

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RESULTS-BASED PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (RPMS)

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17412144

Kathy Jill D. Dajay

Teacher II, Rizal Elementary School, District V, Department of Education, Philippines

<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4331-2138>

Dr. May Pasaporte-Bautista

Public Schools District Supervisor, Schools Division of Bacolod City, Philippines

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1939-9807>

Abstract:

The Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) has been established by the Philippine Department of Education (DepEd) as a strategic tool to match individual performance with organizational objectives. Based on Section 2 of DepEd Order No. In order to guarantee that educators and school staff make a significant contribution to the department's vision, mission, and strategic priorities, RPMS operationalizes the Civil Service Commission's Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) in the education sector in 2015 (DepEd, 2015). This study aimed to determine the extent of implementation of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) in one of the districts of a medium-sized schools division in Central Philippines during the School Year 2024-2025. The study made use of 158 public elementary teachers. The statistical tools used were frequency count and percent distribution, Mean and Mann Whitney U Test. The result of the study showed that The extent of implementation of the RPMS in terms of Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, and Performance Review and Evaluation were all on "great extent". When grouped according to the aforementioned variables, the extent of implementation of the RPMS was all on "Great Extent". The comparative analysis in the extent of implementation of the RPMS when grouped and compared according aforementioned variables showed that there was no significant difference across all variables in the areas of Performance Planning and Commitment and Performance Review and Evaluation; however, there was a "significant difference" in the area of Monitoring and Coaching when grouped according to Age and Length of Service.

Keywords: Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS), Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, and Performance Review and Evaluation

Introduction:

As a strategic tool to match individual performance with organizational objectives, the Philippines' Department of Education (DepEd) has established the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). Supported by DepEd Order No. 2, s. The Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) of the Civil Service Commission is operationalized in the education sector by RPMS in 2015, guaranteeing that educators and school staff make significant contributions to the department's vision, purpose, and strategic priorities (DepEd, 2015).

Performance Monitoring and Coaching, which provides ongoing feedback and support; Performance Review and Evaluation, which involves evaluating outputs and final ratings; Performance Planning and Commitment, where teachers set goals and development plans; and

Planning for Rewards and Development, which connects performance to incentives and career advancement (Monares & Dasig, 2024).

Notwithstanding its methodical nature, RPMS deployment continues to present difficulties. Research has revealed problems such a lack of awareness for RPMS, inadequate technical support, a greater amount of paperwork, and irregular feedback systems (Caparas, 2021; Lacayanga, 2020). These worries frequently lead to teacher uneasiness, a lack of concentration during class, and doubts about the system's capacity to gauge overall performance.

Similar studies have looked into how RPMSs are implemented in different departments. For example, Aldamar et al. (2025) looked at how RPMS affects teaching methods and discovered that traditional ways frequently fail because of misalignment and a lack of support, even when collaborative tactics match RPMS signs well. To guarantee its efficacy, Fernandez (2020) underlined the necessity of more stringent adherence to RPMS guidelines and regular review.

The researcher's personal involvement with RPMS implementation and dedication to enhancing teacher performance using evidence-based interventions serve as the driving forces for this study. The author, a researcher and educational practitioner, sees RPMS's promise as a tool for systemic change, professional development, and instructional excellence in addition to its use as a compliance tool.

Current State of Knowledge

The cornerstones of contemporary performance management systems, especially in public sector enterprises, are performance planning and commitment. These ideas have their origins in strategic management theory, which stresses the need to match institutional goals with personal aspirations in order to guarantee efficiency, responsibility, and ongoing development (Amici & Cepiku, 2020). Goal-setting frameworks, success indicators, and performance contracts that direct employee behavior and expectations during the assessment cycle are common operationalizations of performance planning in global environments.

According to Amici and Cepiku (2020), establishing quantifiable goals is simply one aspect of good performance planning; another is incorporating performance data into organizational processes and decision-making. A culture of dedication is fostered by this strategic alignment, where staff members are aware of their responsibilities in fulfilling more general institutional requirements. Decentralized educational systems and international agencies are examples of networked organizations where shared accountability and cooperative planning further strengthen commitment.

Motivation and role clarity are intimately related to performance commitment in the context of employee engagement. Employees that actively participate in planning and goal-setting procedures exhibit higher levels of commitment and performance, according to Harun and Ling (2020). According to their research, planning encourages initiative, ownership, and alignment with corporate values—all of which are critical components of long-term success in both the public and private sectors.

The significance of structured planning and commitment mechanisms in performance management systems is emphasized by these global viewpoints. They offer a theoretical framework for investigating the implementation of RPMS planning and commitment in Philippine public schools, as well as the potential effects of demographic variables on teachers' involvement in these procedures.

Globally, performance monitoring and coaching have evolved into essential components of performance management systems, particularly in education and public sector organizations. These practices are designed not only to assess progress but also to foster continuous professional development through structured feedback and mentoring.

Betto and Garengo (2024) carried out a comprehensive survey on coaching procedures in performance management systems in Europe. According to their findings, coaching improves communication, employee engagement, and self-efficacy, all of which have a substantial positive impact on organizational performance. The study underlined that rather than being viewed as a stand-alone or remedial activity, coaching works best when it is incorporated into continuous performance monitoring.

Likewise, Coimbra and Proença (2022) emphasized the function of coaching in bolstering staff proficiencies and promoting organizational transformation. By strengthening autonomy, mastery, and purpose—elements that are especially pertinent in educational contexts where teacher motivation and instructional quality are crucial—coaching, according to their research, helps to sustain performance.

Performance Review and Evaluation in the RPMS is anchored on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), which provide a structured framework for assessing teacher competencies across career stages. This alignment ensures that evaluations are not arbitrary but based on nationally validated standards that reflect effective teaching practices (DepEd, 2017; DepEd, 2023). Each RPMS objective corresponds to specific PPST indicators, allowing for consistent and meaningful assessment across schools.

A central feature of this phase is the use of Means of Verification (MOVs), which serve as tangible evidence of a teacher's performance. MOVs include lesson plans, learner outputs, assessment tools, and professional development records. These documents are validated during the review process to ensure they reflect authentic and quality teaching practices (Llego, 2021). As clarified in the PMES guidelines, teachers are no longer required to compile physical portfolios, but must maintain accessible repositories of their instructional materials (Teach Pinas, 2025).

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study is anchored on the Control Theory of Performance Management, a conceptual approach that explains how organizations regulate and align individual performance with institutional goals. The theory was notably advanced by Barrows and Neely (2012) and draws from earlier organizational control models such as those by Ouchi (1977) and Shell (1992). Control theory posits that performance management systems function effectively when mechanisms are in place to monitor, evaluate, and adjust employee behavior and outputs in relation to predefined standards and objectives.

At its core, control theory emphasizes three types of control systems: Behavioral control, which involves monitoring employee actions and reinforcing desired behaviors through norms and policies; Output control, which evaluates performance based on measurable results and applies rewards or sanctions accordingly; and Input control, which focuses on the selection, training, and development of personnel to ensure competency alignment with organizational needs (Krausert, 2009).

In the context of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) implemented by the Department of Education (DepEd), control theory provides a useful lens for understanding how teachers' performance is guided through structured phases—Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, and Performance Review and Evaluation. Each phase reflects a form of control: planning aligns individual goals with institutional targets (input control), monitoring ensures behavioral alignment through coaching and feedback (behavioral control), and evaluation assesses outputs against standards (output control).

The relevance of control theory to this study lies in its emphasis on systematic regulation and feedback, which are central to RPMS implementation. By examining how RPMS is applied across different teacher profiles and identifying areas where control mechanisms may be inconsistent or ineffective, this study aims to propose an action plan that strengthens RPMS delivery. Understanding the dynamics of control within RPMS also supports the development of differentiated strategies—particularly in coaching and monitoring—where significant differences were found based on age and length of service.

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to determine the extent of implementation of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) in one of the districts of a medium-sized schools division in Central Philippines during the School Year 2024-2025. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions: (1) determine the profile of the respondents in terms of Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Average Family Monthly Income; (2) determine the extent of implementation of the RPMS in terms of Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, and Performance Review and Evaluation; (3) determine the significant difference in the extent of implementation of the RPMS when grouped and compared according aforementioned variables.

Methodology:

This section presents the discussion of the research methodology used, the subjects and respondents of the study, the research instruments used, the validity and reliability of the instruments, the procedure for data gathering, and the statistical tools and procedure for data analysis.

Research Design

This study employed descriptive research design to determine the extent RPMS implementation in one of the districts in a medium sized schools division in Central Philippines for the School Year 2024-2025. Descriptive research design attempts to determine, describe, or identify characteristics found within the phenomena investigation. In line therefore with the present study, it is the nature of this undertaking to determine the conditions of things in their present state. It also delves into the relationships between variables that are considered in the study as well as the influence of one variable on another (Dudovskiy, 2017).

Study Respondents

The respondents of the study are the 158 public school teachers who were randomly sampled from a total population of 267. Since the number of respondents is quite large to handle, stratified sampling and random sampling technique was used and using Cochran formula to find the sample size. The respondents was randomly selected by the researcher from each school using the lottery technique.

Instruments

In order to measure the extent of implementation of RPMS, the study made use of a self-made questionnaire which was subjected to full validity and reliability test. The instrument was divided into two (2) parts. Part 1 contained questions on the respondents' profile such as Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service and Average Family Monthly Income.

Part 2 contained the questionnaire proper with a total of 30 line items equally divided into 3 RPMS Phases namely: Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, and Performance Review and Evaluation. This self-made instrument was validity ($M=4.93$, excellent) and reliability (0.93, excellent) tested.

Data Gathering Procedure

In conducting this study, several steps were followed: first, a letter request was submitted to the Schools Division Superintendent and to the School Heads seeking approval to conduct the study. The questionnaires were administered to target respondents after the approval was secured. The printed hard copies were distributed to the schools heads to be distributed later on to the teachers.

The hard copies of the questionnaires were gathered, recorded, analyzed after 3 days. The data that was gathered from the responses of the respondents were tallied and tabulated using the appropriate statistical tools. The raw data were transformed into numerical code guided by a coding manual. This allowed easier computer processing, statistical derivations and tabular presentation. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) will be used in the computer processing of the encoded data.

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective No. 1 used Descriptive Analytical scheme and the statistical tools used were: Frequency Count and Percentage Distribution to determine the profile of the respondents in terms of Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service, Average Family Monthly Income.

Objective No. 2 used Descriptive Analytical scheme and the statistical tools used was Mean to determine the extent of implementation of the RPMS in terms of Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, and Performance Review and Evaluation.

Objective No. 3 used Comparative Analytical Scheme and the statistical tool used was Mann-Whitney U Test to determine if there was a significant difference in the extent of implementation of the RPMS when grouped and compared according aforementioned variables.

Ethical Consideration

This study adheres to established ethical standards in educational research to ensure the integrity of the research process and the protection of all participants. Prior to data collection, informed consent was obtained from all respondents, including teachers, school heads, and other personnel involved in RPMS implementation. Participants were fully briefed on the purpose of the study, the nature of their involvement, and their right to withdraw at any point without penalty. Consent forms outlined the voluntary nature of participation and clarified that no incentives or coercive measures were used.

Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained throughout the study. Personal identifiers were removed from all data sets, and responses were coded to prevent traceability to individual participants or institutions. Data were stored securely and accessed only by the researcher for academic purposes. Findings were reported in aggregate form to avoid disclosing any sensitive or identifiable information.

The study also ensured that no harm—physical, psychological, or professional—would come to participants as a result of their involvement. All procedures complied with institutional and national guidelines on ethical research, including those set by the Department of Education and relevant academic review boards. The researcher exercised neutrality and objectivity in data interpretation, avoiding bias and ensuring that results were presented honestly and transparently. Ethical clearance was secured prior to the commencement of fieldwork, affirming the study's commitment to responsible and respectful research practices.

Results and Discussion:

Profile of the respondents in terms of Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service, and Average Family Monthly Income

Table 1
Profile of Respondents

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Younger (below 41 years old)	85	53.80
	Older (41 years old and above)	73	46.20
	Total	158	100.00
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower (Bachelors Degree)	111	70.25
	Higher (Masters and Doctorate Degree)	47	29.75
	Total	158	100.00
Length of Service	Shorter (less than 11 years)	84	53.16
	Longer (11 years and more)	74	46.84
	Total	158	100.00
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower (less than P29 800)	117	74.05
	Higher (P29 800 and above)	41	25.95
	Total	158	100.00

Table 1 shows the profile of the respondents. As to age, 85 respondents or 53.80% belong to the younger group (below 41 years old), while 73 respondents or 46.20% belong to the older group (41 years old and above). With regards to their highest educational attainment, 111 respondents or 70.25% hold a bachelor's degree, while 47 respondents or 29.75% have earned a master's or doctorate degree. As to their length of service, 84 respondents or 53.16% belong to the shorter group (less than 11 years), while 74 respondents or 46.84% belong to the longer group (11 years and more). When it comes to their average family monthly income,

117 respondents or 74.05% fall under the lower income bracket (less than ₱29,800), while 41 respondents or 25.95% belong to the higher income group (₱29,800 and above).

Descriptive analysis in the extent of implementation of the RPMS in the areas of Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, and Performance Review and Evaluation

Table 2

Extent of implementation of the RPMS in the area of Performance Planning and Commitment

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I ...		
1. align personal goals with DepEd's objectives.	4.08	Great Extent
2. set clear and proper performance expectations so I know what to work on.	4.22	Great Extent
3. am committed to achieve performance targets and objectives.	4.23	Great Extent
4. am committed to uphold quality of teaching and improve student engagement.	4.10	Great Extent
5. ensure that my performance targets are aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST).	4.08	Great Extent
6. identify areas needing professional growth and strategies for personal improvement.	4.18	Great Extent
7. do continuous self-assessment to be ready for any professional development.	3.42	Moderate Extent
8. collaborate and share responsibility with others to achieve educational goals for learners.	4.40	Great Extent
9. adhere to data-driven decision-making in innovating instructional strategies.	3.66	Great Extent
10. plan out ahead to ensure that urgent and important targets are achieved.	3.86	Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.02	Great Extent

Table 2 shows that the extent of implementation of the RPMS among teachers in terms of Performance Planning and Commitment has an overall mean score of 4.02, interpreted as "great extent". This means that teachers demonstrate strong alignment with institutional goals and are actively engaged in planning and committing to performance standards. Item No. 8, which states that "I collaborate and share responsibility with others to achieve educational goals for learners", garnered the highest mean score of 4.40, interpreted as "great extent". This indicates that teachers highly value collaboration and collective accountability in achieving student outcomes. On the other hand, Item No. 7, which states that "I do continuous self-assessment to be ready for any professional development", received the lowest mean score of 3.42, interpreted as "moderate extent". This suggests that while teachers are generally committed, some may not consistently engage in reflective practices that prepare them for professional growth. The relatively lower score in self-assessment may be attributed to limited time, lack of structured reflection tools, or insufficient support systems for professional development. Yet, the overall mean of 4.02 confirms that teachers are implementing performance planning and commitment practices to a commendable degree. Through the lens of teacher resilience and institutional support, this finding highlights the importance of fostering collaborative environments and providing adequate professional development structures. In the study of Sarmiento and Badiang (2024), it was found that strong social support networks—particularly from peers and administrators—served as protective factors against burnout and enhanced teachers' resilience during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Table 3

Extent of implementation of the RPMS in the area of Performance Monitoring and Coaching

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I ...		
1. use RPMS performance monitoring guide to keep track of my own progress.	4.49	Very Great Extent
2. apply feedback from performance monitoring to enhance my teaching strategies.	4.41	Great Extent
3. integrate feedback from performance monitoring into my teaching methods.	4.42	Great Extent
4. make use of strategies provided during coaching to improve my student engagement strategies.	4.44	Great Extent
5. regularly track my progress using RPMS indicators and guidelines.	4.43	Great Extent
6. adequate support for my professional growth from my coach/mentor.	3.91	Great Extent
7. actively apply recommendations from RPMS coaching to improve my teaching.	4.47	Great Extent
8. receive timely and constructive feedback from RPMS performance monitoring.	4.40	Great Extent

9. feel confident in achieving my RPMS goals through coaching and monitoring	4.48	Great Extent
10. am contended with the clarity and effectivity of the RPMS performance evaluation methods.	4.46	Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.39	Great Extent

Table 3 shows that the extent of implementation of the RPMS among teachers in terms of Performance Monitoring and Coaching has an overall mean score of 4.39, interpreted as "great extent". This means that teachers actively engage in monitoring their performance and applying coaching feedback to improve instructional practices. Item No. 1, which states that "I use RPMS performance monitoring guide to keep track of my own progress", garnered the highest mean score of 4.49, interpreted as "very great extent". This indicates that teachers are highly proactive in using RPMS tools to monitor their professional growth. On the other hand, Item No. 6, which states that "I receive adequate support for my professional growth from my coach/mentor", received the lowest mean score of 3.91, interpreted as "great extent". This suggests that while coaching is generally effective, there may be variability in the quality or consistency of support provided by mentors. The slightly lower score in mentor support may be attributed to limited availability of trained coaches, time constraints, or lack of structured mentoring programs. Nevertheless, the overall mean of 4.39 confirms that teachers are implementing performance monitoring and coaching practices with commendable consistency and depth.

Table 4

Extent of implementation of the RPMS in the area of Performance Review and Evaluation

Items	Mean	Interpretation
As a teacher, I ...		
1. receive constructive feedback that helps me improve my teaching practices.	4.59	Very Great Extent
2. always have the right MOVs required in RPMS to effectively support my performance rating.	3.94	Great Extent
3. take self-assessment under RPMS to help me identify areas for my own professional growth.	3.97	Great Extent
4. trust that my final performance rating in RPMS truly reflects my competencies and actual performance.	4.05	Great Extent
5. receive feedback from RPMS evaluation to helps me refine my instructional strategies.	4.20	Great Extent
6. feel motivated to enhance my performance based on RPMS evaluation results.	4.07	Great Extent
7. believe that the evaluation process under RPMS promotes transparency and fairness.	4.28	Great Extent
8. plan my career growth through using my strong and weak points as identified by RPMS results.	4.06	Great Extent
9. take the opportunities for professional development based on evaluation results.	3.77	Great Extent
10. Like the timely and efficient manner of my performance review via RPMS.	4.18	Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.11	Great Extent

Table 4 shows that the extent of implementation of the RPMS among teachers in terms of Performance Review and Evaluation has an overall mean score of 4.11, interpreted as "great extent". This means that teachers actively engage in the RPMS evaluation process and use feedback to enhance their professional growth and instructional practices. Item No. 1, which states that "I receive constructive feedback that helps me improve my teaching practices", garnered the highest mean score of 4.59, interpreted as "very great extent". This indicates that teachers highly value feedback as a tool for instructional improvement. On the other hand, Item No. 9, which states that "I take the opportunities for professional development based on evaluation results", received the lowest mean score of 3.77, interpreted as "great extent". This suggests that while teachers recognize the importance of evaluation, some may face barriers in accessing or pursuing professional development opportunities. The relatively lower score in professional development uptake may be attributed to limited availability of programs, time constraints, or lack of institutional support. Nevertheless, the overall mean of 4.11 confirms that teachers are implementing performance review and evaluation practices with consistency and reflective intent.

Comparative Analysis in the extent of implementation of the RPMS in the areas of Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, and Performance Review and Evaluation when grouped and compared according to Age, Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service, and Average Family Monthly Income

Table 5

Difference in the extent of implementation of the RPMS in the area of Performance Planning and Commitment when grouped and compared according to variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	85	78.07	2981.000	0.671	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	73	81.16				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	111	78.59	2508.000	0.701		Not Significant
	Higher	47	81.64				
Leng of Service	Shorter	84	78.33	3010.000	0.732		Not Significant
	Longer	74	80.82				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	117	81.20	2199.500	0.428		Not Significant
	Higher	41	74.65				

Table 5 shows that there is no significant difference in the extent of implementation of the RPMS in the area of Performance Planning and Commitment when grouped according to age, highest educational attainment, length of service, and average family monthly income. The p-values for all variables—age (0.671), educational attainment (0.701), length of service (0.732), and income (0.428)—are all above the significance level of 0.05. Due to this, the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the extent of RPMS implementation in terms of Performance Planning and Commitment” is therefore accepted. This implies that demographic variables such as age, educational attainment, length of service, and income do not significantly affect how teachers engage with RPMS planning and commitment processes. The uniformity in implementation may be attributed to the standardized nature of RPMS tools such as the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF), which ensures that all teachers, regardless of background, follow the same planning protocols and commitment structures. Monarres and Dasig (2024) conducted a mixed-methods study on the implementation of RPMS in Northern Samar, examining both quantitative data and qualitative insights from teachers and school administrators. The findings revealed that no significant demographic differences were observed in RPMS implementation, particularly in the phases of Planning and Commitment and Review and Evaluation. Teachers emphasized the value of clear goal-setting, organized scheduling, and regular review sessions, while administrators highlighted the importance of effective communication and resource allocation. These results reinforce the conclusion of

Table 6

Difference in the extent of implementation of the RPMS in the area of Performance Monitoring and Coaching when grouped and compared according to variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	85	71.61	2431.500	0.019	0.05	Significant
	Older	73	88.69				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	111	76.52	2278.000	0.207		Not Significant
	Higher	47	86.53				
Leng of Service	Shorter	84	71.88	2467.500	0.025		Significant
	Longer	74	88.16				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	117	78.93	2332.000	0.791		Not Significant
	Higher	41	81.12				

Table 6 shows that there is a significant difference in the extent of implementation of the RPMS in the area of Performance Monitoring and Coaching when grouped according to age and length of service, with p-values of 0.019 and 0.025, respectively—both below the significance level of 0.05. However, the p-values for highest educational attainment (0.207) and average family monthly income (0.791) are above 0.05, indicating no significant difference for these variables. Due to this, the hypothesis that states “there is no significant difference in the extent of RPMS implementation in terms of Performance Monitoring and Coaching” is therefore partially rejected. This implies that age and length of service influence how teachers experience and engage with RPMS monitoring and coaching processes, while educational attainment and income do not. Younger and less experienced teachers may require more structured guidance and support, whereas older and longer-serving teachers may benefit from more autonomous or differentiated coaching strategies. In a study by Alvarez and Pacheco (2023) on mentoring practices in RPMS implementation across public schools in Region IV-A, findings revealed that novice teachers often rely heavily on coaching sessions to clarify expectations and improve instructional delivery, while veteran teachers tend to use coaching as a reflective tool for refining pedagogical strategies. The study emphasized that effective monitoring and coaching must be responsive to the teacher’s career stage, with tailored feedback and differentiated mentoring approaches. These insights support the results

of Table 19, highlighting the need for adaptive coaching models that consider age and tenure in RPMS implementation.

Table 7

Difference in the extent of implementation of the RPMS in the area of Performance Review and Evaluation when grouped and compared according to variables

Variable	Category	N	Mean Rank	Mann Whitney U	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Age	Younger	85	73.81	2618.500	0.088	0.05	Not Significant
	Older	73	86.13				
Highest Educational Attainment	Lower	111	75.49	2163.500	0.087	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	47	88.97				
Length of Service	Shorter	84	73.79	2628.000	0.091	0.05	Not Significant
	Longer	74	85.99				
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	117	77.15	2123.000	0.269	0.05	Not Significant
	Higher	41	86.22				

Table 7 presents the difference in the extent of implementation of the RPMS in the area of Performance Review and Evaluation, when grouped and compared according to selected demographic variables. The data show that the p-values for age (0.088), highest educational attainment (0.087), length of service (0.091), and average family monthly income (0.269) are all above the significance level of 0.05. Due to this, the hypothesis that states "there is no significant difference in the extent of RPMS implementation in terms of Performance Review and Evaluation" is therefore accepted.

This implies that teachers' demographic characteristics do not significantly influence how they engage with RPMS evaluation processes. The consistent implementation across age, tenure, educational background, and income level suggests that the RPMS framework—particularly in its review and evaluation phase—is being applied uniformly. This may be attributed to the standardized tools and procedures embedded in the RPMS cycle, such as the use of the Portfolio Assessment Process, Self-Assessment Tools, and Performance Feedback Models, which are designed to ensure fairness and consistency regardless of teacher profile. Caparas (2021) conducted a descriptive-correlational study on RPMS implementation in SDO-Malolos, focusing on its effects on teachers' professional practice. The study revealed that demographic variables did not significantly affect the level of RPMS implementation, particularly in the phases of performance review and evaluation. Teachers across different backgrounds reported similar levels of engagement with RPMS tools and processes, reinforcing the system's capacity to promote equitable evaluation standards. These findings support the results of Table 20, affirming that RPMS review mechanisms are consistently implemented across diverse teacher groups.

Conclusions:

The socio-demographic profile of the respondents indicates a predominantly younger teaching workforce with baseline qualifications, shorter tenure, and lower income levels. This demographic composition suggests that many educators are still in the early stages of their professional journey, which may influence their perspectives on institutional frameworks like the RPMS. The prevalence of bachelor's degree holders also highlights a potential area for capacity-building through postgraduate education and advanced training programs. The RPMS was implemented to a great extent across all three phases—Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, and Performance Review and Evaluation. This consistent level of implementation reflects a strong adherence to the RPMS framework among teachers, regardless of their individual backgrounds. It suggests that the system is well-integrated into school practices and that educators are actively engaging with its processes to support professional growth and accountability. When the extent of RPMS implementation was analyzed according to socio-demographic variables, results showed uniformly high levels of engagement across all groups. This finding reinforces the idea that RPMS is being applied equitably, with no major disparities in implementation based on age, educational attainment, tenure, or income. Such uniformity may be attributed to the standardized nature of RPMS tools and protocols, which promote consistency in performance management across diverse teacher profiles. However, the comparative analysis revealed a significant difference in the implementation of the Monitoring and Coaching phase when grouped by age and length of service. This suggests that younger and less experienced teachers may require more targeted support and guidance during this phase. The finding underscores the importance of differentiated coaching strategies and mentoring systems that respond to the developmental needs of novice educators, ensuring that RPMS remains responsive and inclusive in its implementation.

Acknowledgement

The researcher would like to sincerely thanks her adviser and the rest of the panel members for their efforts in ensuring that this manuscript is at par with scholarly requirements.

References:

- Aldamar, R. M., Lansao, A. E., & Duge, R. A. (2025). Harnessing Elementary Teachers' Teaching Methods Through the Lens of Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). *International Journal of Fundamental and Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(3), 1–15.
- Almario, R. V., & de Guzman, M. T. (2023). Enhancing Teacher Performance through RPMS-Based Coaching and Monitoring: A Comparative Study. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 11(2), 88–102.
- Almario, J. R., & Reyes, M. A. (2023). RPMS implementation and its impact on teacher development in public schools. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 5(1), 45–56.
- Alvarez, M. C., & Pacheco, R. J. (2023). Mentoring Practices and RPMS Implementation in Public Schools: A Regional Analysis. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 12(2), 45–59.
- Amici, M., & Cepiku, D. (2020). Performance Management: A Theoretical Framework. In *Performance Management in International Organizations* (pp. 97–114). Springer.
- Anwar, A., Usman, B., & Santosa, W. (2024). The influence of strategic planning, risk management and internal control on the performance of the Indonesian Army organization mediated by organizational commitment. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, 8(8), 1–20.
- Barrows, E., & Neely, A. (2012). *Managing Performance in Turbulent Times: Analytics and Insight*. Wiley.
- Benchmark Consulting. (2018). *Professional Practice of Coaching in the Philippines Study*.
- Betto, F., & Garengo, P. (2024). Performance Management Practices and Coaching Projects: A Survey. *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, 12(2), 57–65.
- Binghay, V. C., Gumiran, B. A. L., & Binghay, J. M. G. (2023). Charting a Course for Excellence: Exploring Performance Management in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Labor and Industrial Relations*, 40.
- Budhiraja, S. (2023). Continuous learning and employee performance: A moderated examination of managers' coaching behavior in India. *Personnel Review*, 52(1), 200–217.
- Buendicho, B. (2018). School Head's Coaching and Monitoring Practices: Implication on Teachers' Teaching Performance.
- Caparas, L. A. R. (2021). Implementation of Results-Based Performance Management System – Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers and Its Effects on Teachers' Professional Practice. *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(9), 1–12.
- Cenas, P. V. (2022). Individual Performance Commitment Rating and Work Satisfaction of Pangasinan State University Faculty with Multi-Designations: A Basis for a Mathematical Model. *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*.
- Central Philippine University. (n.d.). *Employees' Self-Assessment of Organizational Commitment, Work Motivation, and Job Performance*.
- Coimbra, M., & Proença, J. F. (2022). Coaching as a Tool for Performance Management. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 30(1), 45–60.
- Cruz, C. E. (2024). The Effectiveness of Individual Performance Commitment Review Form as an Evaluation Tool to Improve Teachers' Performance: Basis for Technical Assistance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(2).
- Cruz, M. A., & Javier, R. L. (2020). Age and experience as correlates of RPMS implementation among public school teachers. *Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement and Evaluation*, 12(1), 34–45.
- Dela Cruz, R. T., & Manalo, S. V. (2024). Socioeconomic Influences on RPMS Implementation: A Study on Performance Planning and Commitment. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 8(4), 114–127.
- Department of Education – Bureau of Human Resource and Organizational Development. (2018). *Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) Manual for Teachers and School Heads*. Philippine National Research Center for Teacher Quality.

Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015: Guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS).

DepEd SDO Pangasinan. (2023). Performance Planning and Commitment (RPMS Phase 1).

Department of Education – RCTQ. (n.d.). Results-Based Performance Management System Manual for Teachers and School Heads.

DeNisi, A., & Murphy, K. R. (2017). Performance appraisal and performance management: 100 years of progress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 421–433.

Diekola Akanmu, M., Panatik, S. A. B., & Shahrin, R. (2025). The influence of performance appraisal practices on employee engagement at higher education institutions of Malaysia. *Cogent Business & Management*, 12(1), 2442093.

D Jungle People. (2025). Employee Commitment in Malaysia: What 2025 Is Telling Us and What Organisations Should Do About It.

Fernandez, M. (2020). The Impact of Result-Based Performance Management System on the Teachers' Attitude. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 10, 1–12.

Foreign Staffing Inc. (2016). Employee Performance Reviews in 23 Countries.

Galiher, R., & Darling, N. (2006). Review of Related Literature and Studies on Student Performance. *Academia.edu*.

Garcia, R. (2019). Evaluating Teachers for Improvement: A Case Study of IPCR Forms in Educational Contexts. *Journal of Educational Assessment*, 28(2), 145–162.

Gregorius, A. W. D., Basri, Y. Z., & Anggiani, S. (2023). The effect of organizational commitment and employee engagement on organizational performance: Indonesia Secretariat General of the National Resilience Council mediated by strategic leadership. *International Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Research*, 5(3), 45–60.

George, C. (2006). A study on the level of understanding and implementation of performance management in the Malaysian public sector.

Gutierrez, E. B. (2022). Performance Evaluation Practices of Select Higher Education Institutions in the City of Manila: Basis for Enhancing Faculty Performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(12), 4239–4243.

Harun, M. Z. M., & Ling, N. S. (2020). Employee Engagement and Employee Performance: A Conceptual Framework. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 22(2), 63–67.

Indradewa, R., & Randi, S. (2021). The effects of competence and motivation on performance mediated by organization commitment: Case study Indonesian government agencies. *International Journal of Research and Review*, 8(1), 1–10

JobStreet Express. (2025). Performance Improvement Plan in Singapore: What Employees Need to Know.

Krausert, A. (2009). Performance Management for Different Employee Groups: Evidence-Based Strategies. Springer.

Kuvaas, B. (2006). Performance appraisal satisfaction and employee outcomes: Mediating role of motivation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(3), 504–522.

Lacayanga, R. B. (2021). Problems encountered among teachers on RPMS: Inputs for teachers enhancement program. *TeacherPH*.

Li, H. (2019). Relative performance evaluation—A review of recent literature at home and abroad. *Modern Economy*, 10(4), 1229–1238.

Licaycay, N. (2023). The Effect of Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) on Teachers' Performance.

Loy, Z. B. S. (2022). Coaching: An approach for leadership development in the Singapore education system. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*.

- Mabey, C. (2008). Management development and performance appraisal in UK organizations. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 18(3), 303–320.
- Manlapig, R. M., & Garcia, L. A. (2022). RPMS coaching and mentoring practices: A correlational study on teacher performance and age. *Journal of Educational Policy and Practice*, 4(2), 78–89
- Maravilla, G. J. T., & Tuble, R. M. (2025). Organizational Commitment and Job Performance of Employees in a Select National Government Agency. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(7).
- McAleavy, T., & Pagden, L. (2022). Raising student achievement in literacy and numeracy through a teacher coaching programme: A case study from Brunei Darussalam.
- Mobarak Ali, Z. B. (2018). A Review of Teacher Coaching and Mentoring Approach. *Academia.edu*.
- Monares, H. T., & Dasig, J. P. (2024). Implementation of Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) and Teachers' Performance Towards a Proposed Instructional Supervision Framework. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 8(4), 114–127.
- Monyatsi, P. P. (2012). The effectiveness of the performance management system in schools in Botswana. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 4(1), 1–12.
- Ng, P. T. (2012). Mentoring and coaching educators in the Singapore education system. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 1(1), 24–35.
- Nguyen, T. T., Pham, H. Q., & Le, D. T. (2020). Performance evaluation in Vietnamese public sector organizations. *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, 42(1), 45–67.
- Ngwenya, T., & Pretorius, S. G. (2015). Performance management in South African schools: A participatory approach. *South African Journal of Education*, 35(2), 1–10.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1977). The Relationship Between Organizational Structure and Organizational Control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22(1), 95–113.
- Philippine National Research Center for Teacher Quality. (2018). Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) Manual for Teachers and School Heads. Department of Education – Bureau of Human Resource and Organizational Development.
- Said, T. F. (2025). Leading through Performance Management in the Brunei Darussalam Public Sector. In *Brunei Darussalam's Economic Transition in a Shifting Global Asia* (pp. 297–326). Springer.
- Sarmiento, R., & Badiang, S. (2024). Teachers' work burnout, social support, and resilience amidst COVID-19 pandemic. *Annals of Studies in Science and Humanities*, 5(2), 12–20. <https://journals.carsu.edu.ph/jASSH/article/view/157>
- Shell, R. L. (1992). Organizational Control Systems and Performance Management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 20(3), 45–58.
- Sujith, A. S. (2017). Performance Appraisal Practices in Different Countries – A Review. *International Journal for Scientific Research & Development*, 5(3).
- Tolentino, B. (2021). Understanding teacher perceptions of RPMS evaluation: Age, experience, and feedback integration. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Development*, 3(2), 58–70.
- Tripartite Alliance for Fair & Progressive Employment Practices. (2024). Performance Management: Appraisal & Employee Improvement.
- Urbano, D. P., & Gurat, M. G. (2023). Level of Practice in the Implementation of DepEd's Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS).
- Urbino, M. C., & Lopez, J. A. (2023). Level of Practice in the Implementation of DepEd's Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). *PhilArchive*.