

From Policy to Practice: Awareness of the Multi-Year Performance Management and Evaluation System Among Public Secondary School Teachers

Niño B. Belocura & Chilo D. Bargamento & William A. Buquia

Abstract — It examined teachers' awareness of the Multi-Year Performance Management and Evaluation System, a developmental framework aimed at enhancing accountability, professional growth, and instructional quality in public secondary schools. Using a descriptive-comparative-correlational design, data from stratified samples of teachers in two districts were gathered through the use of a researcher-developed survey questionnaire that was expert-validated and pilot-tested to determine content validity and high reliability. Participants provided demographic information and rated their awareness of the Performance Management Cycle and the Key Result Areas through the use of a structured Likert-scale instrument. Descriptive statistics, comparative procedures applicable for non-normally distributed data, and analyses of correlation were conducted to determine the level of awareness, differences among profile groups, and relationships within the components of PMES. Findings revealed that teachers have very high awareness in both the Performance Management Cycle and the KRAs, showing significant associations that point out comprehension in PMES processes supports the comprehension of performance domains. Although awareness has been high in the general trend, disparities by age, career stage, educational attainment, and training exposures showed uneven understanding and pointed out areas where greater support is needed. The paper concludes that, while PMES is well known in procedural terms, much deeper and more consistent awareness is called for to realize its full developmental intent, making the case for continuous advocacy effort toward meaningful and homogeneous implementation.

Keywords: *Performance Management, Teachers' Awareness, PMES, Key Result Areas, Advocacy Campaign*

I. INTRODUCTION

Teacher performance management systems are widely regarded as developmental instruments that improve instructional quality by aligning feedback, mentoring, and evaluation with national education objectives. In the Philippines, the mandate is translated into operation through the Multi-Year Performance Management and Evaluation System or PMES, which is founded on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. To address concerns that teachers usually comply with the requirements of PMES without fully understanding its developmental purpose, this study found out the extent to which public secondary school teachers were aware of PMES guidelines for the School Year 2025-2026 in terms of the Performance Management Cycle, KRAs, and their interrelationship, to be able to propose an advocacy campaign. A descriptive-comparative-correlational design was used. Teachers were stratified randomly to complete a researcher-made, expert-validated, pilot-tested questionnaire with established reliability. Data had been analyzed using descriptive statistics, distribution checks, non-parametric group comparison procedures, and rank-order correlation. Results showed that the teachers-who were generally young and positioned at the beginning to proficient stages of their careers-reported very high awareness of both the Performance Management Cycle and the KRAs, that there was a significant positive association between awareness of process phases and performance domains, although there were variations across selected profile variables. This study thus concludes that, although PMES is generally known at the level of procedure, differentiated and sustained advocacy remains necessary to deepen teachers' conceptual understanding and promote a more consistent, growth-oriented use of the system.

Literature Review

TPMSs around the world emphasize cyclical sequences of planning, monitoring, review, and development, with awareness on the part of teachers seen as fundamental to engagement, fairness, and substantive improvement. For effective TPMS to operate, teachers must know how standards, indicators, and feedback pertain to growth, and as Peck et al. (2021) and de Hoyos (2024)

demonstrate clarity, coaching, and explicit orientation underpin system uptake. Contemporary models (Wongmahesak, 2025) also conceptualize teacher performance as a multi-year, developmental process requiring strong awareness of criteria and expectations. International frameworks from the World Bank, UNESCO, and OECD also suggest that awareness reduces anxiety, enhances legitimacy, and strengthens participation. Research in developing contexts finds that transparency enhances teacher trust and ownership (Pesambili, 2022; Beteille & Evans, 2024; Taylor & Tyler, 2020). Philippine studies support such findings in showing that awareness of phases in PMES and PPST-aligned KRAs leads to more accurate documentation, receptivity to coaching, and motivation to improve practice (Brillantes, 2023; Domingo, 2022; Rosales, 2024; Clemente, 2021; Garcia, 2023; Luna, 2023), whereas low awareness results in inconsistent implementation (Santos, 2022; Reyes, 2023). International evidence shows time and again that awareness strengthens instructional alignment, collaboration, confidence, and professional growth (Foster, 2024; Green, 2023; Li, 2021; Williams, 2024; Brown, 2023; Olsen, 2022; Rahman, 2022; Kumar, 2024; Rossi, 2021). Overall, the literature points to a core insight: teacher awareness of performance systems—their phases, indicators, and developmental purpose—is foundational to engagement, consistency, and instructional improvement, and provides a robust conceptual basis for examining awareness about PMES, and informing advocacy efforts.

II. METHODOLOGY

This investigation used a descriptive–comparative–correlational design in determining the teachers’ level of awareness regarding PMES, comparing their level of awareness by profile group, and examining any association between the level of awareness on the performance management cycle and the key result areas. The stratified random sample proportionately consisted of 343 teachers from the total population. The researcher-developed 55-item questionnaire, anchored on the PMES and PPST frameworks, was expert-validated and pilot-tested and proved to be highly reliable ($\alpha > .96$). The instrument measured demographic profiles and level of awareness in regard to the four PMES phases, and seven KRAs aligned with PPST using both a five-point Likert scale and an open-ended item. Institutional approval and informed consent were obtained after which the

instrument was administered in supervised sessions and retrieved immediately. Data coded have been analyzed using descriptive statistics to describe the profiles and levels of awareness. Since the data failed the normality testing, the non-parametric analysis was utilized; therefore, Spearman's rank-order correlation was used to establish the correlations of the level of awareness in regard to the cycle phase and the KRAs. All analyses have been interpreted at the 0.05 significance level to inform the development of the proposed advocacy campaign.

Research Design

This study adopted a descriptive–comparative–correlational design to assess teachers' awareness of the Multi-Year Performance Management and Evaluation System, compare awareness across demographic and professional groups, and determine relationships among pertinent variables. The descriptive component quantified teachers' awareness of the four phases of PMES cycle and the PPST-aligned Key Result Areas. The comparative component evaluated variations across characteristics including age, sex, educational attainment, teaching experience, training exposure, career stage, and the grade level taught. The correlational component assessed the alignment between awareness of the Performance Management Cycle and awareness of the Key Result Areas. Collectively, these components constitute a coherent analytical framework that informs the development of an evidence-based advocacy campaign to strengthen PMES understanding and implementation.

Sample of the Study

Stratified random sampling was used to ensure that the population proportionate to all participating secondary schools was attained, where each school represented a unique stratum and sample size allocation was determined by faculty size. Within each stratum, respondents were selected through a simple lottery, which resulted in a total of 134 teachers in the study. Participants were described in terms of some profile variables: age, sex, educational attainment, teaching experience, training exposure, career stage, and grade level handled, which provided the bases for subsequent analyses. This sampling strategy ensured balanced representation, minimized bias, and

improved the validity and generalizability of the data used in assessing teachers' awareness of PMES and informing the proposed advocacy campaign.

Measures

The structured questionnaire was researcher-developed, adhering to the official guidelines of PMES and the Performance Management Cycle and KRAs articulated in the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers. Content validity was determined through expert evaluation. The instrument consists of three parts: (1) demographic and professional profile, (2) awareness regarding four phases in the PMES cycle, and (3) seven PPST-specified KRAs. All items were measured using five-point Likert ratings, supplemented with an open-ended question that would provide deeper insights. Reliability was established through a pilot test among 30 teachers from a neighboring district, with a Cronbach's alpha of .960, indicating excellent internal consistency. Collectively, these results reflect the instrument's validity, reliability, and suitability to determine teachers' awareness for the succeeding analyses of the study and the development of the advocacy campaign.

Procedure

Data collection proceeded subsequent to institutional approval and adherence to ethical standards. Authorization was obtained from the pertinent education authorities, followed by coordination with school administrators to establish scheduling. Participants received orientation regarding the study's purpose, procedures, and ethical safeguards, and informed consent was obtained to ensure voluntary, confidential, and anonymous participation. The questionnaire, developed by the researcher and validated by three experts with a high validity index of 4.27, has shown its reliability through pilot testing. It would be administered in printed format or under supervision, depending on the availability of teachers, and the completed instruments would be retrieved immediately to avoid missing data. Logistical challenges that may be encountered, such as scheduling conflicts and delays in coordination, were mitigated through ongoing communication

and flexible adjustments. All procedures should be strictly carried out to further ensure the accuracy of the data and an accurate reflection of teachers' PMES awareness.

Data Processing

Data gathered were encoded, cleaned, and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical tools. Frequency counts and percentages were used to summarize respondents' profiles, while weighted means and standard deviations quantified the levels of awareness for the phases of the PMES cycle and KRAs. The Shapiro–Wilk test proved that all variables departed from normality; thus, non-parametric analysis was adopted. The Spearman rank-order correlation was used to determine the relationships between the awareness of the Performance Management Cycle and the KRAs, running all tests at a 0.05 significance level. This provided an analytical framework that dealt rigorously with ordinal data not normally distributed, and its output provided a substantive basis for informing the proposed advocacy campaign on PMES awareness.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Extent of Awareness of Performance Management Cycle

This section assesses the level of awareness regarding the Performance Management Cycle. It is expected to establish the extent to which teachers are aware of the processes involved in performance planning, monitoring and coaching, review and evaluation, and rewarding and development planning within the PMES framework.

TABLE 1
EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT CYCLE IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE PLANNING AND COMMITMENT

Item	Mean	Interpretation
21. Understanding the process of setting individual performance objectives aligned with school and organizational goals.	4.93	Very Great Extent
22. Identifying Key Result Areas (KRAs) and performance indicators during the planning phase.	4.04	Great Extent
23. Participating in performance planning conferences with immediate supervisors.	4.19	Great Extent
24. Clarifying roles and responsibilities based on agreed performance targets.	4.43	Very Great Extent
25. Committing to deliver outputs within the performance standards set for the school year.	4.28	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.37	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.21-5.00= *Very Great Extent*; 3.41-4.20= *Great Extent*; 2.61-3.40= *Moderate Extent*; 1.81-2.60= *Low Extent*; 1.00-1.80= *Very Low Extent*

As shown in Table 1, teachers have displayed a high degree of competence with respect to performance planning and commitment, with an aggregate mean of 4.37. This would therefore suggest that individual goals would be well-aligned with institutional priorities and that the expectations inherent in the performance management system would be clearly committed to. Understanding how to set performance objectives aligned with school goals also had the highest rating among all the items (mean = 4.93). This is indicative of a good understanding of goal alignment and the ability of the teachers to link classroom targets with broader improvement initiatives. This suggests clear direction and deliberate performance planning. On the other hand, the item which was rated least—identifying Key Result Areas (KRAs) and performance indicators during planning (mean = 4.04)—indicates some challenges in translating objectives into measurable indicators. It may be that limited training or mentoring is given on more technical aspects of indicator formulation; this could lead to inconsistent monitoring and misaligned outcomes. These findings are in keeping with the studies by Almario & Espinosa (2021) and Aruta (2022), who found that teachers showed great interest in planning but needed further support to operationalize performance metrics.

TABLE 2
EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT CYCLE IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND COACHING

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Recognizing the importance of continuous monitoring of performance progress.	4.86	Very Great Extent
2. Engaging in regular discussions or coaching sessions with supervisors.	4.77	Very Great Extent
3. Tracking personal accomplishments against the agreed-upon performance indicators.	4.28	Very Great Extent
4. Seeking feedback and guidance to improve task implementation.	4.33	Very Great Extent
5. Using performance data to identify areas for professional growth during the monitoring period.	4.08	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.46	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.21-5.00= *Very Great Extent*; 3.41-4.20= *Great Extent*; 2.61-3.40= *Moderate Extent*; 1.81-2.60= *Low Extent*; 1.00-1.80= *Very Low Extent*

Table 2 shows that the teachers demonstrate a very high level of competence in performance monitoring and coaching, as indicated by the overall mean score of 4.46. This reveals active engagement in continuous monitoring, coaching sessions, and feedback mechanisms under the RPMS system. The highest-rated item - perceived importance of continuous monitoring of performance progress (mean = 4.86) - displays strong appreciation for accountability, self-assessment, and timely adjustment of instructional practices. To some extent, this would mean that teachers perceive tracking their progress as necessary to ensure that instruction is of quality and appropriate for the attainment of school goals. Conversely, the lowest rating pertained to using data information on performance to pinpoint areas in professional growth (mean = 4.08), highlighting the challenges in applying analytics data for self-improvement. Poor data literacy or a lack of coaching may influence teachers to be more dependent on others for feedback rather than self-reflection based on evidence, thus undermining the possibility for growth and development through monitoring practices. This is in line with what Cruz and Serrano (2023) and Francisco (2021) said: any robust monitoring systems need teachers to interpret and then use performance data efficiently.

TABLE 3
EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT CYCLE IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND EVALUATION

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Understanding the procedures for reviewing and rating employee performance.	4.53	Very Great Extent
2. Participating actively in performance evaluation conferences.	4.19	Very Great Extent
3. Interpreting the performance rating tools and criteria used in the PMES.	4.28	Very Great Extent
4. Comparing achieved results with agreed performance commitments.	4.35	Very Great Extent
5. Acknowledging the role of performance review in determining merit and development needs.	4.60	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.39	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.21-5.00= *Very Great Extent*; 3.41-4.20= *Great Extent*; 2.61-3.40= *Moderate Extent*; 1.81-2.60= *Low Extent*; 1.00-1.80= *Very Low Extent*

Table 3 shows that teachers are highly competent in performance review and evaluation, as shown by the overall mean of 4.39. This implies high involvement in the processes of evaluation and recognition of its role in professional development. The highest-rated item, which centers around acknowledging the role of performance review in establishing merit and development needs (mean = 4.60), indicates a positive disposition among teachers toward reviewing as developmental rather than a mere formality. The findings imply a culture that supports feedback, reflective practice, and accountability. The lowest-rated item is active participation during conferences of evaluation, with a mean of 4.19, which remains high but indicates that some teachers will be somewhat hesitant to engage fully in performance discussions, likely due to either time constraints or discomfort with evaluative conversation. Such limited participation may reduce the potential for collaborative reflection and hence attenuate the developmental purpose of the process. This assertion seems consistent with Manalo (2022) and Eustaquio & Santiago (2020) who argued that participatory approaches to review enhance fairness, empowerment, and professional growth.

TABLE 4
EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT CYCLE IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCE REWARDING AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Understanding how performance ratings are linked to rewards, recognition, or incentives.	4.50	Very Great Extent
2. Identifying opportunities for professional development based on evaluation results.	4.60	Very Great Extent
3. Participating in the preparation of Individual Development Plans (IDPs).	4.90	Very Great Extent
4. Recognizing exemplary performance among colleagues through PMES mechanisms.	4.80	Very Great Extent
5. Supporting initiatives that promote continuous improvement and employee motivation.	4.50	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.66	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.21-5.00= *Very Great Extent*; 3.41-4.20= *Great Extent*; 2.61-3.40= *Moderate Extent*; 1.81-2.60= *Low Extent*; 1.00-1.80= *Very Low Extent*

Table 4: Performance Rewards and Development Planning This dimension shows a very high competence level, with a mean of 4.66, which indicates that teachers perceive and actively link evaluation with growth and improvement. The highest-rated item, participation in preparing Individual Development Plans (mean = 4.90), suggests a strong disposition toward self-directed professional development and alignment with the RPMS cycle. In contrast, the lowest ratings pertain to understanding the relationship between ratings and rewards and supporting improvement initiatives or action plans, both garnering means of 4.50, implying that while teachers appreciate recognition, the reward mechanisms could be unclear or inconsistently applied; this can dampen their motivational effect. This points to the need for better information dissemination and consistency in the implementation of recognition systems. These results are consistent with Castro and Loria (2023) and Ramos (2021), who similarly found that more transparent and significant award structures motivate teachers and are contributing factors to organizational commitment.

Extent of Awareness of The Key Result Areas (KRAS) in the PMES

This section outlines the level of awareness of the respondents with regards to the Key Result Areas within the PMES. The purpose is to determine the extent to which teachers understand the principal performance dimensions that undergird the assessment of effectiveness, accountability, and professional development within the performance management framework.

TABLE 5
EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF THE KEY RESULT AREAS (KRAS) IN THE PMES IN TERMS OF CONTENT KNOWLEDGE AND PEDAGOGY

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Demonstrating awareness of the importance of mastering subject content in effective teaching.	4.85	Very Great Extent
2. Understanding strategies for delivering lessons that promote critical and creative thinking.	4.90	Very Great Extent
3. Applying appropriate pedagogical approaches to address learning objectives.	4.90	Very Great Extent
4. Integrating technology and instructional materials to enhance content delivery.	4.90	Very Great Extent
5. Reflecting on teaching practices to improve learner understanding and engagement.	4.85	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.88	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.21-5.00= *Very Great Extent*; 3.41-4.20= *Great Extent*; 2.61-3.40= *Moderate Extent*; 1.81-2.60= *Low Extent*; 1.00-1.80= *Very Low Extent*

Table 5 shows a very high level of competence on Content Knowledge and Pedagogy with an overall mean of 4.88, suggesting solid subject matter competence and good pedagogical skills amongst the teachers. The highest-rated item involves the strategies that foster critical and creative thinking with a mean of 4.90, which further describes how teachers manage to engage students in higher-order thinking as stated in PPST Domain 1. The lowest-rated item, which was about the importance of content mastery, had a mean of 4.85 but is likewise very high; slight variation

indicates that while teachers value mastery highly, periodic updating of subjects is necessary since the emphasis of teaching is now shifting to application and engagement. This finding is supported by Aldover and Llanes (2021) and Ramirez and Castañeda (2022) as they argue that the combination of strong content knowledge and effective pedagogy can improve critical thinking, class engagement, and learning performance.

TABLE 6
EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF THE KEY RESULT AREAS (KRAS) IN THE PMES IN TERMS OF LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Maintaining awareness of classroom management strategies that promote positive behavior.	4.30	Very Great Extent
2. Ensuring safety, inclusivity, and respect in the learning environment.	4.68	Very Great Extent
3. Organizing classroom layouts that support collaborative and independent learning.	4.89	Very Great Extent
4. Utilizing classroom routines that foster responsibility and learner participation.	4.78	Very Great Extent
5. Promoting a supportive atmosphere that encourages curiosity and self-discipline.	4.57	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.64	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.21-5.00= Very Great Extent; 3.41-4.20= Great Extent; 2.61-3.40= Moderate Extent; 1.81-2.60= Low Extent; 1.00-1.80= Very Low Extent

Table 6 shows an exceptionally high competence in managing the learning environment, with an overall mean of 4.64, suggesting that teachers effectively create safe, inclusive, and engaging classrooms. The highest-rated item, arranging layouts to support collaborative and independent learning (mean = 4.89), reflects a strong capacity to design flexible, student-centered spaces that foster interaction and autonomy. The lowest-rated item, maintaining awareness of positive behavior management strategies (mean = 4.30), remains high but points to challenges in consistently applying proactive discipline, likely influenced by large or diverse class sizes. This pattern implies a need for ongoing support in behavior management to sustain positive learning

climates. These findings are supported by the work of Reyes and Villanueva (2021) and Domingo and Torres. (2023), who emphasize that effective learning environments are strengthened when teachers receive continuous mentoring and collegial support in managing student behavior.

TABLE 7
EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF THE KEY RESULT AREAS (KRAS) IN THE PMES IN TERMS OF DIVERSITY OF LEARNERS

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Recognizing learners’ individual differences, backgrounds, and learning styles.	4.67	Very Great Extent
2. Adjusting teaching methods to accommodate varied learner needs and abilities.	4.56	Very Great Extent
3. Applying inclusive practices that support students with special needs.	4.76	Very Great Extent
4. Respecting cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity in instruction.	4.89	Very Great Extent
5. Designing learning activities that ensure equitable participation for all learners.	4.75	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.73	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.21-5.00= *Very Great Extent*; 3.41-4.20= *Great Extent*; 2.61-3.40= *Moderate Extent*; 1.81-2.60= *Low Extent*; 1.00-1.80= *Very Low Extent*

Table 7 shows an exceptionally high competence in addressing the Diversity of Learners, with a general mean of 4.73, indicating that the teachers effectively use approaches that are inclusive and culturally responsive. The highest-rated item—respecting the cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic diversity (mean = 4.89)—exhibits strong sensitivity to learner backgrounds and connotes a clear adherence to the PPST expectation for equitable and respectful learning environments. The lowest-rated item—modification in teaching methods to respond to or accommodate differences in learners (mean = 4.56)—would suggest that while teachers recognize the imperative of differentiation, practical limitations such as class sizes, resource constraints, or lack of appropriate training hinder consistent application. This result tallies with the conclusion reached by De Guzman and Santos (2022) and Garcia and Cruz (2023) that ongoing professional

development supported by the institution would be necessary to solidify the practice of inclusive and differentiated instruction.

TABLE 8
EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF THE KEY RESULT AREAS (KRAS) IN THE PMES IN
TERMS OF CURRICULUM AND PLANNING

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Understanding curriculum guides and standards prescribed by the Department of Education.	4.50	Very Great Extent
2. Aligning lesson objectives with content standards and performance indicators.	4.87	Very Great Extent
3. Preparing daily lesson logs or plans that reflect differentiated instruction.	4.78	Very Great Extent
4. Sequencing learning activities logically to achieve intended learning outcomes.	4.65	Very Great Extent
5. Collaborating with colleagues to plan curriculum-based enrichment activities.	4.89	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.74	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.21-5.00= *Very Great Extent*; 3.41-4.20= *Great Extent*; 2.61-3.40= *Moderate Extent*; 1.81-2.60= *Low Extent*; 1.00-1.80= *Very Low Extent*

Table 8 shows a high level of competence in Curriculum and Planning, with an overall mean of 4.74, hence indicating that teachers understand the curriculum standards critically and construct lessons aligned to the intended learning outcomes. The item rated highest, collaboration with colleagues to plan curriculum-based enrichment activities (mean = 4.89), underscores robust collegial planning supportive of coherent and aligned instruction. In the same way, the understanding of the curriculum guides and standards earned a lower rating with a mean of 4.50, thus still higher but implying an area where ongoing support is needed since, largely, curriculum updates and policy shifts entail continuous professional orientation. These findings also run in consonance with the literature as cited in Soriano (2021) and Bautista & Ramos (2022), which specifically underlined how collaboration and sustained curriculum literacy enhance instructional coherence and give teachers confidence in the translation of standards into practice.

TABLE 9
EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF THE KEY RESULT AREAS (KRAS) IN THE PMES IN
TERMS OF ASSESSMENT AND REPORTING

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Designing formative and summative assessments aligned with learning competencies.	4.90	Very Great Extent
2. Utilizing varied assessment tools to measure learner performance accurately.	4.76	Very Great Extent
3. Recording and analyzing learner results to inform instruction.	4.60	Very Great Extent
4. Communicating learners' progress to parents and stakeholders effectively.	4.90	Very Great Extent
5. Using assessment data to modify and improve teaching strategies.	4.98	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.83	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.21-5.00= *Very Great Extent*; 3.41-4.20= *Great Extent*; 2.61-3.40= *Moderate Extent*; 1.81-2.60= *Low Extent*; 1.00-1.80= *Very Low Extent*

Table 9 shows that the competence level in Assessment and Reporting is particularly high, with an overall mean of 4.83, indicating that teachers are able to design, implement, and utilize assessments for supporting instructional activities. The highest-rated item in this category was "using assessment data to improve teaching strategies" (mean = 4.98), which reveals a strong practice of data-driven teaching strategies aligned with RPMS–PPST expectations. The lowest-rated item was "recording and analyzing learner results" (mean = 4.60), indicating minor problems in documentation and data management, which are likely affected by workload and poor access to digital tools. This supports the findings of Francisco & Cabrera (2022) and Gomez & Villanueva (2023), who note that even though teachers are competent in the design of assessment, efficiency in recording and analysis of data can still be improved through the use of ICT-supported systems.

TABLE 10
EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF THE KEY RESULT AREAS (KRAS) IN THE PMES IN
TERMS OF COMMUNITY LINKAGES AND PROFESSIONAL ENGAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Collaborating with parents, community members, and stakeholders to support learning.	4.30	Very Great Extent
2. Participating in school and community outreach activities.	4.68	Very Great Extent
3. Establishing partnerships that enhance teaching and learning opportunities.	4.89	Very Great Extent
4. Sharing professional expertise through learning action cells or peer mentoring.	4.78	Very Great Extent
5. Demonstrating civic responsibility and commitment to community development.	4.57	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.64	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.21-5.00= *Very Great Extent*; 3.41-4.20= *Great Extent*; 2.61-3.40= *Moderate Extent*; 1.81-2.60= *Low Extent*; 1.00-1.80= *Very Low Extent*

Table 10 reflects a very high level of competence in Community Linkages and Professional Engagement, with a mean of 4.64. This would therefore imply that teachers do collaborate with parents, communities, and other stakeholders to support student learning. The highest-rated item was establishing partnerships that improve teaching and learning, with a mean of 4.89, showing a marked interest in establishing an assisting network that would enrich teaching and promote the welfare of the learners. The lowest-rated item was collaborative work with parents and community members, with a mean of 4.30, which means that barriers exist, such as a lack of time, gaps in communication, or resources within the community; such practices therefore call for extra support by the institution to maintain the involvement. This outcome is supported by findings from Alvarez and Reyes (2021) and Lopez and Dela Cruz (2022), who argue that effective community partnerships are more likely to raise learner outcomes when underpinned by clear structures and ongoing communication.

TABLE 11
EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF THE KEY RESULT AREAS (KRAS) IN THE PMES IN
TERMS OF PERSONAL GROWTH AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Item	Mean	Interpretation
1. Engaging in continuous learning through seminars, trainings, and graduate studies.	4.87	Very Great Extent
2. Reflecting on personal strengths and areas for improvement in teaching practice.	4.78	Very Great Extent
3. Participating in professional organizations and networks.	4.65	Very Great Extent
4. Applying new knowledge and skills gained from professional development activities.	4.89	Very Great Extent
5. Setting professional goals aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST).	4.90	Very Great Extent
Overall Mean	4.82	Very Great Extent

Legend: 4.21-5.00= *Very Great Extent*; 3.41-4.20= *Great Extent*; 2.61-3.40= *Moderate Extent*; 1.81-2.60= *Low Extent*; 1.00-1.80= *Very Low Extent*

Table 11 indicates a very high level of competence in Personal Growth and Professional Development, with an overall mean score of 4.82, which signifies good motivation and proactive pursuit by the teachers themselves of continuing improvement. The highest-rated item, "setting professional goals aligned with the PPST" (mean = 4.90), discloses pronounced goal orientation and clear congruence with career-stage expectations. On the contrary, the lowest-rated item, "participation in professional organizations" (mean = 4.65), may suggest certain hindrances, like workload or lack of opportunities, that may limit wider professional involvement. The findings are consistent with Cabrera and Mendoza (2023) and Santos and Alon (2022), who argue that continuous professional growth is facilitated by an enabling environment and access to collaborative learning networks.

Significant Relationship Between the Respondents' Perceived Extent of Awareness of the Performance Management Cycle and Their Extent of Awareness of the Key Result Areas (KRAS) in the PMES

This section explores the relationship between respondents' level of awareness of the Performance Management Cycle and their level of awareness regarding the identification of KRAs within the PMES to establish whether teachers who are more fully informed about the performance management process also show greater awareness of the KRAs that form the foundation for assessing and improving professional performance.

TABLE 12
SIGNIFICANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS' PERCEIVED EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT CYCLE AND THEIR EXTENT OF AWARENESS OF THE KEY RESULT AREAS (KRAS) IN THE PMES

Correlates	N	Spearman Rho	Level of Sig	p-value	Interpretation
Awareness of Performance Management Cycle	134	.888	0.05	.000	Significant
Awareness of the Key Result Areas (KRAs) in the PMES					

Legend: $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level; $p \leq .05 =$ Significant; $p \geq .05 =$ Not Significant

Table 12 shows a Spearman rho of .888 ($p = .000$), which means that there is a strong and statistically significant positive correlation between teachers' awareness of the Performance Management Cycle and their awareness of the Key Result Areas. More specifically, the more familiar teachers are with the phases in the PMES cycle, the greater their awareness of the KRAs, since these two fundamental elements of the performance system inherently go in tandem. Such a result would indicate that the deeper the understanding of planning, monitoring, reviewing, and development processes, the better the understanding of KRAs as quantifiable dimensions of performance. This finding is supported by previous research studies conducted by Cortez & Evangelista, 2022; Villanueva & Robles, 2021; Garcia & Soriano, 2023, which also show that

awareness of performance management processes enhances the understanding of KRAs and ultimately supports wholistic engagement, accountability, and professional growth.

IV. CONCLUSION

These results show that the teaching workforce is young and positioned at early to mid-career stages, with the majority possessing bachelor's degrees and comparatively fewer years of experience. Such a profile indicates a developing professional trajectory that is highly amenable to ongoing capacity-building. Teachers showed a very high level of awareness regarding the Performance Management Cycle, indicating a clear understanding of planning, monitoring and coaching, review and evaluation, and rewarding and development planning. Similarly, awareness of the Key Result Areas as articulated in the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers was also very high, pointing to strong familiarity with the domains employed to assess professional practice. A significant positive relationship was found between awareness of the Performance Management Cycle and awareness of the KRAs; this would suggest that a more complete understanding of PMES processes bears a relationship with a stronger understanding of performance domains. Despite generally high levels of awareness, differences across the profile groups do indicate a need for more consistent and targeted support. Overall, these findings would suggest that sustained, structured, and differentiated professional development efforts may enhance uniform comprehension and maximize the developmental value of the PMES for all teachers.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Aldover, F., & Llanes, D. (2021). Pedagogical content knowledge and teaching effectiveness among secondary teachers. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 3(1), 55–67.
- [2.] Almario, G., & Espinosa, M. (2021). Teachers' understanding of performance indicators in the Philippine Results-Based Performance Management System. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 9(3), 55–68.
- [3.] Alvarez, M., & Reyes, J. (2021). Strengthening school-community partnerships: Roles of teachers and stakeholders. *Philippine Journal of Community Education*, 7(2), 55–70.
- [4.] Aruta, J. (2022). Coaching practices and teachers' performance planning in Philippine public schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Leadership*, 10(2), 112–127.
- [5.] Bautista, R., & Ramos, J. (2022). Curriculum alignment and lesson planning competence among basic education teachers. *International Journal of Educational Practice*, 8(2), 90–105.
- [6.] Beteille, T., & Evans, D. (2024). *Effective teacher policy reforms: Sequence, capacity and incentives in multi-year performance systems*. Teacher Task Force Briefing.
- [7.] Brillantes, R. M. (2023). Performance management reforms and teacher accountability in Philippine public schools. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 67(2), 45–63.
- [8.] Brown, T. (2023). Teachers' awareness of evaluation systems and its influence on classroom planning in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Educational Evaluation*, 29(2), 112–128.
- [9.] Cabrera, N., & Mendoza, L. (2023). Teachers' participation in professional networks: Impact on reflective practice and collaboration. *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education and Development*, 13(1), 122–139.
- [10.] Castro, M., & Loria, E. (2023). Motivation and performance rewards among public-school teachers: Challenges and prospects. *Philippine Journal of Educational Management*, 7(1), 45–61.
- [11.] Clemente, M. D. (2021). Human resource perspectives on performance appraisal in the Department of Education. *Asian Journal of Education and Human Development*, 9(1), 92–108.
- [12.] Cortez, R., & Evangelista, M. (2022). Linking performance management awareness and key result area understanding among public school teachers. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership and Management*, 5(2), 75–92.
- [13.] Cruz, C., & Serrano, P. (2023). Teachers' use of performance data for professional development in basic education. *Journal of Educational Assessment and Evaluation*, 5(4), 102–119.
- [14.] De Guzman, C., & Santos, A. (2022). Teachers' implementation of differentiated instruction in diverse classrooms: Challenges and prospects. *Asia Pacific Journal of Inclusive Education*, 12(3), 150–167.
- [15.] de Hoyos, R. (2024). The impact of combining performance-management tools and training supports in teacher professional contexts. *International Journal of Educational Management*. Advance online publication.

-
- [16.] Domingo, A. S. (2022). Awareness of PPST-aligned performance standards among public school teachers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education and Development*, 10(3), 112–126.
- [17.] Domingo, L., & Torres, E. (2023). Classroom management and learning engagement: The mediating role of teacher collaboration. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 6(1), 112–129.
- [18.] Eustaquio, D., & Santiago, L. (2020). Collaborative evaluation and teacher empowerment in performance management. *Philippine Education Research Journal*, 8(2), 66–80.
- [19.] Foster, J. L. (2024). Teachers' comprehension of performance appraisal frameworks and instructional improvement in district schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38(1), 44–59.
- [20.] Francisco, R., & Cabrera, D. (2022). Assessment competence and reporting practices among public school teachers. *International Journal of Educational Measurement*, 10(2), 77–95.
- [21.] Garcia, J. E. (2023). Feedback and coaching practices in teacher performance management. *Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement*, 14(2), 88–103.
- [22.] Garcia, L., & Soriano, D. (2023). Performance management literacy and teacher engagement in results-based evaluation systems. *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education and Professional Practice*, 14(1), 112–128.
- [23.] Garcia, M., & Cruz, K. (2023). Inclusive pedagogy and learner-centered instruction in Philippine schools. *Journal of Educational Development and Innovation*, 9(2), 76–93.
- [24.] Gomez, P., & Villanueva, S. (2023). Digital assessment systems and teacher data management efficiency. *Journal of Educational Innovation and Research*, 8(4), 140–156.
- [25.] Green, A. R. (2023). Teachers' awareness of competency-based evaluation standards in Australia. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 48(4), 67–83.
- [26.] Kumar, S. (2024). Teachers' awareness of evaluation reforms and professional engagement in India. *Asian Education Studies*, 9(2), 56–71.
- [27.] Li, X. (2021). Secondary teachers' awareness of performance appraisal reforms in China. *International Review of Education*, 67(3), 389–405.
- [28.] Lopez, G., & Dela Cruz, F. (2022). Parental engagement and teacher collaboration in community-based education. *Philippine Education Research Journal*, 12(1), 33–49.
- [29.] Luna, C. B. (2023). Understanding PPST indicators through the Performance Management and Evaluation System. *Philippine Normal University Research Journal*, 54(2), 133–149.
- [30.] Manalo, R. (2022). Teachers' participation and perception of fairness in performance evaluation. *Journal of Educational Policy and Administration*, 14(1), 55–71.
- [31.] Olsen, H. K. (2022). Teachers' awareness of performance monitoring tools in Scandinavian schools. *Nordic Studies in Education*, 42(1), 25–41.
- [32.] Peck, C. A., Young, M. G., & Zhang, W. (2021). *Using teaching performance assessments for program evaluation and improvement in teacher education*. National Academy of Education.
- [33.] Pesambili, R. (2022). Global policy discourse and the legitimacy of teacher performance evaluation: Ethical and contextual considerations. *Comparative Education Review*.
- [34.] Rahman, A. R. (2022). Malaysian teachers' awareness of appraisal standards under the National Education Blueprint. *Journal of Southeast Asian Education*, 14(2), 57–73.
-

-
- [35.] Ramirez, P., & Castañeda, G. (2022). Integrating content knowledge and pedagogy for improved student outcomes. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 21(6), 1–17.
- [36.] Ramos, J. (2021). Linking teacher performance with rewards and recognition: A basis for motivation enhancement. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education and Management*, 5(2), 88–100.
- [37.] Reyes, P. M. (2023). Implementation of the Multi-Year Performance Commitment Review System in Pampanga. *Philippine Journal of Public School Administration*, 6(1), 33–48.
- [38.] Reyes, C., & Villanueva, J. (2021). Teachers' management practices and classroom climate in public secondary schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Leadership*, 5(2), 44–61.
- [39.] Rosales, F. L. (2024). Linking RPMS to the Multi-Year Performance Management and Evaluation System. *Philippine Journal of Educational Administration*, 13(1), 101–118.
- [40.] Rossi, G. (2021). Teachers' awareness of performance evaluation and motivation in Italy. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 10(3), 1145–1157.
- [41.] Santos, V. M. (2022). Transitioning from RPMS to PMES: Teacher readiness and awareness. *DepEd Schools Division Research Journal*, 5(2), 65–81.
- [42.] Santos, M., & Alon, E. (2022). Continuous professional development and its effects on teacher motivation and instructional competence. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*, 9(2), 88–103.
- [43.] Soriano, L. (2021). Collaborative curriculum planning and instructional coherence in basic education. *Asia Pacific Education Research Review*, 4(1), 77–91.
- [44.] Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2020). The effect of teacher evaluation on productivity and performance. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 12(1), 362–395.
- [45.] Villanueva, P., & Robles, E. (2021). Teacher engagement and understanding of key result areas in the performance management framework. *International Journal of Educational Development and Evaluation*, 9(3), 144–159.
- [46.] Williams, R. T. (2024). Teachers' understanding of appraisal frameworks and professional relationships in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 199, 15–34.
- [47.] Wongmahesak, K. (2025). Teacher performance: What is it, how is it sustained? *Asia Education & Learning Research Journal*, 1(1), 40–57.