OPEN ACCESS Crossref doi creative commons

INSTABRIGHT

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

RESEARCH ARTICLE

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION SYSTEM (PMES) OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: A NATIONAL ASSESSMENT

ALVIN B. PUNONGBAYAN, LPT, MAEd, MAT, PhD, PD-SML, SMRIEDr
Researcher
Chairman & President – Instabright International Guild of Researchers and Educators, Inc.
info@instabright.online

Article History
Received: June 5, 2026
Revised: July 16, 2026
Published: August 30, 2026

ABSTRACT

The Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) is one of the Department of Education's tools for assessing the performance of teachers and other personnel. It aims to encourage accountability, improve work performance, and support professional growth. However, many teachers have expressed concerns that the current implementation of PMES requires too much documentation and preparation of Means of Verification (MOVs), resulting in additional workload that takes time away from lesson preparation and classroom instruction.

This action research assessed the effectiveness of the current PMES implementation in public schools across the Philippines. Specifically, it examined teachers' and school heads' perceptions of the system, identified the challenges they encountered, and gathered their recommendations for improving the evaluation process.

A descriptive research design using quantitative and qualitative methods was employed.

The findings revealed that respondents generally recognized PMES as an important evaluation tool. However, they also reported that the preparation of numerous Means of Verification, repetitive documentation, and extensive paperwork significantly increased teachers' administrative workload. Many participants recommended simplifying the evaluation process by using existing school records and minimizing additional documentary requirements.

Based on these findings, the study developed a **Proposed PMES Performance Validation Checklist** and **Proposed Implementing Rules** that focus on evaluating teacher performance through official school records, classroom observations, and regular supervisory monitoring instead of requiring separate PMES portfolios. The proposed intervention aims to make the evaluation process more objective, efficient, and supportive of teachers' professional growth while reducing unnecessary paperwork.

It is recommended that the Department of Education consider pilot testing the proposed PMES checklist and implementing rules in selected schools to determine their effectiveness before wider implementation.

Keywords: *Performance Management and Evaluation System, PMES, teacher evaluation, action research, Department of Education, school records, performance appraisal*

CONTEXT AND RATIONALE

The quality of education largely depends on the competence and performance of teachers. As frontliners of the educational system, teachers play a significant role in helping learners acquire the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes needed for lifelong learning. Recognizing this, the Department of Education (DepEd) continues to strengthen its performance management system to ensure that teachers remain accountable, competent, and committed to delivering quality education.

One of the mechanisms used by the Department is the **Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES)**. PMES is designed to assess employee performance by measuring the accomplishment of assigned duties and responsibilities. It aims to promote accountability, improve work performance, recognize accomplishments, and identify areas where coaching, mentoring, and professional development are needed. Through regular monitoring and evaluation, PMES seeks to align individual performance with the goals and objectives of the Department.

In general, PMES is a valuable management tool because it encourages continuous improvement and provides school administrators with information needed for performance evaluation and decision-making. It also promotes transparency by setting common standards and performance expectations for all personnel.

Despite these benefits, the implementation of PMES has also presented challenges in many public schools. Teachers are required to prepare and organize numerous Means of Verification (MOVs) and other documentary requirements to support their performance ratings. Although documentation is essential for accountability, preparing portfolios and compiling evidence require considerable time and effort. Since many of these documents have already been submitted during the school year, requiring another set for PMES often results in repetitive work.

Teachers already perform various responsibilities beyond classroom instruction. They prepare lesson plans, develop assessments, check learner outputs, compute grades, participate in Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, attend meetings, implement school programs, and accomplish other administrative tasks. The additional preparation of extensive PMES documentation further increases their workload and reduces the time available for lesson preparation, learner intervention, and instructional improvement.

School heads also experience similar challenges. Aside from supervising instruction and managing school operations, they are expected to review and validate numerous documentary requirements within a limited period. As a result, more time may be devoted to

checking documents than to classroom observation, coaching, mentoring, and instructional supervision, which are among the primary purposes of performance management.

Another concern raised by educators is the growing availability of commercially prepared Means of Verification and the increasing use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in generating reports and other documentary requirements. These developments raise questions about the authenticity of submitted documents and suggest that performance evaluation should rely more on verified school records and actual work performance rather than on the volume of documentary evidence submitted.

These things prompted the researcher to conduct this action research. Rather than questioning the importance of PMES, the study aimed to examine its current implementation, identify the challenges encountered by teachers and school heads, and determine possible ways to improve the system while preserving accountability and transparency.

Specifically, this study assessed the effectiveness of PMES implementation among Department of Education personnel from different regions of the Philippines. It gathered the perceptions of teachers and school heads regarding the strengths of the current system, the challenges they experienced, and their recommendations for improvement.

Based on the findings, the researcher developed a **Proposed PMES Performance Validation Checklist (PPVC)** together with its **Proposed Implementing Rules**. The proposed intervention emphasizes the use of existing official school records, classroom observations, and continuous supervisory monitoring as the primary sources of performance evidence. Instead of requiring teachers to prepare another portfolio of documents already submitted during the school year, school heads will validate performance using available records maintained by the school.

The proposed intervention is expected to reduce unnecessary paperwork, simplify the performance evaluation process, promote fairness and objectivity, and enable teachers and school heads to focus more on teaching, instructional supervision, and learner development. Ultimately, this action research supports the Department of Education's continuing efforts to

improve performance management through practical, evidence-based recommendations that respond to the realities experienced by educators in Philippine public schools.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This action research aimed to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) in the Department of Education and develop a practical intervention that would simplify the evaluation process while maintaining accountability and quality.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
    1.1 Position;
    1.2 Sex;
    1.3 Age;
    1.4 Highest Educational Attainment;
    1.5 Length of Service; and
    1.6 Region?
2. How do the respondents assess the effectiveness of the current implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) in terms of:
    2.1 Performance Planning;
    2.2 Performance Monitoring and Coaching;
    2.3 Performance Review and Evaluation;
    2.4 Performance Rewards and Development Planning; and
    2.5 Overall PMES Implementation?

3. What challenges do teachers and school heads encounter in the implementation of PMES?

4. Is there a significant difference in the respondents' assessment of the effectiveness of PMES when grouped according to their demographic profile?

5. Based on the findings of the study, what intervention may be developed to improve the implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System?

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a **descriptive-evaluative action research design**. The quantitative approach was used to determine the respondents' assessment of the effectiveness of the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) and to identify whether significant differences existed in their responses when grouped according to selected demographic variables. As an action research, the study focused not only on describing an existing problem but also on developing a practical solution that may improve the implementation of PMES in schools.

Respondents

The participants of the study consisted of **public school teachers and school heads from different regions of the Philippines** who have experienced the implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System.

Respondents included Teachers I–III, Master Teachers, Head Teachers, Assistant School Principals, and School Principals.

These participants were selected because they are directly involved in the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of PMES in their respective schools.

The study employed **purposive sampling**, selecting only those respondents who had actual experience with the implementation of PMES and who voluntarily agreed to participate in the study.

Participation was entirely voluntary. Before answering the survey questionnaire, respondents were informed about the purpose of the study and were assured that their responses would remain confidential and would be used solely for research purposes.

Data Gathering Methods

The researcher read numerous articles and memorandums about PMES Implementation and teachers' experiences.

The validated questionnaire was converted into an online survey using Google Forms to allow wider participation from teachers and school heads across different regions of the country.

The survey link was distributed through professional networks, school administrators, educational groups, and social media platforms commonly used by educators.

After the data collection period, all responses were encoded, organized, checked for completeness, and prepared for statistical analysis.

Research Instrument

The primary instrument used in this study was a **researcher-made survey questionnaire** developed based on the objectives of the study, existing PMES policies, related literature, and consultation with educational experts.

Prior to data collection, the questionnaire underwent expert validation to ensure that the items were clear, relevant, and aligned with the objectives of the study. Necessary revisions were incorporated based on the validators' recommendations.

Data Analysis Plan

The collected data were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical tools.

The following statistical treatments were used:

Research Question	Statistical Tool
Profile of Respondents	Frequency and Percentage
Assessment of PMES Effectiveness	Weighted Mean and Standard Deviation
Challenges Encountered	Frequency, Percentage, and Thematic Analysis
Difference in Assessment According to Profile Variables	Independent Samples t-test and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Ethical Considerations

The researcher ensured that the study complied with accepted ethical standards in educational research.

The identities of the respondents were kept confidential. No names or personally identifiable information were included in the presentation of the results. All information gathered was used solely for academic and research purposes.

The researcher also ensured that the data were honestly collected, accurately reported, and interpreted without fabrication, falsification, or misrepresentation.

The findings of the study were presented objectively, regardless of whether they supported the researcher's expectations. Proper acknowledgment was given to all references and related literature cited in the study to uphold academic integrity and avoid plagiarism.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND REFLECTION

Research Question 1

What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of position, sex, age, highest educational attainment, length of service, and region?

Table 1

Distribution of Respondents According to Position

Position	Frequency	Percentage
Teacher I	112	37.33%
Teacher II	68	22.67%
Teacher III	55	18.33%
Master Teacher I	24	8.00%
Master Teacher II	15	5.00%
Head Teacher	9	3.00%
Assistant School Principal	5	1.67%
School Principal	4	1.33%
Others	8	2.67%
Total	**300**	**100.00%**

Discussion

Table 1 shows that the majority of the respondents were **Teacher I**, comprising **112 respondents (37.33%)**, followed by **Teacher II** with **68 respondents (22.67%)** and **Teacher III** with **55 respondents (18.33%)**. Master Teachers accounted for **39 respondents (13.00%)**, while school administrators consisting of Head Teachers, Assistant School Principals, and School Principals represented **18 respondents (6.00%)**.

The distribution indicates that classroom teachers constituted the largest group of respondents. This is appropriate because teachers are the primary implementers of PMES and are directly affected by its requirements, particularly the preparation of Means of Verification (MOVs). Their responses provide valuable insights into the actual implementation of the performance management system.

Table 2

Distribution of Respondents According to Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	65	21.67%
Female	228	76.00%
Prefer not to say	7	2.33%
Total	**300**	**100.00%**

Discussion

As presented in Table 2, **female respondents dominated the study**, with **228 respondents (76.00%)**, while **65 respondents (21.67%)** were male. Seven respondents (**2.33%**) preferred not to disclose their sex.

The result reflects the present composition of the teaching profession in the Department of Education, where female educators comprise the majority of the teaching workforce. Consequently, the findings of this study largely represent the perspectives and experiences of female teachers who actively participate in the implementation of PMES.

Table 3

Distribution of Respondents According to Age

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage
20–29 years	57	19.00%
30–39 years	128	42.67%
40–49 years	72	24.00%
50–59 years	36	12.00%
60 years and above	7	2.33%
Total	**300**	**100.00%**

Discussion

Table 3 reveals that the largest group of respondents belonged to the **30–39 years old** age bracket, with **128 respondents (42.67%)**. This was followed by respondents aged **40–49**

years with **72 respondents (24.00%)**, while **57 respondents (19.00%)** were between **20 and 29 years old**.

Only a small number of respondents belonged to the older age groups. This suggests that most participants were in the early to middle stages of their professional careers and had sufficient experience in the implementation of PMES. Their responses therefore provide relevant information regarding the effectiveness and practicality of the current evaluation system.

Table 4

Distribution of Respondents According to Highest Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's Degree	41	13.67%
Bachelor's Degree with Master's Units	128	42.67%
Master's Degree	81	27.00%
Master's Degree with Doctoral Units	31	10.33%
Doctorate Degree	19	6.33%
Total	**300**	**100.00%**

Discussion

As shown in Table 4, the majority of respondents had pursued graduate studies. The largest group consisted of teachers with **Bachelor's Degree with Master's Units** (**128 respondents or 42.67%**), followed by those who had already completed a **Master's Degree** (**81 respondents or 27.00%**).

Only **41 respondents (13.67%)** remained with a bachelor's degree as their highest educational qualification. Meanwhile, **50 respondents (16.66%)** had already entered doctoral studies or completed a doctorate degree.

The findings indicate that most respondents continuously pursue professional development through graduate education, making them well-informed regarding teacher evaluation systems and educational policies.

Table 5

Distribution of Respondents According to Length of Service

Length of Service	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 5 years	71	23.67%
5–10 years	104	34.67%
11–15 years	59	19.67%
16–20 years	30	10.00%
More than 20 years	36	12.00%
Total	**300**	**100.00%**

Discussion

Table 5 indicates that the largest group of respondents had **5 to 10 years of teaching experience**, comprising **104 respondents (34.67%)**. This was followed by teachers with **less than five years of service** (**71 respondents or 23.67%**) and those with **11 to 15 years of experience** (**59 respondents or 19.67%**).

The results suggest that respondents possessed sufficient teaching experience to evaluate the effectiveness of PMES based on actual implementation rather than limited exposure.

Table 6

Distribution of Respondents According to Region

Region	Frequency	Percentage
Region IV-A (CALABARZON)	178	59.33%
National Capital Region (NCR)	58	19.33%
Region III	23	7.67%
Region XIII	20	6.67%
Region VII	14	4.67%
Region I	7	2.33%
Total	**300**	**100.00%**

Discussion

Table 6 shows that most respondents came from **Region IV-A (CALABARZON)** with **178 respondents (59.33%)**. This was followed by the **National Capital Region (NCR)** with **58 respondents (19.33%)**, while the remaining respondents came from Regions III, XIII, VII, and I.

Although the largest number of respondents came from CALABARZON, the participation of educators from several regions provided broader perspectives on the implementation of PMES. The representation of teachers and school leaders from different geographical areas strengthens the credibility of the findings by reflecting experiences from multiple educational settings.

Reflection

The demographic profile demonstrates that the respondents represent a diverse group of educators in terms of position, age, educational attainment, teaching experience, and geographical location. The majority were classroom teachers, particularly Teacher I to Teacher III, who are the primary implementers of PMES. Most respondents were female, in their early to middle professional careers, and had already pursued graduate education.

The diversity of the respondents strengthens the validity of the study because it captures the experiences of educators with varying professional backgrounds and responsibilities. More importantly, it suggests that the findings presented in the succeeding sections are grounded in the actual experiences of teachers and school heads who regularly participate in the implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System.

Research Question 2

How do the respondents assess the effectiveness of the current implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) in terms of

Performance Planning, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, Performance Review and Evaluation, and Performance Rewards and Development Planning?

Table 7

Assessment of the Effectiveness of PMES in Terms of Performance Planning

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. PMES objectives are clearly explained to teachers.	**3.69**	Agree
2. Performance expectations are clearly communicated.	**3.73**	Agree
3. Performance indicators are appropriate to my position.	**3.03**	Moderately Agree
4. My Key Result Areas (KRAs) are clearly defined.	**3.46**	Agree
5. Performance planning supports quality teaching.	**3.74**	Agree
6. PMES aligns with DepEd goals.	**3.67**	Agree
7. The planning process is easy to understand.	**2.51**	Disagree
8. PMES planning encourages professional growth.	**2.39**	Disagree
Composite Mean	**3.28**	**Moderately Agree**

Discussion

Table 7 reveals that respondents generally **moderately agreed** that the planning component of PMES is effective, with a **composite mean of 3.28**.

The highest-rated indicator was **"Performance planning supports quality teaching" (WM = 3.74)**, followed closely by **"Performance expectations are clearly**

communicated" (WM = 3.73) and **"PMES objectives are clearly explained" (WM = 3.69)**. These findings indicate that teachers generally understand the objectives of PMES and recognize that it is intended to improve employee performance.

However, two indicators received relatively low ratings. Respondents **disagreed** that **the planning process is easy to understand (WM = 2.51)** and that **PMES planning encourages professional growth (WM = 2.39)**. This suggests that although teachers are familiar with PMES, they find the planning process complicated and less helpful in supporting their professional development.

The findings imply that teachers understand the objectives of PMES but do not necessarily experience the planning stage as a meaningful tool for instructional improvement.

Table 8

Assessment of the Effectiveness of PMES in Terms of Performance Monitoring and Coaching

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
School heads regularly monitor my performance.	**2.62**	Moderately Agree
Feedback is provided throughout the school year.	**2.21**	Disagree
Coaching helps improve my performance.	**2.46**	Disagree
Classroom observations are conducted fairly.	**2.80**	Moderately Agree
Monitoring focuses on actual teaching performance.	**2.35**	Disagree
The monitoring process is objective.	**2.55**	Disagree
School heads provide technical assistance when needed.	**3.64**	Agree
Coaching contributes to my professional growth.	**3.30**	Moderately Agree

Composite Mean	**2.74**	**Moderately Agree**

Discussion

The results presented in Table 8 indicate that the implementation of monitoring and coaching obtained a **composite mean of 2.74**, interpreted as **Moderately Agree**.

The highest-rated indicator was **technical assistance provided by school heads (WM = 3.64)**. This suggests that many school heads continue to provide instructional support whenever teachers encounter difficulties.

However, respondents expressed dissatisfaction regarding several important aspects of monitoring. They disagreed that feedback is consistently provided throughout the school year, that coaching effectively improves their performance, that monitoring focuses on actual teaching performance, and that the monitoring process is objective.

These findings indicate that monitoring activities tend to become documentation-oriented rather than developmental. Teachers perceive that coaching is often overshadowed by compliance with documentary requirements instead of focusing on instructional improvement.

Table 9

Assessment of the Effectiveness of PMES in Terms of Performance Review and Evaluation

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
PMES accurately reflects my work performance.	**1.34**	Strongly Disagree
The evaluation process is fair.	**2.14**	Disagree
Evaluation standards are consistently applied.	**2.56**	Disagree

My performance rating reflects my accomplishments.	**2.33**	Disagree
Existing school records are adequately utilized.	**2.93**	Moderately Agree
Documentary requirements are reasonable.	**3.30**	Moderately Agree
The amount of paperwork required is manageable.	**2.46**	Disagree
PMES focuses more on performance than documentation.	**1.11**	Strongly Disagree
Composite Mean	**2.27**	**Disagree**

Discussion

Table 9 presents perhaps the most significant finding of the study. The **Performance Review and Evaluation** component obtained a **composite mean of only 2.27**, interpreted as **Disagree**.

The respondents **strongly disagreed** that PMES accurately reflects their actual work performance (WM = 1.34). Likewise, they strongly disagreed that PMES focuses more on performance than documentation (WM = 1.11), which was the lowest-rated indicator in the entire survey.

Teachers also disagreed that the evaluation process is fair, that performance ratings accurately reflect their accomplishments, and that evaluation standards are consistently applied.

These findings support the qualitative responses of the respondents. Many expressed concerns that ratings sometimes become subjective and that teachers are evaluated more on the completeness of documents than on their actual classroom performance. Several respondents also shared that some schools impose "ceiling ratings," preventing teachers from receiving higher ratings regardless of their accomplishments. Others mentioned that teachers with different Key Result Areas (KRAs) are sometimes informally compared despite having different responsibilities.

Overall, the results suggest that the review and evaluation component of PMES requires substantial improvement to strengthen fairness, transparency, and authenticity.

Table 10

Assessment of the Effectiveness of PMES in Terms of Performance Rewards and Development Planning

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
PMES identifies my strengths.	**2.93**	Moderately Agree
PMES identifies areas for improvement.	**3.15**	Moderately Agree
Results are used for professional development.	**2.73**	Moderately Agree
PMES motivates me to improve.	**1.88**	Disagree
PMES encourages continuous learning.	**2.46**	Disagree
Performance evaluation is beneficial to teachers.	**3.50**	Agree
PMES contributes to school improvement.	**2.96**	Moderately Agree
Overall, PMES is effective.	**2.18**	Disagree
Composite Mean	**2.72**	**Moderately Agree**

Discussion

The findings in Table 10 indicate that respondents only **moderately agreed** that PMES contributes to rewards and development planning, obtaining a **composite mean of 2.72**. While teachers agreed that performance evaluation remains beneficial to teachers (WM = 3.50), they disagreed that PMES motivates them to improve (WM = 1.88). Likewise, respondents disagreed with the statement that the current PMES encourages continuous learning (WM = 2.46).

Perhaps the most important finding is that respondents disagreed with the statement **"Overall, PMES is effective,"** which obtained a weighted mean of only **2.18**.

This result indicates that although respondents recognize the importance of having a performance management system, they believe that the present implementation no longer achieves its intended purpose.

Table 11

Overall Assessment of the Effectiveness of PMES

Dimension	Composite Mean	Interpretation	Rank
Performance Planning	**3.28**	Moderately Agree	1
Performance Monitoring and Coaching	**2.74**	Moderately Agree	2
Performance Rewards and Development Planning	**2.72**	Moderately Agree	3
Performance Review and Evaluation	**2.27**	Disagree	4
Grand Composite Mean	**2.75**	**Moderately Agree**	

Overall Discussion and Reflection

The overall findings reveal that while respondents understand the objectives of the Performance Management and Evaluation System, they perceive significant weaknesses in its current implementation. The strongest area remains **Performance Planning**, indicating that teachers generally understand the purpose and structure of PMES. However, the lowest rating was obtained by **Performance Review and Evaluation**, highlighting concerns regarding fairness, objectivity, and the heavy emphasis on documentation.

The findings suggest that the issue is not the existence of PMES itself but the manner in which it is implemented. Teachers continue to value accountability and performance evaluation, yet they believe that the current system has become overly focused on documentary compliance rather than authentic teaching performance.

The results also support the qualitative feedback gathered during the study. Respondents repeatedly mentioned that preparing Means of Verification consumes valuable time that could

otherwise be spent on lesson preparation, learner intervention, assessment, and instructional improvement. Many also raised concerns about the availability of commercially prepared MOVs and AI-generated documents, which may undermine the authenticity and credibility of portfolio-based evaluation.

Taken together, these findings strongly justify the development of the **Proposed PMES Performance Validation Checklist** and the **Proposed Implementing Rules**. By shifting the evaluation process toward the validation of existing school records and continuous supervisory monitoring, the proposed intervention seeks to reduce unnecessary paperwork while ensuring that teacher performance is assessed based on authentic accomplishments, observable practices, and compliance with established standards. This approach preserves accountability while allowing teachers and school heads to focus more on improving teaching and learning.

Research Question 3

What challenges do teachers and school heads encounter in the implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES)?

Table 12

Challenges Encountered in the Implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES)

Challenges	Weighted Mean	Interpretation	Rank
The same documents are repeatedly submitted.	**5.00**	Strongly Agree	1.5
Preparing PMES portfolios increases teacher workload.	**5.00**	Strongly Agree	1.5
Some MOVs can already be purchased online.	**4.99**	Strongly Agree	3
AI can now generate some PMES documents.	**4.85**	Strongly Agree	4

Teachers with different KRAs should not be compared during rating.	**4.84**	Strongly Agree	5
Preparing Means of Verification (MOVs) is time-consuming.	**4.83**	Strongly Agree	6
Existing school records should be used instead of requiring duplicate documents.	**4.82**	Strongly Agree	7
PMES preparation causes unnecessary stress.	**4.75**	Strongly Agree	8
Too many documentary requirements are required.	**4.40**	Strongly Agree	9
Some raters become subjective during evaluation.	**3.96**	Agree	10
Some schools impose ceiling ratings on teachers.	**3.64**	Agree	11
Composite Mean	**4.65**	**Strongly Agree**	

Discussion

Table 12 presents the challenges encountered by teachers and school heads during the implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System. The overall **composite mean of 4.65**, interpreted as **Strongly Agree**, indicates that respondents experienced substantial concerns regarding the present implementation of PMES.

The highest-rated challenge was the **repetitive submission of documents** (WM = **5.00**). Respondents strongly agreed that they repeatedly submit the same documents throughout the school year and are later required to retrieve, reproduce, organize, and compile them again as Means of Verification during the PMES evaluation period. This finding suggests that the current implementation results in duplication of work rather than efficient documentation.

Closely related to this concern is the finding that **preparing PMES portfolios increases teacher workload** (WM = **5.00**). Teachers emphasized that portfolio preparation consumes

considerable time that could otherwise be devoted to lesson planning, checking learner outputs, remediation activities, instructional interventions, and professional collaboration. The requirement to prepare extensive documentary evidence has become an additional administrative responsibility rather than a meaningful component of performance improvement.

Another significant finding is that respondents **strongly agreed** that **Means of Verification can now be purchased online** (WM = **4.99**). This issue raises concerns regarding the authenticity and credibility of documentary evidence. Several respondents observed that complete PMES portfolios, accomplishment reports, templates, and supporting documents are now readily available through online marketplaces and social media platforms. Because these materials can easily be acquired and customized, documentation alone may no longer accurately reflect an employee's actual performance.

The emergence of **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** also surfaced as a major concern, with a weighted mean of **4.85**. Respondents recognized that AI has become capable of generating accomplishment reports, narratives, lesson materials, and other written outputs within minutes. While AI can support productivity when used responsibly, respondents expressed concern that it may also be misused to create documentary requirements that do not genuinely represent teachers' work. This finding suggests that performance evaluation should place greater emphasis on authentic practice and verified school records instead of relying heavily on prepared narratives.

The respondents also strongly agreed that **teachers with different Key Result Areas (KRAs) should not be compared during performance evaluation** (WM = **4.84**). Teachers pointed out that classroom teachers, Master Teachers, Head Teachers, and School Heads have distinct duties and responsibilities. Since their KRAs differ, performance ratings should be based solely on the standards applicable to their respective positions. Comparing employees with different performance expectations may create perceptions of unfairness and reduce confidence in the evaluation process.

Likewise, respondents strongly agreed that **preparing Means of Verification is time-consuming** (WM = **4.83**) and that **existing school records should instead be utilized** (WM = **4.82**). Teachers explained that lesson plans, quarterly examinations, Tables of Specifications, class records, attendance records, committee reports, and classroom observation forms are already submitted and maintained by the school throughout the year. Requiring another copy of these documents solely for PMES adds little value while increasing administrative workload.

The respondents also identified **stress associated with PMES preparation** (WM = **4.75**) and the existence of **too many documentary requirements** (WM = **4.40**). These findings indicate that teachers perceive the current implementation as compliance-oriented rather than developmental. Instead of motivating teachers to improve instruction, PMES preparation often becomes one of the most demanding administrative activities before the end of the school year.

Although receiving slightly lower ratings than the previous indicators, respondents also agreed that **some raters become subjective during evaluation** (WM = **3.96**). Some respondents believed that similar accomplishments do not always receive similar ratings because evaluation standards may be interpreted differently by different evaluators. Such perceptions may affect teachers' trust in the fairness and consistency of the performance management system.

Another concern was the reported practice of **ceiling ratings** (WM = **3.64**). Respondents shared that in some schools, teachers may be discouraged from receiving very high ratings because they are newly hired or because their scores are informally expected not to exceed those of Master Teachers, Head Teachers, or School Heads. Respondents emphasized that performance ratings should instead be based on individual accomplishments and the indicators specific to each position rather than informal limitations.

Reflection

The findings clearly demonstrate that the greatest concerns surrounding PMES are not related to the concept of performance evaluation itself but to the way it is currently implemented. Teachers recognize the importance of accountability and understand that performance should be assessed. However, they believe that the present system places excessive emphasis on documentation instead of authentic teaching performance.

The issues identified in this study also reveal emerging challenges that did not exist when traditional portfolio-based evaluation systems were first introduced. The widespread availability of commercially prepared MOVs and the rapid development of AI-generated documents have significantly reduced the reliability of documentation as the sole basis for performance evaluation. If documentary evidence can easily be purchased or generated electronically, its authenticity becomes increasingly difficult to verify.

The study therefore suggests that future performance evaluation should rely more heavily on **verified school records, continuous classroom observation, instructional supervision, coaching, mentoring, and actual work outputs** that are naturally produced during the school year. These sources provide stronger evidence of teacher performance than portfolios prepared only during the evaluation period.

The findings strongly support the development of the **Proposed PMES Performance Validation Checklist** and the **Proposed Implementing Rules**. These interventions seek to eliminate repetitive documentation by allowing school heads to validate teacher performance using existing official school records. Through this approach, PMES can continue to promote accountability while reducing unnecessary administrative workload, strengthening objectivity, and enabling teachers to devote more time to teaching and improving learner outcomes.

Research Question 4

Is there a significant difference in the respondents' assessment of the effectiveness of the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) when grouped according to their demographic profile?

Table 13

Test of Difference in the Respondents' Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) When Grouped According to Their Profile

Profile Variable	Statistical Test	Computed Value	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Sex	Independent Samples t-test	t = -0.282	0.779	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Position	One-Way ANOVA	F = 1.631	0.115	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Age	One-Way ANOVA	F = 1.249	0.290	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	One-Way ANOVA	F = 0.065	0.992	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Length of Service	One-Way ANOVA	F = 0.146	0.965	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant
Region	One-Way ANOVA	F = 0.241	0.944	Fail to Reject Ho	Not Significant

Discussion

Table 13 presents the results of the statistical tests conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in the respondents' assessment of the effectiveness of the Performance

Management and Evaluation System (PMES) when grouped according to their demographic profile. An Independent Samples t-test was employed for sex, while One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used for position, age, highest educational attainment, length of service, and region.

The results revealed that **all computed p-values were greater than the 0.05 level of significance**. Specifically, sex obtained a p-value of **0.779**, position **0.115**, age **0.290**, highest educational attainment **0.992**, length of service **0.965**, and region **0.944**. Since all p-values exceeded the level of significance, the null hypothesis was **not rejected** in every case. These findings indicate that there was **no significant difference** in the respondents' assessment of the effectiveness of PMES when grouped according to sex, position, age, educational attainment, length of service, and region. Regardless of their personal and professional characteristics, respondents generally shared similar perceptions regarding the implementation of PMES.

The consistency of the responses suggests that the issues identified in the study are not isolated to a specific group of teachers or school leaders. Instead, the concerns appear to be experienced across different positions, age groups, educational backgrounds, years of service, and geographical locations. Teachers and school heads consistently recognized that while PMES remains an important accountability mechanism, its implementation has become highly documentation-oriented, resulting in repetitive submissions, increased workload, and concerns about fairness and objectivity.

The absence of significant differences further strengthens the validity of the study's findings because it demonstrates a common perception among respondents regardless of their demographic profile. This implies that the challenges encountered in PMES implementation are organizational in nature rather than individual or location-specific.

Reflection

The results of the test of difference show that educators, regardless of their demographic characteristics, hold similar views regarding the implementation of PMES. This shared

perception indicates that the identified concerns are widespread within the Department of Education and are not confined to particular positions or regions.

The findings support the need for a system-wide improvement in PMES implementation. Since respondents from different backgrounds expressed comparable experiences, the proposed **PMES Performance Validation Checklist** and **Implementing Rules** may be adopted across schools to promote a more objective, efficient, and authentic performance evaluation process. By reducing repetitive documentation, maximizing the use of existing school records, and emphasizing validated evidence of actual performance, the proposed intervention has the potential to address the common concerns raised by educators while maintaining accountability and supporting continuous professional growth.

Research Question 5

Based on the findings of the study, what intervention may be proposed to improve the implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) of the Department of Education?

The results of the study revealed several concerns regarding the current implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System. Although respondents acknowledged the importance of having a performance evaluation system, they identified issues that affect its efficiency, fairness, and authenticity. These findings served as the basis for the development of the proposed intervention.

Table 14

Summary of the Major Findings and the Proposed Intervention

Major Findings	Supporting Evidence	Proposed Intervention
Teachers repeatedly submit the same documents throughout the school year.	Composite Mean = 4.65 (Strongly Agree);	Utilize existing official school records as primary Means of

	Highest-ranked challenge	Verification instead of requiring duplicate submissions.
Preparation of PMES portfolios increases teacher workload and causes unnecessary stress.	Weighted Means of 5.00 and 4.75	Replace portfolio preparation with a **PMES Performance Validation Checklist** accomplished by the immediate supervisor.
Documentation has become the primary basis of evaluation instead of actual work performance.	PMES focuses more on documentation than performance (WM = 1.11)	Emphasize classroom performance, actual accomplishments, and validated school records during evaluation.
Some Means of Verification can already be purchased online or generated using Artificial Intelligence (AI).	Weighted Means of 4.99 and 4.85	Validate performance using official school records and direct supervisory observations rather than relying solely on submitted documents.
Some respondents perceived subjectivity and ceiling ratings during evaluation.	Weighted Means of 3.96 and 3.64	Standardize evaluation through objective performance validation procedures and clearly defined indicators.
Respondents from different demographic groups shared similar perceptions regarding PMES implementation.	No significant difference across all profile variables	Implement the proposed intervention uniformly across schools to ensure consistency and fairness.

Discussion

Table 14 summarizes the major findings of the study and the corresponding intervention proposed by the researcher.

One of the most significant findings is that teachers repeatedly submit the same documents despite these already being available in school records. Lesson plans, class programs, quarterly examinations, Tables of Specifications, classroom observation reports, attendance records, committee reports, and accomplishment reports are regularly submitted during the school year. However, teachers are still required to retrieve, reproduce, organize, and compile these documents again solely for PMES purposes. This repetitive process increases administrative workload without necessarily improving the quality of performance evaluation.

The study also found that portfolio preparation has become one of the most demanding responsibilities of teachers at the end of the school year. Respondents strongly agreed that preparing Means of Verification consumes valuable time and contributes to stress and work overload. These findings suggest that the current implementation of PMES places greater emphasis on documentary compliance than on actual instructional performance.

Another important concern identified by the respondents is the growing availability of commercially prepared Means of Verification and AI-generated documents. Because reports, narratives, certificates, lesson plans, and other documentary evidence can now be purchased online or generated through artificial intelligence, relying heavily on submitted documents may no longer guarantee the authenticity of teacher performance. The findings indicate that performance evaluation should instead focus on official school records and actual evidence of work accomplished throughout the school year.

The study further revealed concerns regarding subjectivity in evaluation and the practice of assigning ceiling ratings in some schools. Although not experienced by every respondent, these issues may reduce teachers' confidence in the fairness and credibility of the evaluation process. Performance ratings should therefore be based solely on validated accomplishments and the indicators appropriate to the employee's position rather than on unwritten practices or personal discretion.

Finally, the statistical analysis showed no significant differences in respondents' assessment according to sex, position, age, educational attainment, length of service, or region. This indicates that the identified concerns are common across different groups of educators. Consequently, any improvement to PMES should be implemented system-wide rather than targeting only specific schools or employee classifications.

Reflection

The findings of this study demonstrate that teachers do not oppose performance evaluation. On the contrary, they recognize the importance of accountability, continuous improvement, and professional growth. Their primary concern lies in the manner by which PMES is currently implemented.

The present system requires teachers to devote substantial time and effort to preparing portfolios that largely consist of documents already available in school records. This practice reduces the time that teachers could otherwise spend on lesson preparation, learner support, assessment, classroom innovation, and other activities that directly contribute to improved teaching and learning.

Moreover, the increasing availability of AI-generated outputs and commercially prepared Means of Verification highlights the need to reconsider the role of documentary evidence in performance evaluation. While documentation remains important, it should serve only as supporting evidence rather than the principal basis for determining employee performance.

In response to these concerns, the researcher proposes the adoption of the **PMES Performance Validation Checklist** together with the **Proposed Implementing Rules**. Instead of requiring teachers to repeatedly compile documentary portfolios, school heads and authorized evaluators shall validate teacher performance using official school records that have already been submitted and verified throughout the school year. Classroom observations, monitoring reports, attendance records, committee outputs, examination records, lesson plans, and other official documents maintained by the school shall serve as the primary sources of evidence.

The proposed checklist is intended to simplify the evaluation process, reduce unnecessary paperwork, promote objectivity, discourage the submission of fabricated or AI-generated documents, and allow teachers to devote more time to improving instruction and learner outcomes. By emphasizing authentic performance over documentary compliance, the proposed intervention supports the original purpose of PMES—to enhance employee performance while promoting quality education and organizational excellence within the Department of Education.

PROPOSED PMES PERFORMANCE VALIDATION CHECKLIST AND IMPLEMENTING RULES (See attached Annexes A and B"

ACTION PLAN

Action Plan for the Proposed PMES Performance Validation Checklist (PPVC)

Goal:

To improve the implementation of the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) by reducing repetitive documentary requirements, promoting objective performance evaluation, and utilizing existing official school records through the Proposed PMES Performance Validation Checklist (PPVC).

Objectives	Activities	Persons Responsible	Time Frame	Resources Needed	Success Indicator
1. Present the findings of the action research to school officials.	Conduct presentation of the research findings during School	Researcher, School Head	June 2027	LCD Projector, Laptop, Research Report	Research findings presented and acknowledged by

	Management Committee Meeting and Faculty Meeting.				school officials.
2. Orient teachers regarding the Proposed PMES Performance Validation Checklist.	Conduct orientation and consultation with teachers and school heads.	School Head, Master Teachers, Researcher	June–July 2027	Orientation Materials, Checklist Forms	At least 90% of teachers attended the orientation.
3. Pilot-test the Proposed PMES Performance Validation Checklist.	Implement the checklist during the performance evaluation period in selected schools.	School Head, Immediate Supervisors	School Year 2027–2028	Printed Checklist, Official School Records	Checklist successfully utilized during evaluation.
4. Monitor the implementation of the checklist.	Conduct periodic monitoring and collect feedback from	School Head, Master Teachers	Quarterly	Monitoring Forms	Monitoring reports completed every quarter.

	teachers and evaluators.				
5. Evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention.	Compare teacher satisfaction, workload, and evaluation efficiency before and after implementation.	Researcher, School Head	End of School Year	Survey Questionnaire, Evaluation Reports	Improvement in teacher satisfaction and reduction in documentary workload.
6. Recommend institutional adoption.	Submit the research and proposed checklist to the Schools Division Office for consideration.	Researcher	After Pilot Implementation	Research Report, Endorsement Letter	Proposal endorsed for Division-level review.

REFERENCES

Department of Education. (2015). *Department of Education Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) Manual for Teachers and School Heads.*

Department of Education. (2020). *DepEd Order No. 031, s. 2020: Interim Guidelines for Performance Management and Evaluation.*

Department of Education. (2022). *Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST).*

Department of Education. (2022). *Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) Tools for School Year 2021–2022.*

Department of Education. (2024). *DepEd Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) Guidelines.*

Department of Education. (2025). *Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.*

Republic Act No. 9155. (2001). *Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001.*

Republic Act No. 6713. (1989). *Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees.*

Civil Service Commission. (2017). *Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) Guidelines.*

Armstrong, M. (2022). *Armstrong's Handbook of Performance Management* (7th ed.). Kogan Page.

Aguinis, H. (2019). *Performance Management* (4th ed.). Chicago Business Press.

ANNEX A

Proposed PMES Performance Validation Checklist (PPVC) Implementing Rules

Rationale

The findings of this study revealed that although teachers recognize the importance of the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES), its current implementation places considerable emphasis on the preparation of documentary Means of Verification (MOVs). Respondents strongly agreed that the repetitive submission of documents, excessive paperwork, increased workload, and stress have reduced the efficiency of the performance evaluation process. The study likewise found that some documentary evidence can now be purchased online or generated using Artificial Intelligence (AI), raising concerns regarding the authenticity and credibility of submitted portfolios.

To address these concerns, this study proposes the **PMES Performance Validation Checklist (PPVC)**. Instead of requiring teachers to repeatedly compile documentary portfolios, the evaluator shall validate the employee's performance using official school records that have already been submitted, verified, and maintained throughout the school year.

The PPVC aims to simplify documentation, reduce administrative workload, promote fairness and objectivity, strengthen evidence-based evaluation, and allow teachers to devote more time to improving teaching and learning.

Proposed Implementing Rules

Section 1. Title

These guidelines shall be known as the **Proposed Implementing Rules on the PMES Performance Validation Checklist (PPVC).**

Section 2. Purpose

The PPVC aims to:

1. simplify the implementation of PMES;
2. eliminate repetitive submission of documentary requirements;
3. maximize the use of official school records already maintained by the school;
4. strengthen objectivity in performance evaluation;
5. reduce teacher workload associated with portfolio preparation;
6. ensure that performance ratings are based on authentic accomplishments rather than the quantity of submitted documents; and
7. improve the efficiency and credibility of the Performance Management and Evaluation System.

Section 3. Scope

These guidelines shall apply to all teaching and non-teaching personnel covered by the Performance Management and Evaluation System of the Department of Education.

Section 4. General Policies

1. Teachers shall no longer be required to reproduce documents that have already been officially submitted and accepted by the school during the school year.

2. Existing school records shall serve as the primary Means of Verification whenever applicable.
3. Evaluators shall validate accomplishments using official records maintained in the school office.
4. Only documents that are not officially available in school records may be requested from the employee.
5. The evaluator shall accomplish the PMES Performance Validation Checklist during the final performance evaluation.
6. Performance ratings shall be based on validated accomplishments and compliance with prescribed standards.
7. The use of commercially prepared, purchased, fabricated, or AI-generated documentary evidence that does not represent the employee's actual work shall not be accepted.
8. All evaluations shall be conducted objectively and consistently based on approved PMES indicators.

Section 5. Sources of Validation

Performance may be validated through the following official school records:

- Daily Lesson Logs / Lesson Plans
- Classroom Observation Tools (COT)
- RPMS Classroom Observation Reports
- Quarterly Examinations
- Tables of Specifications
- Class Record

- School Forms
- Attendance Reports
- Accomplishment Reports
- Committee Reports
- Memoranda
- Certificates issued by the school
- Learning Action Cell attendance
- Training records
- Official communication
- Other authenticated school records

Section 6. Duties and Responsibilities

School Head

The School Head shall:

- supervise the implementation of the checklist;
- ensure fair and objective evaluation;
- validate official school records;
- certify the accuracy of the evaluation.

Immediate Supervisor

The Immediate Supervisor shall:

- accomplish the checklist;
- verify submitted records;

- indicate observations;
- recommend appropriate ratings.

Teacher

The teacher shall:

- perform assigned duties;
- submit required school documents within prescribed deadlines;
- cooperate during validation;
- provide additional records only when necessary.

Section 7. Rating Procedure

Instead of repeatedly requiring teachers to submit portfolios, evaluators shall simply determine whether the required evidence has already been officially submitted during the school year.

Each indicator shall be marked:

☐ YES

☐ NO

If YES, the evaluator shall verify the existing school record.

If NO, the evaluator shall indicate the deficiency.

PMES PERFORMANCE VALIDATION CHECKLIST

Teacher's Name: _____

Position: _____

Region: _____

Division: _____

School: _____

School Year: _____

Evaluator: _____

A. INSTRUCTIONAL DOCUMENTS

Indicator	Yes	No	Remarks
Daily Lesson Logs/Lesson Plans were submitted on or before the deadline throughout the school year.	□	□	
Lesson Plans required minimal revisions.	□	□	
Quarterly Examinations were submitted on time.	□	□	
Quarterly Examinations were free from major errors.	□	□	
Table of Specifications accompanied every quarterly examination.	□	□	
Learning materials complied with DepEd standards.	□	□	

B. LEARNER ASSESSMENT

Indicator	Yes	No	Remarks
Class records were updated regularly.	□	□	
Grades were submitted on time.	□	□	
Learner assessment records were complete.	□	□	
School Forms were submitted on schedule.	□	□	

C. CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE

Indicator	Yes	No	Remarks
Classroom observations were completed.	□	□	
Recommendations from classroom observations were addressed.	□	□	
Professional conduct was consistently demonstrated.	□	□	
Attendance and punctuality were satisfactory.	□	□	

D. PROFESSIONAL ENGAGEMENT

Indicator	Yes	No	Remarks
Participated in Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions.	□	□	
Attended required trainings.	□	□	
Served in assigned committees.	□	□	
Submitted committee reports on time.	□	□	

E. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Indicator	Yes	No	Remarks
Completed assigned professional development activities.	□	□	
Demonstrated continuous improvement throughout the school year.	□	□	
Implemented recommendations from previous evaluations.	□	□	

Summary of Validation

Result	Number
Total Applicable Indicators	
Total "YES" Responses	
Total "NO" Responses	

Performance Validation Result

☐ All required performance indicators successfully validated.

☐ Additional supporting documents are required.

☐ Performance successfully verified using official school records.

Evaluator's Certification

I hereby certify that the performance of the teacher has been validated using official school records and verified evidence maintained by the school. The evaluation reflected in this checklist is based on actual accomplishments observed and documented throughout the school year.

Evaluator: _____ Signature:

_____

Position: _____ Date:

_____

Teacher's Conforme

I certify that the information reflected in this checklist has been discussed with me and that the validation was based on my official work accomplishments during the school year.

Employee: _____ Signature:

_____

Position: _____Date:

_____