

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CB-PAST AND RPMS: QUANTITATIVE EVIDENCE ON THEIR IMPACT ON TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Iris T. Sayag¹, Jane C. Oropa, Ed.D.²

¹ Student, Graduate School, North Eastern Mindanao State University, Mindanao, Philippines

² Faculty, Graduate School, North Eastern Mindanao State University, Mindanao, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Teacher performance appraisal is essential for educational quality, ensuring that teachers meet evolving instructional and professional standards. This study explores the comparison of the Competency-Based Performance Appraisal System for Teachers (CB-PAST) and the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the analysis of their impact on teacher performance in public schools. This study employed a descriptive correlational design, a methodological approach that aims to systematically describe the characteristics of a population while examining the relationships between variables without manipulating. The study involved 232 elementary teachers from Prosperidad District, Agusan del Sur Division, employing quantitative method to examine the effectiveness of both systems through a validated questionnaire and analyzing them using statistical tools such as frequency count, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and Pearson correlation. Results revealed that there was a highly significant difference in the implementation of the Competency-based Performance Appraisal System for Teachers (CB-PAST) and the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS), with a computed t-value of 12.68 and a p-value of 0.000. This statistical outcome indicates that teachers clearly perceive RPMS as substantially different and more effectively implemented compared to the older CB-PAST framework. These findings reveal significant differences in the structure, implementation, and perceived effectiveness of the two systems. While CB-PAST emphasized competencies and developmental feedback, RPMS aligns performance with organizational goals through measurable indicators linked to the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). The study concludes that RPMS offers a more structured and goal-oriented approach, contributing positively to accountability and teacher development, although challenges in implementation persist. Recommendations include enhanced capacity-building programs, clearer guidelines, and regular system evaluations to ensure both teacher growth and improved educational outcomes.

Keywords: Appraisal System, CB-PAST, RPMS, Professional Development, Public Schools, Teacher Performance

1. INTRODUCTION

Teacher performance appraisal is a crucial component of educational quality improvement, with systems in place globally to assess, support, and advance teacher competencies and effectiveness. These systems are essential for ensuring that teachers are equipped to meet the diverse and evolving needs of students, fostering professional growth, and aligning individual goals with institutional and national educational standards. Effective teacher appraisal systems combine structured evaluations with developmental feedback, allowing educators to reflect on and improve their instructional practices while contributing to broader educational outcomes (Darling-Hammond, 2020). Performance management, according to Armstrong (2018), is a continuous process aimed at improving an organization's overall performance. This process involves cyclical planning, controlling, and performance evaluation, ensuring that planning is always the starting point. He emphasizes that performance management helps align individual efforts with the organization's goals through a series of interrelated activities. Gerrish (2018) also

notes that performance management focuses on guiding employees toward achieving long-term organizational objectives, while Mone (2018) underscores the management system ensures that all organizational members, from staff to management, are aligned and working towards the organization's targets. This study explores the effectiveness of two key appraisal systems implemented in the Philippine education sector—the Competency-Based Performance Appraisal System for Teachers (CB-PAST) and the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). It aims to analyze their respective impacts on teacher performance and professional growth, examining how these systems align with institutional objectives and contribute to educational quality improvement.

Internationally, various countries have adopted distinct approaches to teacher performance appraisal. Competency-based frameworks, as seen in countries like Canada and the United States, assess teachers on a set of core instructional and pedagogical competencies, emphasizing skills in lesson planning, instructional delivery, and student engagement (Marzano, 2022). Meanwhile, results-based systems, such as those used in the United Kingdom and Australia, link teacher performance to specific outcomes, including student achievement and school-wide goals. These systems create accountability by connecting teacher performance with tangible, measurable results, fostering a results-driven culture within schools (OECD, 2019). However, both approaches have benefits and limitations, with competency-based systems often viewed as more personalized but less outcome-focused, while results-based systems can increase accountability but add to administrative demands on teachers (Burgess & Greaves, 2020).

In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) has implemented two major performance appraisal systems over recent years: The Competency-Based Performance Appraisal System for Teachers (CB-PAST) and the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). CB-PAST, introduced in 2007, primarily focused on assessing teachers' competencies, aiming to foster reflective practice and encourage individual professional growth. However, some educators criticized it for being overly rigid and subjectively administered (Garcia, 2020). In 2015, DepEd introduced the RPMS, which shifted the focus toward results-based evaluation. Aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), the RPMS framework set out Key Result Areas (KRAs) and targeted specific goals, aiming to improve student outcomes and align teachers' efforts with institutional objectives DepEd (2015). However, despite these efforts, there are significant challenges in the implementation of the RPMS in the context of teachers' performance and professional development in the Prosperidad Districts Division of Agusan del Sur. To address this gap, further investigation is needed to understand the unique scenarios and contexts within the district that contribute to these challenges.

While both CB-PAST and RPMS aim to enhance teacher performance and accountability, limited research in the Philippine context has directly compared these two systems in terms of their impact on teacher performance and professional development. Studies have individually examined the benefits and challenges of each system, yet there is little analysis exploring how they differ in influencing teachers' growth, instructional practices, and engagement with professional development opportunities. Moreover, the experiences and perspectives of teachers who have transitioned from CB-PAST to RPMS remain largely unexplored. This research addresses this gap by conducting a comparative analysis of CB-PAST and RPMS, aiming to provide insights into their distinct impacts on teachers' performance and professional development in Philippine public schools. The research particularly seeks to determine whether the proper implementation of these guidelines leads to improved teacher performance in areas such as instructional competence, school performance, community involvement, and professional growth. As an educator who has firsthand experience with the RPMS, the researcher is deeply invested in understanding how its implementation impacts teachers' performance, with the goal of contributing to the improvement of educational outcomes in the public school system.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive correlational design. This method determines the relationship between the implementation of the Competency-Based Performance Appraisal System for Teachers (CB-PAST) and the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS), and their perceived impact on teachers' performance in public schools. Data were collected using standardized survey questionnaires administered by the researcher to public school teachers of Prosperidad District, Agusan del Sur Division, and results were analysed using appropriate statistical methods to determine correlations among variables in assessing the similarities, differences, and extent to the implementation associated with the two performance appraisals.

2.2 Research Participants

The study involved 232 participants from the fourteen identified elementary schools in Prosperidad District for the school year 2024-2025 who had job positions of teacher 1 to 3 and master teachers 1 to 4 in the field and who were able to experience the tools on the Competency-Based Performance Appraisal System for Teachers (CB-PAST) and the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). They were selected from a total population of 551 teachers using a stratified random sampling with a 5% margin of error.

2.3 Research Instruments

A researcher-made questionnaire was used to collect data. The instrument underwent content validation and reliability testing by education experts, including a Division Education Program Supervisor, District Supervisor, School Principals, and Master Teachers. The questionnaire, divided into three parts, the personal profile of the respondents (sex, academic rank and position, age, number of years in service), comparative indicators of CB-PAST and RPMS, and extent of the implementation using a 5-point Likert scale. A pilot test with 15 teachers from a different schools of Prosperidad District confirmed good internal consistency across all indicators, with Cronbach's alpha values as follows: similarities in the indicators of CB-PAST ($\alpha = 0.886$), similarities in the indicators of RPMS ($\alpha = 0.859$), differences in the indicators of CB-PAST ($\alpha = 0.744$), differences in the indicators of RPMS ($\alpha = 0.810$), extent of CB-PAST implementation ($\alpha = 0.876$) and extent of RPMS implementation ($\alpha = 0.899$). These values indicate that the questionnaire is a reliable tool for measuring the comparative analysis of CB-PAST and RPMS in teachers' performance in public schools.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure and Analysis

The researchers undertook the following steps and procedures in gathering the data of the study. The researchers secured a certification and letter of request from the Graduate School of Northeastern Mindanao State University (NEMSU) to conduct the study. Upon approval, the researcher requested the office of the Schools Division Superintendent to conduct the study in Prosperidad District. The approved letter of endorsement was the basis to accommodate the researchers to gather data using a questionnaire. The researchers then asked permission from the district supervisor of Prosperidad District. After the approval letter from the district supervisor was released, the researchers asked permission from the school principal of the purposely identified schools to set an appointment with the identified participants. Then, the researchers asked the participants to read and sign the Informed Consent Form. Thereafter, the researchers conducted a survey of the schools of Prosperidad. In obtaining an honest response to the questions, the questionnaire was administered personally by the researchers. Afterwards, the results of the data gathered were tallied, prepared in tabular form, analyzed, and applied with the appropriate statistical treatment.

2.5 Ethical Consideration

The researchers adhere to the ethical guidelines to protect the dignity, rights, and welfare of the participants. The researchers applied the principles of ethical considerations developed by Bhandari (2023). The participants were informed of the purpose of the study. Participants were free to choose to participate without any pressure or coercion. Participants were informed and gave consent. The researchers explained to the participants the statement about known risks associated with the participation in the study. Confidentiality was ensured by the researcher. Aside from this, the researchers informed the participants that the gathered responses would be anonymously and confidentially kept.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the Prosperidad District, Division of Agusan del Sur, the teaching profession consists mainly female, mature, and experienced, as shown by the demographic profile of the 232 teacher respondents in this survey. Most participants (66%) are within the ages of 36 and 55, followed by (22%) individuals between the ages of 26 and 35, and (12%) those over 55. This suggests that the educational population in the schools under research has a high degree of professional maturity and experience, as it is mostly made up of educators in their mid- to late-career stages. National trends of diminishing teacher recruitment or delayed acceptance into the profession in rural and less urbanized areas may be the reason for a small percentage of younger teachers (Santos & Casinto, 2020).

Table 3.1 *Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents in terms of age, sex, rank and years in service.*

Only 7% of respondents were men, in contrast to 93% of respondents who were women. This is in accordance with national data in the Philippine education sector, demonstrating that women remain to predominate in teaching, especially at the elementary level (DepEd, 2023). It also emphasizes the need to look at gender-specific experiences and engagement with performance rating systems like the RPMS, though this shows high female participation in

Profile		Frequency	Percent
Age	Below 26 years old	0	0%
	26-35 years old	51	22%
	36-55 years old	153	66%
	Above 55 years old	28	12%
	Total	232	100%
Sex	Male	17	7%
	Female	215	93%
	Total	232	100%
Rank	Teacher 1	14	6%
	Teacher 2	44	19%
	Teacher 3	150	65%
	Master Teacher 1	22	9%
	Master Teacher 2	2	1%
	Total	232	100%
Years in Service	10-15 years	121	52%
	16-20 years	52	22%
	21-25 years	26	11%
	Above 25 years	33	14%
	Total	232	100%

public education. There is gender-based variations in how teachers respond to organized systems, based on recent studies like those conducted by Acosta and Acosta (2021). Female teachers often demonstrate more compliance and a greater appreciation for development feedback.

Teacher III participants make up most of the group of respondents (65%), followed by Teacher II participants (19%), Master Teacher I participants (9%), Teacher I participants (6%), and Master Teacher II participants (1%). The high percentage of Teacher III participants indicates that most participants have reached the mid-level career progression. Based to this distribution, most educators appear to comprehend the requirements linked to professional development and evaluation.

Considering years of service, over fifty percent of the teachers (52%) have been employed for 10 to 15 years, followed by 16 to 20 years (22%), 21 to 25 years (11%), and more than 25 years (14%). This brings legitimacy to the conclusion that teachers are experienced professionals who have a great deal of expertise with performance management systems. Dizon (2020) claims that teachers with ten or more years of experience have more varied views about performance reviews and often use their acquired expertise to assess the effectiveness, fairness, and influence of systems such as RPMS on classroom operations.

These statistics have several implications. First, the large number of qualified educators suggests a willingness to take part in standards-based and reflective performance systems such as RPMS. They are crucial players in the effective implementation of RPMS reforms because of their expertise with institutional dynamics, policy changes, and methods of instruction. To guarantee that systems are sensitive to the unique needs and viewpoints of both new and experienced educators, male and female, the widespread presence of one demographic profile, especially regarding age and gender, also calls into question the creation of inclusive policies. In addition, the absence of younger educators emphasizes the necessity of targeted recruitment and retention tactics that can consider the changing demographics of the teaching profession.

In terms of sex, the data revealed a clear gender disparity, with 93% of respondents being female with a frequency of 215 and only 7% male with a frequency of 17. This finding aligns with the common trend of a female-dominated teaching profession, particularly at the primary education levels. A study by Sebastian et, al (2022) found that elementary teaching remains a female dominated profession, resulting in limited encounters for students with male or father figures in their education. Furthermore, Harigovind (2025) highlighted that between 2018-2019 and 2023-

2024, female representation among schoolteachers in India increased by over 3.3 percentage points to 53.3% while male representation declined to 46.6%. This shift was particularly driven by growth in private schools.

In terms of rank, the table provides a breakdown of respondents' academic ranks, revealing a hierarchical structure within the group. Most respondents (65%) hold the rank of Teacher 3 with a frequency of 150 out of 232, indicating that a significant number have progressed in their careers. Additionally, 19% are Teacher 2 with a frequency of 44, while only 6% remain at the Teacher 1 level, suggesting a relatively small number of early-career educators. A combined total of 10% of respondents have achieved Master Teacher ranks, with 9% holding the title of Master Teacher 1 and only 1% attaining Master Teacher 2. The limited number of Master Teachers suggests that career advancement beyond Teacher 3 may be challenging, possibly due to stringent requirements or limited promotion opportunities. Similarly, a study by Darling-Hammond (2020) emphasizes the challenges teachers face in career advancement due to stringent promotion requirements and limited opportunities. This supports the finding that while many respondents have reached the Teacher 3 level, fewer have progressed to Master Teacher ranks, indicating potential barriers to professional growth.

Lastly, in terms of years in service, the table provides a breakdown of the respondents' years of service, revealing a diverse range of experience within the group. More than half of the respondents (52%) have been in service for 10-15 years with a frequency of 121 out of 232, highlighting a strong presence of mid-career professionals. Another 22% have been teaching for 16-20 years, reinforcing the presence of experienced educators with a frequency of 52. Additionally, 11% have served for 21-25 years with a frequency of 26, while 14% have been in the profession for more than 25 years with a frequency of 33, indicating a notable group of highly experienced teachers.

3.2 Similarities in the Indicators of CB-PAST and RPMS

Table 2. Consolidated findings of the indicators of similarities of CB-PAST and RPMS

Indicators	CB-PAST Mean	Description	RPMS Mean	Description	Difference (RPMS - CB-PAST)
Understanding of content and teaching methods	4.08	Agree	4.72	Strongly Agree	+0.64
Classroom management for learning	4.12	Agree	4.72	Strongly Agree	+0.60
Lesson planning and delivery	4.08	Agree	4.72	Strongly Agree	+0.64
Assessment Strategies	4.00	Agree	4.69	Strongly Agree	+0.69
Ongoing professional development	4.02	Agree	4.73	Strongly Agree	+0.71
Collaboration with colleagues	4.12	Agree	4.76	Strongly Agree	+0.64
Encouraging participation and motivation	4.16	Agree	4.74	Strongly Agree	+0.58
Professionalism and ethics	3.96	Agree	4.75	Strongly Agree	+0.79
Innovation and use of technology	4.01	Agree	4.81	Strongly Agree	+0.80
Strengthening content and pedagogy	4.06	Agree	4.81	Strongly Agree	+0.75
Overall Means	4.06	Agree	4.75	Strongly Agree	+0.69

The comparative analysis demonstrates relentless similarities in the key indicators used to assess teacher performance, although the Competency-Based Performance Appraisal System for Teachers (CB-PAST) and the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) effectively differ in framework and structure. Both systems put a strong emphasis on the basic elements of good teaching, emphasizing common ideals such as professional conduct, instructional competency, and ongoing development.

Most importantly, the indicators “Demonstrates a thorough understanding of subject content and teaching methods” in both CB-PAST and RPMS emphasize the importance of subject content mastery and pedagogy. This common objective is in line with Shulman’s (1987) idea of pedagogical content knowledge, which remains a pillar of both evaluation systems and illustrates the essential role that topic knowledge plays in high-quality instruction. In both CB-PAST (M=4.08) and RPMS (M=4.72), teachers gave this indicator favourable reviews, demonstrating its consistent applicability across frameworks.

Both instruments measure how well teachers manage the learning environment and foster student motivation, which is another obvious connection between classroom management and learner engagement. The two systems have the evidence “Effectively manages the classroom environment” and “Encourages active student participation and fosters motivation,” showing a common understanding of these as crucial elements of effective instruction. This viewpoint is supported by the literature: both CB-PAST and RPMS explicitly acknowledge that classroom management has a significant effect on student progress (Marzano and Marzano, 2015).

Additionally, as evidenced by the item “Plans and delivers lessons that engage and reach the needs of all students, both systems set a high value on differentiated instruction and instructional planning. This indicates a shared commitment to inclusive and learner-centered practices, which corresponds to the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles (CAST, 2018), which place an emphasis on proactive lesson planning to meet the needs of a variety of learners.

In addition, another area where the CB-PAST and RPMS coincide is the use of evaluation to direct instruction. Linkage with best practices in formative assessment is indicated by the shared emphasis on “Uses different methods of assessment to monitor and improve student learning. “Efficient formative assessment enhances learning outcomes, as stated by Black and Wiliam (2012), and both systems clearly view this as an essential component of teacher evaluation.

Professional development is an additional prevalent theme. Both frameworks contain the markers “engages in ongoing professional development” and “pursues professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skills. “The Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (DepEd, 2017) along with other governmental measures promote the long-held belief that teachers should pursue lifelong learning.

Furthermore, both systems assess ethical norms and professional cooperation. CB-PAST and RPMS continually acknowledge that teaching is a social and moral profession, as shown by items like “Works collaboratively with colleagues” and “Demonstrates professionalism and adheres to ethical standards. “Collaborative involvement and ethical conduct are vital components of successful schools, as stated by Darling-Hammond (2010).

The RPMS’s major performance indicators are still quite similar to those of CB-PAST, although improvements in clarity, standardization, and measurable outcomes. The fundamental skills essential to successful teaching are recognized by both systems: topic mastery, planning and evaluation, classroom management, professional development, teamwork and ethics. These analogies demonstrate that RPMS was an evolution based upon CB-PAST’s fundamental strengths, modified to better meet national demands, and tailored to the needs of education in the twenty-first century.

3.3 Differences in the Indicators of CB-PAST and RPMS

A significant change in the Department of Education’s methodology for teacher evaluation may be seen in the switch from CB-PAST to RPMS. The basis of appraisal is the first significant difference. A subjective yet chronologically oriented framework is produced by CB-PAST, which evaluates teacher performance by looking at behaviors and professional competences (M=4.10). In contrast, RPMS obtains a better perception score (M=4.68) by using results-based indicators that correspond to quantifiable outputs. Armstrong (2006) believes that this move to outcomes-based evaluation enhances accountability and transparency by improving the alignment between institutional and individual goals.

Table 3. Consolidated findings of the indicators of differences of CB-PAST and RPMS

Indicators	CB-PAST Mean	Description	RPMS Mean	Description	Difference (CB-PAST/RPMS)
Evaluation Basis	4.10	Agree	4.68	Strongly Agree	+0.58
Focus on Appraisal	4.01	Agree	4.68	Strongly Agree	+0.61
Feedback Orientation	4.04	Agree	4.68	Strongly Agree	+0.64
Performance Measurement	4.07	Agree	4.64	Strongly Agree	+0.57
Assessment Method	4.06	Agree	4.70	Strongly Agree	+0.64
Overall Means	4.07	Agree	4.68	Strongly Agree	+0.61

Both systems are further divided by the appraisal's focus. As an element of professional development, CB-PAST motivates teachers to evaluate their own work (M=4.07). Mello (2010) highlighted that successful evaluation systems link individual outputs to institutional goals for greater coherence, and RPMS drives performance by anchoring it to specific school or national aims (M=4.68).

Considering feedback orientation, RPMS primarily bases feedback on obtaining desired results (M=4.68), although CB-PAST puts more emphasis on narrative and formative feedback targeted at personal growth (M=4.04). In accordance with Pulakos (2009), performance systems that present goal-oriented, data-driven feedback are normally more effective at improving performance, which explains why RPMS ranks higher in this area.

Although RPMS analyses performance based on teacher's contribution to school-wide or institutional goals (M=4.64), CB-PAST focuses its performance measurement on a teacher's present of individual competencies and alignment with professional standards (M=4.07). This institutional alignment reinforces Hatry's (2010) claim that organizational impact, not simply individual behavior, should be taken into consideration in contemporary performance measurement.

A significant difference in assessment approaches is that RPMS provides objective and quantifiable metrics like performance indicators, accomplishment reports, and learner outputs (M=4.70), while CB-PAST uses subjective tools like peer observation and anecdotal evidence (M=4.06). In accordance with Aguinis (2009), who claims that standardized measures increase fairness and effectiveness in performance evaluation, this objectivity ensures standardization, a crucial fundamental.

Although CB-PAST presents a more individualized and analytical approach, RPMS is a more data-driven, results-oriented method that provides more clarity, institutional alignment, and quantifiable accountability. Teachers seem to find this current approach better in line with contemporary educational reforms and performance goals, as seen by the continually higher mean scores for RPMS across all metrics.

3.4 Extent on the Implementation of the CB-PAST and RPMS

Performance Management System (RPMS) both applied to various extents. The analysis reveals an apparent change from a moderately high to a highly intensive use of teacher performance appraisal processes. Based on the average scores, all four components—Performance Monitoring and Coaching, Performance Review and Evaluation, Performance Planning and Commitment, and Performance Rewards and Development Planning—were scored as being implemented to a "High Extent" under CB-PAST (overall mean = 3.94), whereas the RPMS gave the same components a "Very High Extent" rating (overall mean = 4.71). It is shown by this apparent rise in implementation intensity that RPMS is currently used in schools in a more organized and methodical manner.

Teachers discovered RPMS to be more effective for setting clear, aligned goals at the beginning of the performance cycle, as shown by the increase in Performance Planning and Commitment from 3.82 under CB-PAST to 4.68 under RPMS. This supports Mello's (2010) statement that, in order to enhance relevance and ownership, performance systems should begin with strategic planning in line with institutional goals. From 3.99 to 4.69, the Performance Monitoring and Coaching component improved, suggesting that RPMS fosters more reliable, cooperative, and

substantial monitoring procedures. Performance systems that integrate coaching mechanisms enhance instructor accountability and support networks, claims Pulakos (2009).

Table 4. Consolidated findings on the extent of implementation of CB-PAST and RPMS

INDICATORS	CB-PAST		RPMS		GRAND MEAN	OVER-ALL ADJECTIVAL RATING
	MEAN	ADJECTIVAL RATING	MEAN	ADJECTIVAL RATING		
Performance Planning and Commitment	3.823	High Extent	4.676	Very High Extent	4.250	Very High Extent
Performance Monitoring and Coaching	3.986	High Extent	4.688	Very High Extent	4.337	Very High Extent
Performance Review and Evaluation	3.974	High Extent	4.738	Very High Extent	4.356	Very High Extent
Performance Rewards and Development Planning	3.972	High Extent	4.747	Very High Extent	4.360	Very High Extent
Over-all Mean	3.939	High Extent	4.712	Very High Extent	4.326	Very High Extent

In addition, Performance Review and review showed the largest implementation increase (from 3.97 to 4.74), a result indicative of the RPMS's methodical approach to evidence-based review. As stated by Dizon (2020), who highlighted that structured evaluations lead to a more reliable and growth-focused appraisal, the integration of teacher portfolios and classroom observation tools under RPMS has standardized the evaluation process. Performance Rewards and Development Planning additionally showed improvement, rising from 3.97 in CB-PAST to 4.75 in RPMS. Based on Aguinis (2009), an effective reward and development plan encourages motivation and ongoing growth. This indicates that RPMS has strengthened the relationship between performance and developmental treatments.

A higher integration of RPMS in school performance management culture is provided by the overall increase in application from High Extent to Very High Extent across all components. Furthermore, studies suggest that RPMS has been successful in resolving the primary problems of CB-PAST, including subjectivity, irregular feedback, and a lack of connection with national teaching standards. Based on DepEd Order No. 2, s., RPMS follows the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Although it offers an accurate and uniform framework for evaluating teaching performance, its enhanced implementation in 2015 and with the RPMS-PPST tools (DepEd, 2019) has probably helped.

The common implementation of RPMS indicates that schools are better able to keep an eye on teacher performance, provide appropriate interventions, and promote a culture of ongoing professional development. It also indicates that national initiatives to shift to a performance management system, the fact is more standards-based and results-oriented have been effective. To keep RPMS user-friendly and avoid it from becoming excessively bureaucratic, this also requires ongoing technical support, ongoing capacity growth, and tool simplification.

3.5 Significant Relationship Between the Profile of the Respondents and RPMS Implementation

Table 5. Relationship between the profile of the respondents and RPMS Implementation

Variables Tested		Computed r	P-value	Decision	Conclusion
Performance Planning	Age	0.017	0.796	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not significant
	Sex	0.144	0.028	Reject null hypothesis	Significant
	Rank	0.050	0.445	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not significant
	Years in Service	0.117	0.076	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Significant
Performance Monitoring	Age	0.049	0.457	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not significant
	Sex	0.130	0.049	Reject null hypothesis	Significant
	Rank	0.107	0.105	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not significant
	Years in Service	0.019	0.768	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Significant
Performance Review	Age	0.038	0.561	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not significant
	Sex	0.107	0.103	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Significant
	Rank	0.086	0.189	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not significant
	Years in Service	0.100	0.131	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Significant
Performance Rewards	Age	0.083	0.210	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not significant
	Sex	0.133	0.044	Reject null hypothesis	Significant
	Rank	0.055	0.403	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Not significant
	Years in Service	0.086	0.192	Failed to reject null hypothesis	Significant

The correlational analysis between the demographic profile of respondents and the implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) reveals that sex is the only demographic variable found to have a statistically significant relationship with multiple components or indicators of the RPMS implementation. Specifically, sex was significantly correlated with Performance Planning ($r=0.14$, $p=0.03$), Performance Monitoring ($r=0.13$, $p=0.05$), and Performance Rewards ($r=0.13$, $p=0.04$). In contrast, other variables such as age, rank and years in service yielded non-significant results across all RPMS domains, suggesting that implementation patterns are generally consistent regardless of experience or tenure, but may vary across gender.

The significance of sex in relation to RPMS implementation may be attributed to differing levels of engagement, perception, or task performance among male and female educators. According to Acosta and Acosta (2021), female teachers often demonstrate higher compliance and responsiveness to structured performance systems, which may explain their stronger association with planning, monitoring, and development-related components. This is consistent with studies by Lahtero and Risko (2012), who found that gendered organizational roles and expectations can subtly influence the way teachers interact with performance management systems. The implication is that sex may play a role in how teachers engage with performance expectations, particularly in contexts where appraisal tools are closely tied to developmental feedback and documentation compliance.

That age, rank and years in service were found to have no significant correlation with any RPMS component indicates a broadly uniform application of the system, regardless of a teacher's level of experience or professional hierarchy. This finding suggests that the RPMS framework, particularly when guided by the Philippine Professional

Standards for Teachers (PPST), is being implemented in a manner that is standardized and equitable. As noted by Dizon (2020), the RPMS-PPST tools were designed to ensure fair assessment of performance across career stages, thereby minimizing bias related to seniority or teaching position.

From a policy standpoint, the results emphasize the importance of gender-sensitive approaches in performance management implementation. While RPMS is generally well-accepted, training programs and coaching strategies might benefit from acknowledging and addressing gender-related engagement trends. Moreover, the non-significance of age, rank and service length indicates that professional development interventions should be universal rather than hierarchical, reinforcing the principle of continuous learning regardless of one's stage in the profession.

The data affirm RPMS's inclusive and standardized design, while also calling attention to the nuanced influence of gender on teacher performance engagement.

3.6 Significant Difference Between CB-PAST and RPMS Implementation

Table 5. Significant difference of CB-PAST and RPMS Implementation

Sources of Variation	Computed t	P-Value	Decision	Conclusion
Similarities of CB-PAST & RPMS	14.50	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant
Difference of CB-PAST & RPMS	12.68	0.000	Reject null hypothesis	Highly Significant

The results of the t-test reveal a highly significant difference in the implementation of the Competency-based Performance Appraisal System for teachers (CB-PAST) and the Results-based Performance Management system (RPMS), with a computed t-value of 12.68 and a p-value of 0.000. This statistical outcome indicates that teachers clearly perceive RPMS as substantially different – and more effectively implemented – compared to the older CB-PAST framework. The difference is not due to chance but rather reflects structural and functional improvements embedded in the RPMS. This finding validates the transition initiated by the Department of Education towards a standards- and results-based evaluation system.

The significant difference in implementation can be attributed to RPMS's stronger alignment with the PPST and its emphasis on measurable outputs and learner-focused indicators. Unlike CB-PAST, which was often critiqued for being subjective and inconsistent (Abulon & Corpus, 2014), RPMS introduces structured tools such as the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Forms (IPCRF), Key Results Area (KRAs) and Classroom Observation protocols – features that support greater consistency, transparency, and developmental feedback. As noted by Dizon (2020), RPMS enhances accountability and growth by anchoring teacher appraisal on concrete, evidence-based practices rather than purely self-assessed competencies.

From an implementation standpoint, the significant difference also suggests that institutional support and teacher readiness for RPMS may have improved over time. Training programs, coaching mechanisms, and technical assistance provided during the RPMS rollout have likely contributed to its effective institutionalization. This supports the findings of Aguinis (2013), who emphasized that the success of performance systems relies not only on technical structure but also on the capacity of users to understand and use them meaningfully.

The implications of this finding are two-fold. First, it affirms that RPMS, as a successor to CB-PAST, has succeeded in addressing the limitations of the previous system by introducing clearer guidelines, standard alignment, and more objective performance measurements. Second, it highlights the importance of continuous capacity building and system evaluation to ensure that RPMS remains responsive to teachers' evolving needs. As performance evaluation systems impact both professional development and classroom practices, it is crucial for DepEd to sustain mechanisms that ensure fairness, usefulness and teacher empowerment under RPMS.

The highly significant difference between the implementation of CB-PAST and RPMS confirms that the shift toward results-based performance management has been both strategic and impactful. RPMS is not merely a rebranded evaluation tool; it is a transformative system that supports quality teaching, professional growth, and accountability in line with national and global education standards.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, the study concludes that the RPMS is more extensively implemented and perceived as significantly more effective than the CB-PAST in supporting teacher performance and professional development. While CB-PAST served as a foundation for performance evaluation through competencies and reflective practice, RPMS built on this by introducing measurable outputs, clearer expectations, and stronger alignment with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Teachers value RPMS's structure, clarity, and alignment with school goals, as well as its capacity to foster continuous improvement.

The significant differences in mean scores and the statistical validation from the t-test affirm RPMS as a transformative shift in teacher appraisal practices in the Philippines. The system not only enhances instructional performance and collaboration but also offers equitable implementation across age groups, ranks, and years of service. The gender-related differences in implementation suggest a need for more including training and support, particularly in coaching and mentoring.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank and give all the glory and honor to the Almighty Father, the source of strength, wisdom, and perseverance to complete this study. To the graduate school of North Eastern Mindanao State University for their guidance, thoughtful critiques, meaningful suggestions, and constant support that greatly contributed to the successful completion of this research. Heartfelt thanks are also extended to the elementary teachers of the Prosperidad District, Department of Education – Agusan del Sur Division, for their participation, cooperation, and meaningful contributions to this study.

6. REFERENCES

- [1]. Abrojena, V. L., & Ormilla, R. C. G. (2023). Challenges and Opportunities in the Implementation of Results-Based Performance Management System. *Management Research Journal*, 12(1), 1-11
- [2]. Acosta, R. A., & Acosta, J. S. (2021). *Gender-based analysis of teachers' engagement in RPMS implementation*. *Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 13(2), 89–104.
- [3]. Acosta, R. A., & Acosta, J. S. (2021). *Gender-based analysis of teachers' engagement in RPMS implementation*. *Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 13(2), 89–104.
- [4]. Aguinis, H. (2013). *Performance management* (3rd ed.). Pearson Education.
- [5]. Aima Shafiq, D. S. G. F., & Bashir, I. (2024). TEACHERS' BURNOUT IN THE CLASSROOM: EXPLORING ITS IMPACT ON STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT—A CORRELATIONAL STUDY. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 7(4), 1704-1715.
- [6]. Armstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- [7]. Bergmark, U. (2023). Teachers' professional learning when building a research-based education: context-specific, collaborative and teacher-driven professional development. *Professional development in education*, 49(2), 210-224.
- [8]. Burgess, S., & Greaves, E. (2020). Performance management in the UK education system: Teacher accountability and outcomes. *Economics of Education Review*, 32(1), 89-102.
- [9]. Canuto, P. P., Choycawen, M., & Pagdawan, R. (2024). The influence of teaching competencies on teachers' performance and students' academic achievement in primary science education. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 82(1), 29.
- [10]. CAST. (2018). *Universal Design for Learning guidelines version 2.2*. <http://udlguidelines.cast.org>

- [11]. Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. Teachers College Press.
- [12]. Darling-Hammond, L., Saunders, R., Podolsky, A., Kini, T., Espinoza, D., Hyler, M., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2019). Best practices to recruit and retain well-prepared teachers in all classrooms. *Learning Policy Institute*.
- [13]. Department of Education. (2017). *DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST)*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- [14]. Department of Education. (2019). *RPMS-PPST resource package for school year 2019–2020*. Bureau of Human Resource and Organizational Development–Human Resource Development Division.
- [15] DepEd. (2007). *Competency-Based Performance Appraisal System for Teachers (CB-PAST): Guidelines and Implementation*. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
- [16]. DepEd. (2015). *Guidelines on the establishment and implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in DepEd* (DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015). Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
- [17] Dizon, R. C. (2020). *Effectiveness of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in public elementary schools*. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 9(2), 112–125.
- [18]. Garcia, T. (2023). The role of PPST in shaping teacher performance. *Journal of Teacher Standards and Practices*, 5(1), 34-47.
- [19]. Gecolea, C. (2019). Observance of results-based performance management system (RPMS) guidelines and Calamba East District teachers' performance. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (IJSRP)*, 9(8), 9264.
- [20]. Hatry, H. P. (2010). *Performance measurement: Getting results* (2nd ed.). The Urban Institute Press.
- [21]. Junio-Sabio, C., & Manalo, M. M. (2020). Assessing elementary school teachers' performance using CBPAST and IPCR: A five-year trajectory report. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 10(2), 154-158.
- [22]. Lahtero, T. J., & Risku, M. (2012). *Gendered leadership in Finnish basic education?* *International Journal of Educational Management*, 26(7), 569–580. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513541211255595>
- [23]. Lappe, J. M. (2000). Taking the mystery out of research: Descriptive correlational design, *Orthopedic Nursing*, 19(2), 81
- [24]. MAMAUAG, R. (2022). Results-based performance management system: Its implementation challenges in San Antonio Elementary School. *International journal of arts, sciences and education*, 3(1), 1-10.
- [25]. MONARES, H. T., & DASIG, D. J. P. (2024). Implementation Of Results–Based Performance Management System (RPMS) And Teachers' Performance Towards a Proposed Instructional Supervision Framework.
- [26]. OECD. (2019). *Teacher evaluation and accountability: Global perspectives on policy and practice*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.
- [27]. Ormilla, R. C. G. (2021). The implementation of results-based performance management system in public elementary schools. *Management Research Journal*, 10(1), 13-23.
- [28]. Pulakos, E. D. (2009). *Performance management: A new approach for driving business results*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- [29]. Sacramento, R. (2023). *Level of Implementation of Result-Based Performance Management System of Allacapan North District of SDO Cagayan*. SSRN.
- [30]. Santos, J. M., & Casinto, R. G. (2020). Teacher shortages in the Philippine public education system: Policy implications and recruitment strategies. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 12(1), 41–56.
- [31]. Urbano, D., & Gurat, M. (2023). *Level of Practice in the Implementation of DepEd's Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS)*.