HORIZONS A Graduate Research Journal. Volume 1, Issue 1
E-ISSN: 3155-7023

DOI: https://doi.org/10.66206/eduheart.HORIZONS.007

Teachers' Scores on the Results-Based Performance Management System (Rpms) and the Learners' Academic Achievement Based on Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCS) of Solano East Central School- Integrated Sped Center

Clarissa Madlao Mendoza
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-2127-6083
Aldersgate College, Inc., Solano, Nueva Vizcaya
clarissa.madlao002@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

This study examined whether elementary teachers' Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) ratings are associated with learners' academic achievement based on the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs) in a Philippine public school with an integrated SPED program. It also tested whether teacher characteristics (age, years in service, number of trainings) relate to RPMS ratings. Using a descriptive-correlational design and documentary analysis, the study analyzed 53 teachers and 1,501 learners (Grades 1–6) from Solano East Central School–Integrated SPED Center in SY 2022–2023. Teacher performance was taken from validated RPMS–IPCRF records; learner outcomes were Mean Percentage Scores (MPS) from DepEd Form 24. Analyses included descriptive statistics, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson correlations. Teachers obtained an Outstanding overall RPMS mean (M = 4.92). Learners' overall MPS was 86.04 (Proficient), highest in Edukasyon sa Pagpapakatao (ESP) (MPS = 87.84) and lowest in Araling Panlipunan (AP) (MPS = 84.74). Age groups differed in RPMS ratings ($F = 3.60$, $p = .012$), favoring younger teachers; years of teaching ($p = .944$) and trainings attended ($p = .097$) showed no differences. RPMS had no significant correlation with learners' MPS in any subject ($|r| \leq .134$, all $p > .05$). Despite consistently high RPMS performance, teacher ratings did not predict learner achievement on MELCs. Findings suggest (a) RPMS may emphasize compliance over subject-specific instructional impact and (b) professional development quality, feedback practices, and discipline-specific pedagogy warrant stronger alignment with learner outcomes.

Keywords: *outcomes-based learning, teacher training, performance appraisal, academic development*

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Education (DepEd) implemented the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) as a comprehensive teacher evaluation framework aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). The RPMS aims to strengthen instructional quality, support professional growth, and promote accountability among educators. Parallel to this system, the Most Essential Learning Competencies (MELCs) were introduced to streamline curriculum expectations and prioritize essential learning outcomes for all learners.

In Solano East Central School–Integrated SPED Center, teachers consistently receive outstanding RPMS ratings. However, Mean Percentage Score (MPS) data of learners remain at Proficient levels. This raises an important question: Do high teacher RPMS scores translate into improved student learning outcomes?

This study examined the relationship between teachers' RPMS performance and learners' academic achievement across key learning areas aligned with the MELCs. It also determined the influence of teachers' profile variables—age, years of teaching, and number of trainings attended—on their RPMS scores.

METHODS

This study used a descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationship between teachers' performance scores and their students' academic achievement. Conducted during the 2022–2023 school year at Solano East Central School–Integrated SPED Center in the Schools Division of Nueva Vizcaya, the study included 53 elementary teachers and 1,501 learners from Grades 1 to 6.

The researchers gathered information through documentary analysis using two existing school records: the RPMS–IPCRF tool to measure teacher performance across Key Result Areas and DepEd Form 24 to record students' Mean Percentage Scores across subject areas. The researchers secured formal written approval from the Division Superintendent, District Supervisor, and School Head before accessing any files. Once permission was granted, the summary sheets were retrieved, tabulated, and processed. The team maintained strict confidentiality and data privacy by removing all personal identifiers from the records.

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics—specifically frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations—to summarize performance levels. A one-way ANOVA tested whether RPMS scores varied significantly across teacher profiles, while Pearson's r measured the direct relationship between teacher RPMS scores and student academic performance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1.
Profile variable of the respondents (teachers in terms of age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
25-32	6	11.32%

33-40	12	22.64%
41-48	17	32.08%
49-56	10	18.87%
57-64	8	15.09%
TOTAL	**53**	**100.0**

Table 1 shows that teacher ages range from 25 to 64 years, with the majority in the 41–48 age group (32.08%), followed by those aged 33–40 (22.64%). Educators in the 41–48 age bracket bring professional maturity, stability, and instructional expertise, enabling them to deliver effective instruction while mentoring younger colleagues, whereas those in the 33–40 range demonstrate strong subject mastery and classroom management skills. This concentration of experienced faculty fosters a stable, collaborative school environment that supports quality learning. These insights align with research by Rockoff (2004), Kini and Podolsky (2016), and the NCES (2020), which emphasizes that experienced teachers consistently improve student achievement, adapt effectively to diverse student needs, and maintain a strong commitment to continuous professional growth.

Table 2
Profile variable of the respondents of teachers in terms of years of teaching

Years of Teaching	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0-7	9	17%
8-15	13	25%
16-23	20	38%
24-31	7	13%
32-39	4	8%
TOTAL	**53**	**100%**

Table 2 shows that the largest group of respondents, comprising 38% (20 teachers), has 16 to 23 years of teaching experience, followed by 25% (13 teachers) with 8 to 15 years, and 17% (9 teachers) with 0 to 7 years. This high concentration of seasoned educators reflects a faculty rich in pedagogical expertise, capable of tailoring instruction, managing classrooms efficiently, and fostering engaging learning environments. These findings align with research by Darling-Hammond (2000), Berliner (2004), Hattie (2009), and Stronge (2018), which highlights that experienced teachers deliver content more effectively, build positive student relationships, and promote higher critical thinking skills. Overall, having a predominantly experienced faculty creates a strong foundation for sustained academic performance and high instructional quality.

Table 3
Profile variable of the respondents teachers in terms of training/seminars attended for the last 5 years

Number of Trainings/Seminars Attended	**Frequency**	**Percent**
0-20	4	7.55%
21-40	41	77.36%
41-60	8	15.09%
TOTAL	**53**	**100.0**

Table 6 shows that most respondents (77.36%, 41 teachers) attended 21–40 training programs over the past five years, followed by 15.09% (8 teachers) with 41–60 sessions, and only 4 teachers attended 0–20 sessions. This high participation rate demonstrates a strong commitment to continuous professional development, enabling educators to regularly update their instructional methodologies, classroom management, and assessment strategies. These findings align with research by Garet et al. (2001), Guskey (2002), Desimone (2009), and Darling-Hammond et al. (2017), which emphasizes that sustained, high-quality training boosts teaching confidence, equips educators with evidence-based strategies, and directly enhances instructional quality. Ultimately, active engagement in professional learning builds dynamic, student-centered environments that support continuous academic improvement.

Table 4
Performance level of the teachers' respondents on their scores in the Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS)

Grade Level	KRA 1			KRA 2			KRA 3			KRA 4			KRA 5		PF	TOTAL
	OBJ 1	OBJ 2	OBJ 3	OBJ 4	OBJ 5	OBJ 6	OBJ 7	OBJ 8	OBJ 9	OBJ 10	OBJ 11	OBJ 12	OBJ 13	OBJ 14	OBJ 15	
1	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.34	0.35	0.31	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.34	0.34	0.10	4.92
2	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.34	0.34	0.35	0.31	0.34	0.35	0.33	0.32	0.32	0.28	0.08	4.74
3	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.10	5.00
4	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.34	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.341	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.10	4.98
5	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.350	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.10	5.00
6	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.34	0.35	0.35	0.342	0.33	0.33	0.31	0.09	4.88
Mean	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.34	0.35	0.34	0.35	0.35	0.34	0.34	0.34	0.33	0.10	4.92
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.10

LEGEND:4.500-5.000, Outstanding(O); 3.500-4.449, Very Satisfactory (VS); 2.500-3.449 Satisfactory (S); 1.500-2.449, Unsatisfactory (U); Below 1.499, Poor(P)

Table 4 shows an overall mean score of 4.92, demonstrating high teacher performance and strong alignment with RPMS standards and PPST Domains 1, 4, and 7. Grade 3 and Grade 5 teachers achieved perfect scores of 5.00 across all 15 objectives, driven by effective instructional strategies for key developmental stages and strong peer support mechanisms. Conversely, Grade 2 posted the lowest score at 4.74, pointing to opportunities for improvement in early literacy and numeracy instruction (PPST Domains 2 and 5). Narrow standard deviations confirm consistent performance across most areas, though slight variability in Objectives 8 (mean = 0.34, SD = 0.02) and 14 (mean = 0.33, SD = 0.03) highlights a need for targeted training in ICT integration and learner-centered strategies. These results support theories by Danielson (2013), Hattie (2012), and Fullan (2020) regarding clear performance standards, feedback, and instructional coherence. Ultimately, sustaining high performance requires continuous, targeted professional development to address grade-specific and objective-specific needs.

Table 6
Academic achievement of learners based on their mean percentage score (MPS) in the different learning areas

Grade Level	General Average Grade	% of passing	Average Grade per Learning Area								
			MTB	English	Science	Filipino	Math	AP	EPP	MAPEH	ESP
1	***86.71***	100%	87.47	85.69	-	86.78	85.08	87.18	-	85.47	82.08
2	***84.3***	100%	84.2	82.5	-	85.1	85.1	83.7	-	84.6	85
3	***85.16***	100%	84.89	84	87.32	84.88	83.78	82.67	-	84.77	89
4	***85.57***	100%	-	84.79	84.67	86.29	83.49	85.19	86.93	83.82	89.67
5	***88.37***	100%	-	87.93	88.01	89.32	86.89	87.76	87.44	84.65	91.28
6	***87.11***	100%	-	88	86.5	89	84.12	85.15	86.34	85.69	90

	General Average Grade	Average Grade per Learning Area								
		Mother Tongue	English	Science	Filipino	Math	AP	TLE	MAPEH	ESP
Key Stage 1	85.25	85.5	84.06	87.32	85.59	84.65	84.52		84.95	85.36
Key Stage 2	86.79		86.91	86.39	88.21	84.83	86.03	86.90	84.72	90.31

MPS	86.04	85.50	85.49	86.86	86.9	84.74	85.28	86.90	84.83	87.84
VI	P	P	P	P	P	AP	P	P	AP	P

LEGEND: 90% and above, Advanced (A); 85%-89%, Proficient (P); 80%- 84%, Approaching Proficiency (AP); 75%-79%, Developing (D); 74% and below Beginning (B)

The table shows an overall Mean Percentage Score (MPS) of 86.04, indicating that learners are Proficient and possess a solid grasp of grade-level competencies. Edukasyon sa Pagpapakatao (EsP) achieved the highest score at 87.84 (Proficient), reflecting effective values education aligned with CASEL's (2020) Social and Emotional Learning Framework. Conversely, Araling Panlipunan (AP) recorded the lowest score at 84.74 (Approaching Proficiency), as its abstract content requires additional scaffolding and higher-order thinking support in line with Vygotsky's (1978) Social Development Theory. While general learner achievement remains strong, these variations highlight the need for targeted, contextualized instruction and teacher support to bridge learning gaps in lower-performing subjects.

Table 7
Difference between the teachers' scores in the Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) according to age of the respondents

Variables	Age	Mean	Computed F-value	p-value	Description
Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS)	25-32	4.9942	3.60	.0120	Significant
	33-40	4.9336			
	41-48	4.8421			
	49-56	4.9488			
	57-64	4.9199			

df=52

Table 7 reveals a statistically significant difference in teachers' RPMS scores across age groups ($F = 3.60$, $p = 0.0120$). Teachers aged 25–32 achieved the highest mean score ($M = 4.9942$), whereas those aged 41–48 recorded the lowest ($M = 4.8421$). This variation suggests generational differences in adaptability, as younger educators—often digital natives—tend to be more familiar with modern pedagogical tools, evaluation metrics, and continuous feedback platforms (Ghavifekr & Rosdy, 2015; Kim & Park, 2022). Consequently, school administrators should provide differentiated professional development tailored to different age cohorts to ensure fair evaluations and balanced support across all career stages.

Table 8
Difference between the teachers' scores in the Result-Based Performance Management System RPMS and years in teaching

Variables	Years in Teaching	Mean	Computed F-value	p-value	Description
Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS)	0-7	4.9197	0.190	.9441	Not Significant
	8-15	4.9208			
	16-23	4.8952			
	24-31	4.9217			
	32-39	4.9323			

df=52

Table 8 shows no statistically significant difference in teachers' RPMS scores across teaching experience brackets ($F = 0.190$, $p = 0.9441$). Mean scores varied narrowly between 4.8952 and 4.9323, indicating that length of service does not significantly influence performance evaluations. These results align with Sartain and Steinberg (2020) and Department of Education (2023) frameworks, which emphasize that modern, competency-based tools assess objective teaching outcomes rather than years of tenure. Ultimately, the findings confirm that the RPMS serves as an impartial evaluation tool that prioritizes actual performance over traditional seniority.

Table 9
Difference between the teachers' scores in the Result-Based Performance Management System RPMS and number of trainings/Seminars attended

Variables	Number of Trainings/ Seminars Attended	Mean	Computed F-value	p-value	Description
Result-Based Performance	0-20	4.9913	2.45	.0967	Not Significant
	21-40	4.8949			

Management System (RPMS)	41-60	4.9596			

df=52

Table 9 shows no statistically significant difference in teachers' RPMS scores based on the number of training sessions attended ($F = 2.45$, $p = 0.0967$, $df = 52$). Minor variations in mean scores across training groups—0–20 ($M = 4.9913$), 21–40 ($M = 4.8949$), and 41–60 ($M = 4.9596$)—were not statistically meaningful, proving that training quantity alone does not translate to higher performance ratings. These results align with research by Desimone and Garet (2015) and Darling-Hammond et al. (2017), which emphasizes that professional development impact depends on training quality, coherence, and contextual relevance rather than accumulated hours. Consequently, educational policy and planning should shift focus from tracking training frequency to delivering high-impact, content-focused professional learning.

Table 10
Correlation between the teachers' scores on the Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and learners' academic achievement in MTB

Compared Variables	**r-values**	**r^2-values**	**p-value**	**Statistical Inference**
Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) **Vs** Learners' Academic Achievement in MTB	-0.003	0.0000	0.388	Not significant

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 10 reveals a negligible and statistically insignificant relationship between teachers' RPMS scores and learners' academic achievement in Mother Tongue Based (MTB) education ($r = -0.003, r^2 = 0.0000, p = 0.388$). This indicates that teacher evaluation ratings do not predict student MTB performance, largely because performance systems often emphasize administrative compliance rather than instructional quality or socio-linguistic context. These results align with critiques by Kraft and Gilmour (2017) and Darling-Hammond et al. (2022), which show that standardized evaluation tools frequently fail to capture nuanced classroom realities. Ultimately, the findings highlight the need for context-sensitive, integrative evaluation models that measure actual pedagogical impact on student learning.

Table 11
Correlation between the teachers' scores on the Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and learners' academic achievement in English

Compared Variables	**r-values**	**r^2-values**	**p-value**	**Statistical Inference**
Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) **vs** Learners' Academic Achievement in English	0.134	0.0180	0.2680	Not significant

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 11 shows a weak, statistically insignificant relationship between teachers' RPMS scores and learners' academic achievement in English ($r = 0.134$, $r^2 = 0.0180$, $p = 0.2680$). With $p > 0.05$, the null hypothesis is retained, indicating that teacher evaluation ratings account for only 1.8% of the variance in student English performance. These findings align with Santiago et al. (2022) and Darling-Hammond and Hyler (2020), who argue that performance evaluation systems often prioritize administrative compliance over genuine instructional impact. Ultimately, the results suggest a need to re-examine RPMS metrics, as student success in English relies more heavily on instructional quality, classroom environment, and socio-emotional support.

Table 12
Correlation between the teachers' scores on the Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and learners' academic achievement in Filipino

Compared Variables	r-values	r^2-values	p-value	Statistical Inference
Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) **Vs** Learners' Academic Achievement in Filipino	0.031	0.0009	0.2680	Not significant

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 12 shows a very weak, statistically insignificant relationship between teachers' RPMS scores and learners' academic achievement in Filipino ($r = 0.031$, $r^2 = 0.0009$, $p = 0.2680$). Because $p > 0.05$, teacher evaluation ratings account for only 0.09% of the variance in student performance, indicating no meaningful impact on achievement. These results align with research by Kraft and Gilmour (2017) and Darling-Hammond et al. (2019), which highlights that standardized appraisal systems often emphasize procedural compliance over the relational and contextual dynamics crucial to language subjects. Ultimately, the findings emphasize the need to re-examine RPMS metrics, as learner success in Filipino depends more heavily on classroom dynamics, instructional materials, and home environment support.

Table 13

Correlation between the teachers' scores on the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and learners' academic achievement in Science

Compared Variables	r-values	r^2-values	p-value	Statistical Inference
Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) **Vs** Learners' Academic Achievement in Science	0.0120	0.0001	0.3290	Not significant

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 13 reveals an extremely weak, statistically insignificant relationship between teachers' RPMS scores and learners' academic achievement in Science ($r = 0.0120$, $r^2 = 0.0001$, $p = 0.3290$). Because $p > 0.05$, teacher evaluation ratings account for less than 0.01% of the variance in student achievement, indicating no meaningful impact on learning outcomes. These results align with critiques by DepEd (2020), Darling-Hammond et al. (2022), and the OECD (2021), which emphasize that standard appraisal frameworks fail to capture the complex, inquiry-based instruction and resources essential for Science education. Ultimately, the findings confirm a disconnect between RPMS ratings and student performance, calling for evaluation models that better account for classroom conditions and curriculum implementation.

Table 14

Correlation between the teachers' scores on the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and learners' academic achievement in Mathematics

Compared Variables	r-values	r^2-values	p-value	Statistical Inference
Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) **Vs** Learners' Academic Achievement in Mathematics	0.081	0.0066	0.2710	Not significant

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 14 shows a very weak, statistically insignificant relationship between teachers' RPMS scores and learners' academic achievement in Mathemat= 0.081, r² = 0.0066, p =, $p = 0.2710$). Because $p > 0.05$, teacher evaluation ratings account for only 0.66% of the variance in student performance, indicating that high RPMS scores do not directly lead to better student outcomes in Math. These findings align with Kraft and Gilmour (2017) and Darling-Hammond et al. (2020), who emphasize that standardized appraisal tools often miss the classroom dynamics, student engagement, and differentiated instruction necessary for learning. Ultimately, the results suggest that teacher evaluation metrics must be refined beyond administrative checkboxes to genuinely capture and support effective teaching.

Table 15
Correlation between the teachers' scores on the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and learners' academic achievement in Araling Panlipunan

Compared Variables	r-values	r^2-values	p-value	Statistical Inference
Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) **Vs** Learners' Academic Achievement in Araling Panlipunan	0.018	0.0003	0.2730	Not Significant

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 15 shows a very weak, statistically insignificant relationship between teachers' RPMS scores and learners' academic achievement in Araling Panlipunan ($r = 0.018$, $r^2 = 0.0003$, $p = 0.2730$). Because $p > 0.05$, teacher evaluation ratings account for only 0.03% of the variance in student performance, indicating that RPMS scores do not predict student success in this subject. These findings align with Kraft and Gilmour (2017) and Darling-Hammond et al. (2020), who emphasize that performance appraisal systems often prioritize administrative compliance over subject-specific teaching quality, while student outcomes are strongly influenced by external factors like resources and socio-economic background. Ultimately, the results show that RPMS alone is insufficient as a standalone predictor of achievement, pointing to a need for more integrative evaluation models.

Table 16
Correlation between the teachers' scores on the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and learners' academic achievement in Edukasyong Pantahan at Pangkabuhayan (EPP)

Compared Variables	r-values	r^2-values	p-value	Statistical Inference
Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) **Vs** Learners' Academic Achievement in Edukasyong Pantahanan at Pangkabuhayan (EPP)	0.0343	0.0012	0.3960	Not Significant

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 16 reveals a very weak, statistically insignificant relationship between teachers' RPMS scores and learners' academic achievement in Edukasyong Pantahanan at Pangkabuhayan (EPP) ($r = 0.0343$, $r^2 = 0.0012$, $p = 0.3960$). Because $p > 0.05$, teacher evaluation ratings account for a negligible 0.12% of the variance in student achievement, proving that high RPMS scores do not predict student performance in practical, skills-based subjects. These results align with findings by Santiago et al. (2022), Flores and Alvarado (2023), and Darling-Hammond et al. (2021), which emphasize that administrative evaluation frameworks often fail to capture actual classroom impact and hands-on learning. Ultimately, the disconnect highlights the need to redesign teacher evaluations into multifaceted tools that incorporate formative feedback and contextual learning realities.

Table 17
Correlation between the teachers' scores on the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and learners' academic achievement in Music, Arts, Physical Education and Health (MAPEH)

Compared Variables	r-values	r^2-values	p-value	Statistical Inference
Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) **Vs** Learners' Academic Achievement in MAPEH	0.097	0.0094	0.2730	Not Significant

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 17 shows a very weak, statistically insignificant relationship between teachers' RPMS scores and learners' academic achievement in MAPEH ($r = 0.097$, $r^2 = 0.0094$, $p = 0.2730$). Because $p > 0.05$, teacher evaluation ratings account for only 0.94% of the variance in student performance, indicating that standard RPMS scores do not predict student success in performance-oriented subjects. These findings align with Santiago et al. (2021) and Darling-Hammond et al. (2020), who emphasize that standardized evaluation systems must be contextualized to capture discipline-specific and practical

instructional quality. Ultimately, the results demonstrate that RPMS metrics need to be adapted to reflect the unique, performance-driven demands of MAPEH education.

Table 18
Correlation between the teachers' scores on the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and learners' academic achievement in Edukasyon sa Pagpapakatao

Compared Variables	r-values	r^2-values	p-value	Statistical Inference
Result-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) **Vs** Learners' Academic Achievement in Edukasyong sa Pagpapakatao	0.1290	0.0166	0.2730	Not Significant

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 18 shows a very weak, statistically insignificant relationship between teachers' RPMS scores and learners' academic achievement in Edukasyon sa Pagpapakatao ($r = 0.1290$, $r^2 = 0.0166$, $p = 0.2730$). Because $p > 0.05$, teacher evaluation ratings explain only 1.66% of the variance in student performance, indicating that high RPMS scores do not reliably predict student success in values education. These findings align with Kraft and Blazar (2018) and Santiago et al. (2020), who argue that performance management systems capture only limited aspects of teaching quality and require targeted instructional support to meaningfully impact student learning. Ultimately, the results suggest that current evaluation frameworks alone are insufficient predictors of academic achievement in EsP.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The faculty at Solano East Central School brings a strong foundation of experience and a genuine commitment to lifelong learning, reflected in high attendance at professional development seminars and consistently top-tier RPMS ratings. While instruction across grade levels is largely uniform and effective, small dips in Objective 8 (Learner Feedback) and Objective 14 (Professional Reflection) highlight clear entry points for growth. On the student side, overall academic performance remains solid, with high scores in Edukasyon sa Pagpapakatao (EsP) proving the value of socio-emotional learning. However, lower outcomes in Araling Panlipunan (AP) reveal that learners struggle when abstract, context-heavy material isn't grounded in practical, engaging instruction.

Looking at teacher demographics, age emerged as the only factor significantly linked to RPMS scores—younger educators scored higher, likely due to greater tech fluency and familiarity with modern assessment metrics. Surprisingly, neither years of teaching tenure nor sheer training volume influenced performance ratings, proving that accumulating seminar hours does not automatically guarantee higher evaluation marks. The most critical takeaway, however, is the total disconnect between high teacher RPMS ratings and actual student achievement across every subject area, particularly in core subjects like English, Mathematics, and Science. Excellent paper ratings are simply not translating into higher student scores, exposing a fundamental flaw in evaluation systems that prioritize administrative compliance over true pedagogical impact. These findings directly justify the proposed Strategic Training Plan, highlighting an urgent need to align teacher evaluations with real classroom results, provide age-responsive digital support, and deliver targeted training that drives student learning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Building strong instructional leadership starts with formalizing a Structured Peer Coaching and Mentorship Program that selects Lead Teachers for their proven ability to move student learning forward, not just their years of experience. Pairing these mentors with peers for regular coaching, co-teaching, and demo lessons creates a culture of real collaboration—especially when backed by meaningful incentives like performance credits or reduced class loads. Alongside mentorship, Targeted RPMS Workshops should focus directly on the areas where teachers struggle most, specifically providing learner feedback (Objective 8) and deep professional reflection (Objective 14). Using monthly Learning Action Cells (LAC) for practical video reflections and hands-on practice ensures these sessions actually translate into better teaching rather than just filled-out paperwork.

In the classroom, subject-specific tweaks can make an immediate difference. Institutionalizing Math Mastery Fridays allows schools to pause standard routines every Friday afternoon, using recent assessment data to group students by skill level so struggling learners get targeted remediation while advanced kids get enrichment. For performance subjects, simple Daily MAPEH Micro-Activities embedded in morning routines—like quick rhythmic exercises, breathing techniques, or speed sketches—keep physical wellness and creative skills active without crowding the schedule. Weekly coordination between homeroom teachers and subject specialists keeps these energizers fresh and purposeful throughout the school year.

Closing the generational tech gap calls for Age-Responsive Digital Upskilling that respects where teachers are in their careers. Instead of one-size-fits-all IT seminars, senior teachers benefit from foundational digital tools, while younger teachers focus on advanced classroom integration—using informal "tech-buddy" pairings to give senior staff safe, ongoing support. Most importantly, the division must tackle RPMS Refinement for Real Classroom Impact. Evaluation metrics need to shift away from procedural paperwork and start measuring actual student growth, portfolio artifacts, and daily learning. Collaborating with university partners to pilot subject-specific observation tools will ensure teacher performance ratings finally reflect real student achievement.

Finally, successful execution relies on Developmental Leadership and Systemic Support to give this plan real traction. The division needs a clear, step-by-step implementation roadmap backed by focused monitoring and leadership training for school heads and supervisors. Aligning these school-level efforts with DepEd's broader policy priorities ensures

the continuous funding, administrative endorsement, and long-term momentum needed to turn these recommendations into lasting educational progress.

AI DECLARATION STATEMENT

AI-supported tools helped with grammar and structure in creating this article. No AI tools were used to collect, analyze, or interpret data; all authors are credited for their academic contributions.

REFERENCES

Abarro, J. O. (2018). Local seminars and teacher performance: A correlational study. Journal of Education and Practice, 9(12), 45–52.

Abarro, J. O. (2018). The influence of age and length of service on teacher performance. Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement, 15(2), 45–60.

Abrugar, R. F. (1995). The influence of teacher motivation on student learning in Filipino. Philippine Journal of Education, 74(2), 33–41.

Afe, J. O. (2001). Reflections on becoming a teacher and the challenges of teacher education (Inaugural Lecture Series No. 64). University of Benin.

Aguirre, J. A. (2018). Teacher effectiveness and academic achievement in secondary schools. Philippine Educational Measurement Journal, 14(1), 45–62.

Akinola, B. A. (2009). Mother tongue instruction and student achievement: A Nigerian case. Language and Education, 23(2), 91–102.

Akram, M. (2019). Effectiveness of English language teaching and student performance. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 10(3), 521–529.

Albarracin, D., Smith, C. L., & Wang, C. (2018). The impact of tenure on job performance: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 103(7), 700–715. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000304

Alimi, M. (2012). The use of indigenous languages in Nigerian schools: Benefits and challenges. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 2(10), 254–260.

Alonzo, A. M. (2015). Character education through Edukasyon sa Pagpapakatao: A Philippine perspective. Southeast Asian Journal of Moral Education, 4(1), 12–21.

Arianti, A., & Santoso, D. (2020). The role of mathematics education in life planning and decision making. Journal of Educational Studies, 15(2), 123– 134.

Ariaso, P. R. (2020). Attitudes and performance in Filipino among junior high students. Filipino Language Research Journal, 7(1), 88–97.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice-Hall.

Barkley, E. F. (2006). Student engagement techniques: A handbook for college faculty. Jossey-Bass.

Berliner, D. C. (2004). Expert teachers: Their characteristics, development, and accomplishments. Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 24(3), 200–212. https://doi.org/10.1177/0270467604265535

Batuigas, J. A., Cruz, R. L., & Mendoza, A. J. (2022). Promotion practices and professional growth among public school teachers in the Philippines. Journal of Educational Management, 10(1), 36–49.

Bautista, R. A., & Reyes, M. L. (2021). Results-based performance management system (RPMS) ratings and students' NAT performance: A correlational study. Journal of Educational Policy and Leadership, 6(2), 72–88.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 25(6), 551–575. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807

Burroughs, N., Gardner, J., Lee, Y., Schmidt, W., & van der Ploeg, A. (2019). Teaching for excellence and equity: Analyzing teacher characteristics, behaviors, and student outcomes with TIMSS. Springer.

CASEL. (2020). CASEL's SEL framework: What are the core competencies and key settings? https://casel.org/sel-framework/

Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., & Rockoff, J. E. (2014). Measuring the impacts of teachers II: Teacher value-added and student outcomes in adulthood. American Economic Review, 104(9), 2633–2679. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.104.9.2633

Danielson, C. (2013). The framework for teaching: Evaluation instrument. The Danielson Group.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8(1), 1–44. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n1.2000

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Espinoza, D. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute.

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C. M., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development. Educational Researcher, 38(3), 181–199. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08331140

Dweck, C. S. (2006). Mindset: The new psychology of success. Random House.

Fullan, M. (2020). Deep learning: Engage the world, change the world. Corwin.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? American Educational Research Journal, 38(4), 915–945. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038004915

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8(3), 381–391. https://doi.org/10.1080/135406002100000512

Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.

Kini, T., & Podolsky, A. (2016). Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/does-teaching-experience-increase-teacher-effectiveness-review-research

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a useful theory of goal setting and task motivation. American Psychologist, 57(9), 705–717. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003- 066X.57.9.705

OECD. (2021). Teachers and leaders in vocational education and training. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/59d4fbb1-en

Rockoff, J. E. (2004). The impact of individual teachers on student achievement. American Economic Review, 94(2), 247–252. https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828041302244

Stronge, J. H. (2018). Qualities of effective teachers (3rd ed.). ASCD.

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–478. https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540

Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). General system theory: Foundations, development, applications. George Braziller.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.