phase of RPMS, performance rewarding and development planning, is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. The Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Rewarding and Development Planning

Indicators of Performance Rewarding and Development Planning	Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. The rater and the ratee (teacher) identify the strengths (competencies which the ratee demonstrated consistently and areas that meet or exceed expectations) and the development needs (competencies where the ratee has room for improvement).	4.54	0.60	To a Very Great Extent
2. The rater and ratee finalize action plans to meet the development needs of the teacher.	4.46	0.62	To a Great Extent
3. The rater introduces learning and development opportunities to improve the performance of the ratee.	4.48	0.64	To a Great Extent
4. The ratee is recognized in a school-based recognition program/ceremony for his/her "outstanding" performance.	4.42	0.73	To a Great Extent
Overall Level of Practice in the Implementation of RPMS: Performance Rewarding and Development Planning	4.47	0.58	To a Great Extent

It is shown in Table 5 that proficient teachers noted that their raters implement the indicators of performance rewarding and development planning to a great extent, with a mean of 4.47 (SD=0.58). This implies that raters generally implement these four indicators most of the time.

Among the four indicators in the fourth phase of RPMS, indicator 1, "*The rater and the ratee (teacher) identify the strengths (competencies which the ratee demonstrated consistently and areas that meet or exceed expectations) and the development needs (competencies where the ratee has room for improvement)*", has the highest mean (M=4.54, SD=0.60). This suggests that teachers are guided greatly in identifying their strengths and weaknesses, both in functional and core behavioral competencies, during the performance cycle. The identified strengths and development needs are reflected in the fourth part of teachers' IPCRF called the development plan or action plan. The development plan serves as the basis for the teachers to perform their functional and core behavioral competencies in the next school year.

After identifying teachers' strengths and development needs, their action plans are finalized, which is the second indicator in the fourth phase of RPMS. Different from the first indicator, it has a computed mean labeled as to a great extent (M=4.46, SD=0.62). This means that raters guide the proficient teachers in how they could identify their professional development plans from identification to finalization of professional development plans most of the time.

The indicator with the second-highest computed mean is indicator 3, "*the rater introduces learning and development opportunities to improve the performance of the ratee*", having a mean of 4.48 (SD=0.64). As reflected in Table 5, teachers indicated that their raters implement this indicator to a great extent. With proficient teachers' identified strengths and weaknesses, learning and development opportunities are introduced to teachers to improve their performance. Introducing learning and development means providing professional development for the personnel of DepEd, as mentioned by Diaz (2020). Accordingly, learning and development aim to improve teachers' work performance and competencies by providing a wide variety of opportunities for their growth in knowledge, skills, and attitudes. On the other hand, it was stipulated in DepEd Training and Development System Operation Manual (2011) that learning and development about the personal and professional development process necessarily integrate the goals of the individual professional with the development goals of the school, division, and region for better learner outcomes.

Although indicator 4 of the fourth phase of RPMS, "*the ratee is recognized in a school-based recognition program for their outstanding performance*" is implemented in schools of SDO Nueva Vizcaya to a great extent, it has the lowest computed mean (M=4.42, SD=0.72). This implies that this indicator is the least implemented task of raters in the fourth phase of RPMS. Equivalently, recognizing the outstanding performance of teachers in school-based programs is the least observed indicator in the performance rewarding and development planning. Five respondents identified that this

indicator is practiced to a little extent or a very little extent. Additionally, two other teachers identified that they had never experienced being recognized for their outstanding performance. When the researcher surfaced the reason, one of them revealed “There were instances that we are being recognized for our outstanding performance, just like during the Teachers’ Day Celebration. But in observance of the health protocols during the pandemic, we were not able to practice this. However, our principal congratulates us for performing well even in times of difficulties...(*teacher Valentina*)”.

Because teachers are not being rewarded for their outstanding performance, it is possible that they will not be motivated to perform better in the next performance cycle. Abourizk (2021) mentioned that a good reward system keeps employees satisfied, loyal to the company, and eager to advance. Employees are motivated to work harder when receiving public recognition and increased pay rewards.

The process of giving a reward to the desired performance outcome is referred to as an *instrumentality* in the VIE theory or Expectancy Theory established by Vroom (1964). The IET (2021) also stated that rewards should be given to individual employees for them to have a good effort in their work. Under instrumentality, there are possible ways of rewarding employees: (a) giving incentives, (b) trusting employees, and (c) employees having clear expectations regarding their remuneration.

It should be noted that teachers' exemplary performance is being rewarded with incentives through the Performance-Based Incentive System (PBIS). Through Executive Order No. 80, s. 2012 entitled, *Directing the Adoption of a Performance-Based Incentive System (PBIS) for Government Employees* signed by the late President Benigno S. Aquino III on 20 July 2012, and Memorandum Circular No. 2012-01 issued by the Inter-Agency Task Force (Malacañang Administrative Order No. 25 S. 2011), the Performance-Based Incentive System (PBIS) serves as an avenue for recognizing and rewarding commendable accomplishments by government agencies and individual employees. The PBIS, which was implemented in F.Y. 2012 by Executive Order No. 80, aims to align personnel efforts with organizational targets by encouraging higher performance and greater accountability in the government (Malacañang Administrative Order No. 25 S. 2011).

The PBIS consists of the Productivity Enhancement Incentive (PEI) and the Performance-Based Bonus (PBB) that were adopted by the national government beginning Fiscal Year (F.Y.) 2012. The PBB is characterized by a system of rewarding all bureaus or delivery units and personnel within the DepEd based on their contribution to overall agency performance (DepEd Order No. 12, s. 2013). Similarly, PEI is an across-the-board bonus among DepEd employees for recognizing and rewarding exemplary accomplishments to foster teamwork and meritocracy (DepEd Order No. 53, s. 2017).

Despite the overall great extent of implementing this phase of RPMS, it can be inferred that there are teachers who mentioned that they are being guided in identifying their strengths and weaknesses and in finalizing their action plans to a little or a very little extent. This means that proficient teachers are guided several times, or they are almost not being guided in these two indicators. Possibly, this may result in failure to identify the desired action plan to cater to the development needs of proficient teachers. Hence, raters should observe these indicators during the performance rewarding and development planning phase of RPMS.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Coaches and raters in the Department of Education (DepEd) Schools Division of Nueva Vizcaya practiced the implementation of the four phases of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) to a very great extent. This might be the outcome of having a reward system in the department through incentives, like the Performance-Based Incentive System (PBIS). Guided by the Expectancy Theory and Goal Setting Theory, the reward might have motivated them to work and perform their roles and responsibilities in guiding proficient teachers in the division. However, there were indicators in the phases of RPMS that were not fully implemented by coaches. Moreover, school administrators should strictly observe and comply with the mandates on the orientation of the implementation of RPMS. To help ensure compliance with the implementation of RPMS in schools, supervisors should conduct regular visits to the schools to provide necessary assistance and establish a feedback mechanism to further improve RPMS implementation.

References

- Abourizk, R. (7 December 2021). *Reward management: Theory and importance*. <https://study.com/academy/lesson/reward-management-theory-importance.html#:~:text=Having%20a%20good%20reward%20system,motivate%20employees%20to%20work%20harder>.
- Argon, T. (2015). Teachers views on performance and reward in the framework of expectancy theory. *Journal of Education Sciences Research*, 5(2), 143-164.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292078597_Teacher_views_on_performance_and_rewards_in_the_framework_of_expectancy_theory_Bekle_ni_kurami_kapsaminda_performans_ve_odullere_yonelik_ogretmen_gorusleri
- Barber, M., & Mourshed, M. (1September 2007). *How the world's best performing education system come out on top*. <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-and-social-sector/our-insights/how-the-worlds-best-performing-school-systems-come-out-on-top>
- Bhattacharyya, D. K. (2011). Performance Management Systems and strategies. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280561362_Performance_Management_Systems_and_Strategies
- Davis, B. (2013, November 22). Motivating yourself with goal and expectancy theories. *The University of Arizona Global Campus*. <https://www.uagc.edu/blog/motivating-yourself-with-goal-and-expectancy-theories>

Department of Education (14 February 2020). *Sulong edukalidad a move to innovative PH education, says Briones*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2020/02/14/sulong-edukalidad-a-move-to-innovate-ph-education-says-briones/>

Department of Education Order No. 2, s. 2015. *Implementation of the results-based performance management system (RPMS) in the Department of Education*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2015/02/06/do-2-s-2015-guidelines-on-the-establishment-and-implementation-of-the-results-based-performance-management-system-rpms-in-the-department-of-education/>

Department of Education Training and Development System Operation Manual (2011).

Diaz, H. G. (2020). *Impact of professional learning and development activities participated in by secondary mathematics teachers through Kirkpatrick's evaluation levels*. (Unpublished dissertation), Saint Mary's University.

Dizon, A. D., San Pedro, A. B., Munsayac, M. M., Padilla, J., & Pascual, M. C. G. (2018). Level of implementation of the results-based performance management system (RPMS) in the Department of Education Division of Gapan City, Philippines. *International Journal of Research*, 6 (1), 484-503

Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S., & Master, B. (2013). Effective instructional time use for school leaders: longitudinal evidence from observations of principals. *Educational Researcher*, 42 (8), 433-444.

Hillman, A.J. & Dalziel, T. (2003). Boards of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 28 (3), pp.383–396.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, G. C. (2012). *Educational Administration, Theory, Research and Practice* (7th ed.). (Translation Editor: Selahattin Turan). Ankara: Nobel Publications.

Indeed Editorial Team (15 September 2021). *How to use the expectancy theory of motivation*. <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/expectancy-theory-of-motivation>

Indeed Editorial Team (25 March 2021). *The importance of ethics in the workplace: Six significant benefits*. <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/why-ethics-is-important-in-the-workplace>

Lazaro, L. (2017). *Appraising the implementation of the spiral progression approach in teaching junior high school mathematics*. Saint Mary's University, Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya.

Malacañang Administrative Order No. 25 S. 2011. *Inter-agency task force on the harmonization of national government performance monitoring, information and reporting systems*. <https://rbpms.dap.edu.ph/about/>

Mamaug, R. S., & Antonio, L. A. (2022). Results-based performance management system: Its implementation challenges in San Antonio Elementary School. *International Journal of Arts, Sciences and Education*, 3 (1), 1-10.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2009b). *Chapter 3. The professional development of teachers*. <https://www.oecd.org/berlin/43541636.pdf>

Ormilla, R. C. (2021). The implementation of results-based performance management system in public elementary schools. *Management Research Journal*, 10 (1), 113-23.

Purvis, R. L., Zagenczyk, T. J., & McCray, G. E. (2015). What's in it for me? Using expectancy theory and climate to explain stakeholder participation, its direction and intensity. *International Journal of Project Management*. 33 (1), 3–14.

Quilang, L. J. L. (2017). Mathematics knowledge for teaching and mathematical connections made during investigative tasks in statistics and probability among preservice mathematics teachers in Northeastern Luzon. *Graduate Research Journal*, 10, 74-139. Saint Mary's University, Bayombong, Nueva Vizcaya.

Rhode Island Department of Education (2014). *Providing high-quality written feedback to educators*. <https://www.ride.ri.gov/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/Teachers-and-Administrators-Excellent-Educators/Educator-Evaluation/Best-Practices-Resources/High-Quality-Feedback-Calibration-Participant-Packet.docx>

Sabio, J., & Manalo, M. (2020). Assessing elementary school teachers' performance using CBPAST and IPCR: A five-year trajectory report. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 10 (2), 154-158.

SEAMEO INNOTECH (2012). K to 12 education in Southeast Asia. <https://www.seameo-innotech.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/PolRes-K-to-12-in-SEA.pdf>

Smith, A. D., & Rupp, W. T. (2003). Knowledge workers: exploring the link among performance rating, pay and motivational aspects. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 7(1), 107–124. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270310463662>

Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T., & Shapiro, D.L. (2004). Introduction to special topic forum: The future of work motivation theory. *The Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 379–387.

Van Waeyenberg, T., Reccei, R., & Decmar, A. (2020). Performance management and teacher performance: the role of affective organizational commitment and exhaustion. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1 (1), 15-22
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09585192.2020.1754881?journalCode=rjih20>

Williams, L. (2020). *Expectancy theory*. <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/wmintrobusiness/chapter/reading-expectancy-theory/>