

ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)



ISRG PUBLISHERS

Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci

ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)

Journal homepage: <https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss>

Volume – IV Issue - II (March – April) 2026

Frequency: Bimonthly



AWARENESS, CHALLENGES, AND COPING MECHANISMS OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS ON THE INTERIM GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

VALEN A. OÑATE JR.

Cagayan State University-Aparri Campus Aparri, Cagayan

| **Received:** 05.04.2026 | **Accepted:** 12.04.2026 | **Published:** 29.04.2026

*Corresponding author: VALEN A. OÑATE JR.

Abstract

This study examined the level of awareness, challenges, and coping mechanisms of public secondary school teachers in Gattaran, Cagayan regarding the Interim Performance Management and Evaluation System (I-PMES). Although performance management reforms in the Department of Education aim to improve accountability and learning outcomes, gaps remain between policy and implementation. A descriptive-correlational design was used, involving purposively selected teachers who responded to a validated survey with Likert-scale and open-ended items. Statistical tools such as frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, t-test, ANOVA, and Pearson r were applied. Findings showed that teachers had moderate to high awareness of I-PMES guidelines but still faced challenges in documentation, indicator interpretation, and time management. They adopted coping strategies such as time management, peer collaboration, professional development, and resourcefulness. Significant relationships were found among awareness, challenges, and coping mechanisms, suggesting that awareness influences how teachers manage difficulties. The study concludes that targeted support, clearer guidelines, and strengthened orientation programs are needed to improve implementation and teacher well-being.

Keywords: I-PMES, teacher awareness, implementation challenges, coping mechanisms, performance management

INTRODUCTION

Performance Management Systems have long been part of the Department of Education's reforms because of their direct impact on learning outcomes and their role in achieving DepEd's goals in curriculum and instruction. These systems involve teachers' performance planning, review, and evaluation, which strengthen accountability and improve teaching and learning outcomes.

In line with this, DepEd institutionalized the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) through DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015, anchored on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). More recently, DepEd issued Memorandum No. 017, s. 2025, introducing the Interim Performance Management and Evaluation System (I-PMES) for School Year

2024–2025. This policy reinstated the previously suspended PMES by reiterating its objectives, processes, performance standards, and compliance requirements, directing teachers to resume systematic documentation and evaluation of performance. Division offices supported this transition through orientations and advisories to clarify implementation.

Studies show that teachers encounter recurring challenges when performance systems are implemented or revised. Common difficulties include documentation requirements, frequently changing guidelines, limited technological and resource support, and variations in teachers' and school leaders' capacity to interpret indicators and produce Means of Verification (MOVs) (Esteban, 2024; IOER-IMRJ, 2024). Research in Philippine divisions and similar contexts abroad also reports moderate to significant difficulties in adapting to RPMS or PMES (Mamauag, 2023). To cope, teachers use strategies such as time management and planning, peer collaboration, professional development, and stress management routines, as well as resourceful practices like creating templates and adjusting workflows (Paril, 2023).

Despite these findings, gaps remain in the context of I-PMES, particularly regarding teachers' level of awareness, the extent of challenges, and coping mechanisms in specific local settings. There is also limited evidence linking awareness, challenges, and coping strategies, especially in relation to teacher profile variables. This lack of updated local data may contribute to policy-practice misalignment and insufficient targeted support. It may also affect the fairness and validity of PMES evaluations if teachers are unaware of standards or overwhelmed by requirements.

This study therefore examines the awareness, challenges, and coping mechanisms of public secondary school teachers in Gattaran in relation to I-PMES. It aims to generate evidence for improved orientations, capacity-building initiatives, and support systems, and to inform the formalization of effective coping practices. Ultimately, it provides baseline data for future research on teacher practice, performance, and well-being.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to determine the level of awareness, challenges, and coping mechanisms of Teachers in Public Secondary Schools in Gattaran on the Interim Guidelines for Performance Management and Evaluation System (I-PMES). It seeks to answer the following questions:

- i. What is the profile of the secondary school teachers in terms of the following:
 - a. Socio-demographic
 - i. Age
 - ii. Sex
 - iii. Civil status
 - iv. Educational Attainment
 - b. Employment
 - i. Position
 - ii. Length of Service
 - iii. IPCRF rating
2. What is the level of awareness of secondary school teachers on the following Interim Guidelines for PMES:

- a. Cycle and Timeline
 - b. PPST-Based Objectives
 - c. Assessment
 - d. Coaching, Mentoring, and Monitoring
 - e. Rating
 - f. Ratee, Rater, and Approving Authority
3. To what extent do secondary school teachers encounter challenges in the implementation of the following Interim Guidelines for PMES:
 - a. Cycle and Timeline
 - b. PPST-Based Objectives
 - c. Assessment
 - d. Coaching, Mentoring, and Monitoring
 - e. Rating
 - f. Ratee, Rater, and Approving Authority
 4. What coping mechanisms are used by secondary school teachers in addressing the challenges on the following Interim Guidelines for PMES:
 - a. Cycle and Timeline
 - b. PPST-Based Objectives
 - c. Assessment
 - d. Coaching, Mentoring, and Monitoring
 - e. Rating
 - f. Ratee, Rater, and Approving Authority
 5. Is there a significant difference in the level of awareness, extent of challenges, and coping mechanisms of teachers when grouped according to their profile?
 6. Is there a significant relationship between the teachers' level of awareness, extent of challenges, and coping mechanisms in the implementation of the Interim Guidelines for PMES?

METHODOLOGY

This section presents the methodology employed in the study, including the research design, locale of the study, respondents, sampling procedure, research instruments, data gathering procedures, and ethical considerations. It explains the systematic processes undertaken to ensure the validity, reliability, and rigor of the study in examining the awareness, challenges, and coping mechanisms of public secondary school teachers in relation to the Interim Performance Management and Evaluation System (I-PMES).

Research Design

This study employs a descriptive–correlational research design. A descriptive design is used to describe systematically and factually the profile of teachers, their level of awareness, challenges encountered, and coping mechanisms in relation to the Interim Guidelines for Performance Management and Evaluation System (I-PMES) (Creswell, 2014). Meanwhile, the correlational aspect of the design determines the significant differences and relationships between the profile variables and the teachers' awareness, challenges, and coping mechanisms.

The study utilizes both descriptive and correlational variables. The

descriptive variables included the socio-demographic profile of the respondents such as age, sex, civil status, and educational attainment, along with their employment profile covering position, length of service, and designation. It also examines the respondents' level of awareness, the challenges they encountered, and the coping mechanisms they employed. Meanwhile, the correlational variables focuses on determining the relationships among teachers' awareness, challenges, and coping mechanisms, as well as identifying significant differences in these variables when respondents were grouped according to their profile categories.

Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in different public secondary schools in Gattaran, Cagayan, Philippines. These schools are under the supervision of the Department of Education–Division of Cagayan. Gattaran is a first-class municipality with both rural and semi-urban areas, and its schools cater to a diverse population of students. Public secondary schools in the municipality are staffed by teachers of varying ages, educational backgrounds, and lengths of service, which make the setting ideal for exploring differences and relationships across teacher profiles.

Respondents and Sampling Technique

The respondents of this study are public secondary school teachers in Gattaran. The target population includes permanent teachers currently serving during the school year. To determine the respondents, purposive sampling was employed since the study specifically focuses on teachers covered by the Interim Guidelines for Performance Management and Evaluation System (I-PMES). The sample size was computed using Lynch's formula at a 5% margin of error to ensure representativeness of the population. The following matrix shows the breakdown of the respondents according to their schools.

Research Instruments

The main instrument for data collection is a structured survey questionnaire developed by the researcher and validated by experts in education and research. It consists of five parts. The first part covers the profile of teachers, including questions on socio-demographic and employment characteristics. The second part measures teachers' awareness of I-PMES using Likert-scale items ranging from Very High Awareness to Very Low Awareness, focusing on objectives, policies, processes, performance standards, and compliance requirements. The third part identifies challenges encountered through Likert scale items related to workload, guidelines, resources, and time management. The fourth part assesses coping mechanisms using Likert-scale items evaluating time management, peer support, stress management, professional development, and resourcefulness. Finally, the fifth part provides an open-ended section where respondents may offer qualitative insights.

Data Gathering Procedure

A formal letter was sent to the Division Office of Cagayan and to the school principals to request permission to conduct the study. After Approval, the questionnaire undergone validation and pilot testing with a small group of teachers who are not part of the actual study. The validated survey was distributed personally and through online platforms such as Google Forms, depending on accessibility and the teachers' preferences. The researcher collected and retrieved all responses within the agreed timeline to ensure a high response rate. Finally, the gathered data was organized, coded, and tabulated in preparation for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

Frequency and percentage were used to describe the profile of the respondents. Mean and standard deviation helps determine the level of awareness, the extent of challenges, and the coping mechanisms of the participants. To identify significant differences in awareness, challenges, and coping mechanisms when grouped according to their profile, t-tests and ANOVA will be employed. Pearson r correlation were utilized to examine the relationship among teachers' awareness, challenges, and coping mechanisms. Lastly, Cronbach's Alpha was applied to test the reliability of the research instrument.

Ethical Consideration

Informed consent was obtained from all respondents before participation, with a written form explaining the study's purpose, procedures, voluntary participation, right to withdraw without penalty, time requirement, and assurance of confidentiality. Participants were given sufficient time to understand the document before signing, and no coercion was applied. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly observed, with optional names replaced by codes for data handling. Individual responses were not disclosed to administrators or third parties and were reported only in aggregate form. Data access was restricted to the researcher and adviser. All records were securely stored in password-protected devices and locked cabinets. After the retention period, physical and electronic data were properly disposed of. The study complied with DepEd ethical guidelines for research involving human participants.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets the data gathered in the study in relation to the research objectives. The results are organized according to the specific problems posed, focusing on the teachers' profile, level of awareness, extent of challenges, coping mechanisms, and the relationships among the variables. Statistical findings are supported with relevant literature to provide deeper understanding and context.

Profile of the Secondary School Teachers

Socio-demographic Profile

Table 1a. Distribution of secondary school teachers in terms of their socio-demographic profile

| Variables | Frequency (n=114) | Percentage |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| <i>Age (in years)</i> | | |
| 30 or below | 32 | 28.1 |
| 31 to 40 | 44 | 38.6 |
| 41 to 50 | 24 | 21.1 |
| 51 or above | 14 | 12.3 |
| | <i>Mean= 37.92 y/o</i> | <i>SD= 9.00</i> |
| <i>Sex</i> | | |
| Female | 76 | 66.7 |
| Male | 38 | 33.3 |
| <i>Civil status</i> | | |
| Single | 46 | 40.4 |
| Married | 68 | 59.6 |

| <i>Educational attainment</i> | | |
|-----------------------------------|----|------|
| Bachelor's graduate | 2 | 1.8 |
| With units in a masteral program | 44 | 38.6 |
| Masteral graduate | 52 | 45.6 |
| With units in a doctorate program | 14 | 12.3 |
| Doctorate graduate | 2 | 1.8 |

Table 1a presents the socio-demographic profile of secondary school teachers, including age, sex, civil status, and educational attainment, which are important factors influencing teaching practices and responsiveness to institutional policies. In terms of age, most teachers belong to the 31–40 years old group, with a mean age of 37.92 years (SD = 9.00), indicating a moderately varied workforce largely composed of mid-career professionals. This suggests a balance between experience and adaptability to reforms, consistent with Santos et al. (2021), who noted that mid-career teachers exhibit higher instructional competence and openness to innovation. The smaller proportion of teachers aged 51 and above (12.3%) may reflect retirement trends, as observed by Garcia and Lopez (2019).

Regarding sex, 66.7% are female while 33.3% are male, confirming the persistent female dominance in teaching as reported by DepEd (2020). Cruz et al. (2020) further noted that female teachers often demonstrate strong nurturing skills, although limited male representation may affect diversity in teaching styles. In terms of civil status, 59.6% are married and 40.4% are single, suggesting potential work-life balance demands among many teachers (Reyes et al., 2022). Lastly, most respondents have pursued graduate studies, with 45.6% holding master's degrees and a small proportion holding doctoral degrees, indicating strong professional development orientation. Valdez et al. (2021) emphasized that higher educational attainment enhances teaching effectiveness. Overall, the profile reflects a female-dominated, mid-career, academically engaged teaching workforce.

Employment Profile

Table 1b. Distribution of secondary school teachers in terms of their employment profile

| Variables | Frequency (n=114) | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| <i>Position</i> | | |
| Teacher 1 | 32 | 28.1 |
| Teacher 2 | 14 | 12.3 |
| Teacher 3 | 60 | 52.6 |
| Master Teacher 1 | 6 | 5.3 |
| Master Teacher 2 | 2 | 1.8 |
| <i>Length of service (in years)</i> | | |
| 3 or below | 20 | 17.5 |
| 4 to 10 | 52 | 45.6 |
| 11 to 20 | 30 | 26.3 |
| 21 or above | 12 | 10.5 |

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------|------------------|
| | Mean= 9.46 years | SD= 7.42 |
| <i>IPCRF Rating</i> | | |
| <i>Very satisfactory (3.500 to 4.499)</i> | 2 | 1.8 |
| <i>Outstanding (4.500 to 5.000)</i> | 112 | 98.2 |
| | Mean= 4.764 (Outstanding) | SD= 0.154 |

Table 1b presents the employment profile of secondary school teachers in terms of position, length of service, and performance rating. In terms of position, 52.6% are Teacher III, indicating that most respondents have advanced beyond entry-level roles, reflecting experience and compliance with promotion requirements (DepEd, 2020). However, only a small proportion occupy Master Teacher positions, suggesting limited or competitive advancement opportunities, consistent with Valdez et al. (2021). Regarding length of service, 45.6% have served for 4–10 years, with a mean of 9.46 years (SD = 7.42), indicating a moderately experienced workforce with a mix of early-, mid-, and late-career teachers that supports mentoring and knowledge sharing (Santos et al., 2021). In terms of performance, 98.2% received an Outstanding rating in their IPCRF, with a mean of 4.764, while only 1.8% were Very Satisfactory, reflecting generally high performance levels. However, studies suggest that such uniform ratings may also indicate possible rating inflation or limited differentiation in evaluation systems (Ortega et al., 2022). Overall, the profile reflects a stable, experienced, and highly performing teaching workforce.

Level of Awareness of the Secondary School Teachers on the Interim Guidelines for Performance Management Evaluation System

Performance Management and Evaluation Cycle and Timeline

Table 2a. Weighted means and level of awareness of the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along performance management and evaluation cycle and timeline

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|---------------|---------------------|
| 1. I am aware of the phases included in the PMES cycle. | 4.27 | Highly aware |
| 2. I understand the timeline for each phase of the PMES. | 4.25 | Highly aware |
| 3. I am familiar with the start and end periods of the PMES cycle. | 4.19 | Aware |
| 4. I know my responsibilities at each stage of the PMES timeline. | 4.25 | Highly aware |
| 5. I am aware of the deadlines related to PMES implementation. | 4.16 | Aware |
| Dimension Mean | 4.22 | Highly aware |

As presented in Table 2a, the overall awareness of teachers on the PMES cycle is High, with a composite mean of 4.22 (Highly

Aware). The highest-rated dimensions include familiarity with the phases of the cycle (4.27), responsibilities at each stage (4.25), and the timeline for each phase (4.25), indicating strong understanding of system operations and expectations. While the lowest awareness was observed in knowledge of the start and end periods of the cycle and implementation deadlines, interpreted as Aware. This only suggests that while teachers are generally well-informed, guidance on cycle schedules may further enhance comprehension (Santos et al., 2021; Garcia & Lopez, 2019).

PPST-Based Objectives for Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers

Table 2b. Weighted means and level of awareness of the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along PPST-based objectives for proficient and highly proficient teachers

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|---------------|---------------------|
| 1. I am aware that PMES objectives are aligned with the PPST. | 4.44 | Descriptive Value |
| 2. I understand the difference between objectives for Proficient and Highly Proficient teachers. | 4.50 | Highly aware |
| 3. I am familiar with the PPST indicators used in setting objectives. | 4.39 | Highly aware |
| 4. I know how PPST-based objectives are identified for my position. | 4.38 | Highly aware |
| 5. I am aware of how PPST-based objectives support professional growth. | 4.51 | Highly aware |
| Dimension Mean | 4.44 | Highly aware |

As presented in Table 2b, the overall awareness of teachers on PMES alignment with professional standards is High, with a dimension mean of 4.44 (Highly Aware). The highest-rated dimensions include recognition that PMES objectives align with the PPST, understanding differences between objectives for Proficient and Highly Proficient teachers, and awareness of how these objectives support professional growth, all interpreted as Highly Aware. While the lowest awareness, though still high, pertains to identification of PPST indicators based on position. This suggests that teachers not only understand the framework but can also relate it to their roles, enhancing goal setting, performance alignment, and professional development (Santos et al., 2021; Garcia & Lopez, 2019).

Assessing PPST-Based Objectives

Table 2c. Weighted means and level of awareness of the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along assessing PPST-based objectives

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|---------------|-------------------|
| 1. I am aware of the tools used to assess PPST-based objectives. | 4.40 | Highly aware |

| | | |
|--|-------------|---------------------|
| 2. I understand the criteria for evaluating PPST-based objectives. | 4.32 | Highly aware |
| 3. I am familiar with the required Means of Verification (MOVs). | 4.39 | Highly aware |
| 4. I know how my performance is measured against PPST indicators. | 4.36 | Highly aware |
| 5. I am aware of the assessment process for PPST-based objectives. | 4.35 | Highly aware |
| Dimension Mean | 4.36 | Highly aware |

In terms of assessing PPST-based objectives, as reflected by the dimension mean of 4.36 (Highly Aware), teachers demonstrate a strong level of awareness of the processes and tools used in evaluating their performance under the PMES. They show high awareness of the tools used to assess PPST-based objectives, the required Means of Verification (MOVs), and how their performance is measured against PPST indicators. Teachers also show high awareness of the criteria for evaluating PPST-based objectives and the overall assessment process indicating that teachers are not only familiar with the requirements but also understand how performance is evaluated.

This tells us that teachers are well-informed about the assessment mechanisms of PPST-based objectives, which can lead to more accurate documentation, better preparation of MOVs, and improved performance outcomes.

Strengthening Coaching, Mentoring, and Performance Monitoring

Table 2d. Weighted means and level of awareness of the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along strengthening coaching, mentoring, and performance monitoring

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|---|---------------|---------------------|
| <i>I am aware that coaching and mentoring are integral parts of PMES.</i> | 4.48 | Highly aware |
| <i>I understand the role of school leaders in coaching and mentoring.</i> | 4.58 | Highly aware |
| <i>I am familiar with performance monitoring mechanism under PMES.</i> | 4.33 | Highly aware |
| <i>I am aware of feedback processes included in PMES.</i> | 4.30 | Highly aware |
| 4. <i>I know how coaching and mentoring support my performance improvement.</i> | 4.42 | Highly aware |
| Dimension Mean | 4.42 | Highly aware |

In terms of Strengthening Coaching, Mentoring, and Performance

Monitoring as evident in table 2d, teachers demonstrate a strong understanding of how these processes are integrated into the PMES. They show high awareness that coaching and mentoring are integral parts of PMES, understand the role of school leaders in providing guidance, and recognize how coaching and mentoring support their performance improvement. They also exhibit high awareness of the performance monitoring mechanisms and the feedback processes included in PMES suggesting that teachers not only understand the existence of these systems but also their practical application in supporting professional growth and enhancing their performance. Findings indicate that teachers are well-informed about coaching, mentoring, and monitoring practices, which can facilitate more effective guidance, timely feedback, and continuous improvement in their teaching performance.

Computation of Rating

Table 2e. Weighted means and level of awareness of the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along computation of rating

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|---------------|---------------------|
| 1. I am aware of how performance ratings are computed under PMES. | | Highly aware |
| 2. I understand the components included in the rating computation. | | Highly aware |
| 3. I am familiar with the weighting of different performance indicators. | | Highly aware |
| 4. I know how my final performance rating is derived. | | Highly aware |
| 5. I am aware of how ratings affect professional development. | | Highly aware |
| Dimension Mean | 4.35 | Highly aware |

As reflected by the dimension mean of 4.35 (Highly Aware), teachers demonstrate a strong understanding of how performance ratings are determined under the PMES. They show high awareness of how performance ratings are computed, the components included in the rating computation, and the weighting of different performance indicators. Teachers also exhibit high awareness of how their final performance rating is derived and how ratings affect professional development. It indicates that teachers understand the technical aspects of rating computation and recognize the implications of their ratings for career growth and professional improvement. The findings suggest that teachers are well-informed about the rating computation process, which can contribute to transparency, fairness, and motivation to meet performance expectations.

Ratee, Rater, and Approving Authority

Table 2f. Weighted means and level of awareness of the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along ratee, rater, and approving authority

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|---------------|---------------------|
| 1. I am aware of my role as a ratee in the PMES process. | | Highly aware |
| 2. I understand the responsibilities of the rater. | | Highly aware |
| 3. I am familiar with the role of approving authority. | | Highly aware |
| 4. I know how communication flows among the ratee, rater, and approving authority. | | Highly aware |
| 5. I am aware of accountability mechanisms for each role. | | Highly aware |
| Dimension Mean | 4.49 | Highly aware |

In terms of ratee, rater, and approving authority, as reflected by the dimension mean of 4.49 (Highly Aware), teachers demonstrate a strong understanding of the roles and responsibilities of each party involved in the PMES process. They show high awareness of their own role as a ratee, understand the responsibilities of the rater, and are familiar with the role of the approving authority which are all interpreted as highly aware. This indicates that teachers not only understand their individual responsibilities but also recognize the collaborative and procedural aspects of the PMES system. The findings suggest that teachers are well-informed about the roles and accountability structures within PMES.

Summary of Level of Awareness

Table 2g. Overall mean and level of awareness of the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES

| Dimension | Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|-------------|---------------------|
| 1. Performance Management and Evaluation Cycle and Timeline | 4.22 | Highly aware |
| 2. PPST-Based Objectives for Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers | 4.44 | Highly aware |
| 3. Assessing PPST-Based Objectives | 4.36 | Highly aware |
| 4. Strengthening Coaching, Mentoring, and Performance Monitoring | 4.42 | Highly aware |
| 5. Computation of Rating | 4.35 | Highly aware |
| 6. Ratee, Rater, and Approving Authority | 4.49 | Highly aware |
| Overall Mean | 4.38 | Highly aware |

As presented in Table 2g, the overall awareness of secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES is high, with a composite mean of 4.38 (Highly Aware). Across the different dimensions, the highest awareness was observed in

understanding the PMES cycle and timeline, PPST-based objectives for Proficient and Highly Proficient teachers, and the assessment of these objectives. Teachers also demonstrated strong awareness of coaching, mentoring, and performance monitoring processes, computation of ratings, and the roles of rater, and approving authority.

These findings suggest that teachers not only comprehend the procedural and technical aspects of PMES but also recognize its alignment with professional growth and accountability. The consistent high ratings across all dimensions indicate readiness to actively participate, comply with system requirements, and leverage PMES to improve instructional practices and performance. Similar results were reported by Santos et al. (2021) and Valdez et al. (2021), who found that high teacher awareness of performance management systems enhances compliance, professional development, and instructional effectiveness.

Extent of Challenges Encountered by the Secondary School Teachers on the Interim Guidelines for Performance Management Evaluation System

Performance Management and Evaluation Cycle and Timeline

Table 3a. Weighted means and extent of challenges encountered by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along performance management and evaluation cycle and timeline

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|---------------|--------------------|
| 1. I have trouble following the PMES timeline. | 3.05 | Fair extent |
| 2. The PMES schedule conflicts with other school responsibilities. | 3.16 | Fair extent |
| 3. Time constraints affect my compliance with PMES requirements. | 3.16 | Fair extent |
| 4. The PMES cycle is difficult to manage within the school year. | 2.96 | Fair extent |
| 5. Monitoring deadlines under PMES is challenging. | 3.26 | Fair extent |
| Dimension Mean | 3.12 | Fair extent |

In terms of PMES cycle and timeline, as reflected by the dimension mean of

3.12 (Fair extent), teachers experience a moderate level of challenges in managing the implementation of the system. They report a fair extent of difficulty in monitoring deadlines, as well as dealing with schedule conflicts with other school responsibilities and time constraints affecting compliance, which are all interpreted as fair extent suggesting that while teachers are generally aware of the PMES processes, they encounter practical difficulties in balancing their requirements with their existing workload. These imply that time management and scheduling remain key concerns in PMES implementation.

PPST-Based Objectives for Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers

Table 3b. Weighted means and extent of challenges encountered by

the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along PPST-based objectives for proficient and highly proficient teachers

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|---|---------------|--------------------|
| 1. Aligning objectives with PPST indicators is challenging. | 3.25 | Fair extent |
| 2. Differentiating objectives for Proficient and Highly Proficient levels is difficult. | 3.02 | Fair extent |
| 3. I find PPST indicators complex to interpret. | 2.98 | Fair extent |
| 4. Setting realistic PPST-based objectives is challenging. | 3.19 | Fair extent |
| 5. There is limited guidance in formulating PPST-based objectives. | 3.23 | Fair extent |
| Dimension Mean | 3.13 | Fair extent |

Table 3b presents PPST-based objectives for Proficient and Highly Proficient teachers, which reflects the dimension mean of 3.13 (Fair extent) This implies that teachers experience a moderate level of challenges in aligning their objectives with the PMES requirements. The findings suggest that while teachers are aware of PPST-based objectives, translating these standards into clear and attainable goals remains somewhat difficult. The results imply that teachers may benefit from additional support, such as clearer guidelines, exemplars, and training, to better understand and apply PPST indicators in objective settings.

Assessing PPST-Based Objectives

Table 3c. Weighted means and extent of challenges encountered by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along assessing PPST-based objectives

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|---|---------------|--------------------|
| 1. Preparing appropriate MOVs is challenging. | 3.47 | Moderate extent |
| 2. Assessment criteria for PPST-based objectives are unclear. | 3.04 | Fair extent |
| 3. Gathering evidence for performance assessment is time-consuming. | 3.44 | Moderate extent |
| 4. I find it difficult to self-assess using PPST indicators. | 3.07 | Fair extent |
| 5. Consistency in assessment is a challenge. | 3.21 | Fair extent |
| Dimension Mean | 3.25 | Fair extent |

In terms of assessing PPST-based objectives, as reflected by the dimension mean of 3.25 (Fair extent), teachers experience a moderate level of challenges in the evaluation process. It suggests that while teachers are generally capable of navigating the

assessment process, certain areas still require improvement, particularly in ensuring clarity and consistency. The results imply that although challenges are manageable, additional support in terms of clearer guidelines, streamlined documentation processes, and capacity-building activities may help reduce difficulties and improve the efficiency and reliability of assessing PPST-based objectives.

Strengthening Coaching, Mentoring, and Performance Monitoring

Table 3d. Weighted means and extent of challenges encountered by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along strengthening coaching, mentoring, and performance monitoring

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|---------------|--------------------|
| 1. There is limited time for coaching and mentoring sessions. | 3.37 | Fair extent |
| 2. Access to mentors or coaches is insufficient. | 3.07 | Fair extent |
| 3. Performance feedback is not always timely. | 3.12 | Fair extent |
| 4. Monitoring performance progress is challenging. | 3.12 | Fair extent |
| 5. Coaching and mentoring activities are not consistently implemented. | 3.07 | Fair extent |
| Dimension Mean | 3.15 | Fair extent |

As shown in Table 3d. Weighted means and extent of challenges encountered by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along strengthening coaching, mentoring, and performance monitoring with dimension mean of 3.15 (Fair extent), teachers experience a moderate level of challenges in the implementation of these support mechanisms.

The findings suggest that while such support systems exist, they may not be fully optimized or consistently practiced within the school setting. The results imply that although challenges are only to a fair extent, improvements in time allocation, accessibility of mentors, and consistency of implementation may enhance the effectiveness of coaching, mentoring, and performance monitoring. Strengthening these areas can lead to better professional support and continuous improvement among teachers under the PMES.

Computation of Rating

Table 3e. Weighted means and extent of challenges encountered by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along computation of rating

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 1. The rating | 2.82 | Fair extent |

| | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------|
| computation process is difficult to understand. | | |
| 2. I find the scoring system complex. | 2.81 | Fair extent |
| 3. There is limited transparency in rating computation. | 2.74 | Fair extent |
| 4. Clarifications on rating results are insufficient. | 2.67 | Fair extent |
| 5. Discrepancies in ratings are challenging to address. | 2.61 | Fair extent |
| Dimension Mean | 2.73 | Fair extent |

In terms of computation of rating, the dimension mean is 2.73 (Fair extent). Teachers experience a moderate level of challenges in understanding how performance ratings are determined under the PMES. This suggests that while the overall process is understood, practical difficulties in clarity, transparency, and resolution of rating issues persist. It implies that although the challenges are moderate, providing clearer explanations, more transparent procedures, and accessible support for addressing discrepancies can help teachers better understand and engage with the rating computation process. Improving these areas may enhance trust and confidence in the PMES evaluation system.

Ratee, Rater, and Approving Authority

Table 3f. Weighted means and extent of challenges encountered by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along ratee, rater, and approving authority

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|---|---------------|--------------------|
| 1. Roles and responsibilities are not always clearly defined. | 2.63 | Fair extent |
| 2. Communication with the rater can be challenging. | 2.60 | Fair extent |
| 3. Feedback from the approving authority is limited. | 2.75 | Fair extent |
| 4. Conflicting interpretations of roles affect PMES implementation. | 2.91 | Fair extent |
| 5. Coordination among ratee, rater, and approving authority is challenging. | 2.72 | Fair extent |
| Dimension Mean | 2.72 | Fair extent |

In terms of ratee, rater, and approving authority, the mean is 2.72 (Fair extent). This means that teachers experience a moderate level of challenges related to roles, communication, and coordination within the PMES process suggesting that while the framework for roles and responsibilities exists, practical issues in understanding, communication, and collaboration can hinder smooth

implementation. Although challenges are moderate, enhancing role clarity, improving communication channels, and strengthening coordination mechanisms may help teachers better navigate the PMES process.

Summary of Level of extent of challenges

Table 3g. Overall mean and extent of challenges encountered by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES

| Dimension | Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|-------------|--------------------|
| 1. Performance Management and Evaluation Cycle and Timeline | 3.12 | Fair extent |
| 2. PPST-Based Objectives for Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers | 3.13 | Fair extent |
| 3. Assessing PPST-Based Objectives | 3.25 | Fair extent |
| 4. Strengthening Coaching, Mentoring, and Performance Monitoring | 3.15 | Fair extent |
| 5. Computation of Rating | 2.73 | Fair extent |
| 6. Ratee, Rater, and Approving Authority | 2.72 | Fair extent |
| Overall Mean | 3.02 | Fair extent |

As reflected in Table 3g, the summary of the extent of challenges encountered by secondary school teachers in implementing the interim guidelines for PMES indicates a moderate level of difficulty, with an overall mean of 3.02 (To a Fair Extent). Across dimensions, teachers reported the greatest challenges in assessing PPST-based objectives, strengthening coaching, mentoring, and performance monitoring, and aligning objectives with the PPST. Slightly lower challenges were noted in the computation of ratings and understanding the roles of ratee, rater, and approving authority.

These results suggest that while teachers are generally knowledgeable and aware of PMES processes, practical implementation issues—such as time constraints, documentation requirements, coordination, and procedural clarity—pose moderate difficulties. Similar findings were reported by Alvarez et al. (2021) and Garcia & Lopez (2019), who noted that even well-informed teachers often face challenges in translating performance management guidelines into practice. Addressing these issues through clearer procedures, targeted guidance, and support mechanisms may reduce difficulties and facilitate more effective PMES implementation.

Coping Mechanisms Used by the Secondary School Teachers in Addressing the Interim Guidelines for Performance Management Evaluation System

Performance Management and Evaluation Cycle and Timeline

Table 4a. Weighted means and extent of coping mechanisms used by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along performance management and evaluation cycle and timeline

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|---------------|------------------------|
| 1. I create a personal schedule to track PMES deadlines. | 3.53 | Moderate extent |
| 2. I prioritize PMES tasks alongside teaching responsibilities. | 3.19 | Fair extent |
| 3. I seek clarification from school heads regarding timelines. | 3.30 | Fair extent |
| 4. I collaborate with colleagues to manage PMES requirements. | 4.04 | Moderate extent |
| 5. I use reminders or planning tools to cope with PMES schedules | 3.65 | Moderate extent |
| Dimension Mean | 3.54 | Moderate extent |

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|---|---------------|------------------------|
| 1. I review PPST documents to better understand indicators. | 4.02 | Moderate extent |
| 2. I consult colleagues when setting PPST-based objectives. | 4.14 | Moderate extent |
| 3. I attend orientations or trainings related to PPST. | 3.63 | Moderate extent |
| 4. I seek guidance from school leaders in formulating objectives. | 3.74 | Moderate extent |
| 5. I reflect on my teaching practice to align objectives with PPST. | 4.32 | High extent |
| Dimension Mean | 3.97 | Moderate extent |

As reflected by the dimension mean of 3.54 (Moderate extent), teachers employ several coping mechanisms to manage the demands of the PMES. This indicates that while teachers actively adopt strategies to cope with PMES demands, some approaches particularly those requiring personal initiative or balancing multiple responsibilities are less frequently practiced or more challenging to implement. It suggests that teachers rely on a combination of planning, collaboration, and support-seeking to navigate the PMES cycle and timeline.

PPST-Based Objectives for Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers

Table 4b. Weighted means and extent of coping mechanisms used by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along PPST-based objectives for proficient and highly proficient teachers

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|---|---------------|------------------------|
| 1. I review PPST documents to better understand indicators. | 4.02 | Moderate extent |
| 2. I consult colleagues when setting PPST-based objectives. | 4.14 | Moderate extent |
| 3. I attend orientations or trainings related to PPST. | 3.63 | Moderate extent |
| 4. I seek guidance from school leaders in formulating objectives. | 3.74 | Moderate extent |
| 5. I reflect on my teaching practice to align objectives with PPST. | 4.32 | High extent |
| Dimension Mean | 3.97 | Moderate extent |

Apparent in table 4b, the dimension mean of 3.97 (Moderate extent), teachers employ various coping mechanisms to effectively align their objectives with the PPST standards. Teaching practice to align objectives with PPST got the highest weighted mean which is classified as High extent. These mechanisms indicate that teachers rely on a combination of self-directed learning, collaboration, and support-seeking to cope with the challenges of setting PPST-based objectives suggesting that teachers actively engage in reflective practice and collaborative strategies to overcome difficulties in understanding and applying PPST-based objectives.

Assessing PPST-Based Objectives

Table 4c. Weighted means and extent of coping mechanisms used by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along assessing PPST- based objectives

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|---------------|------------------------|
| 1. I organize my MOVs regularly. | 3.68 | Moderate extent |
| 2. I use self-reflection to evaluate my performance. | 3.91 | Moderate extent |
| 3. I seek feedback to improve assessment results | 4.12 | Moderate extent |
| 4. I refer to rubrics to guide my performance assessment | 4.19 | Moderate extent |
| 5. I document teaching practices consistently. | 3.75 | Moderate extent |
| Dimension Mean | 3.93 | Moderate extent |

With a mean of 3.93 (Moderate extent), this implies that teachers utilize various coping mechanisms to effectively manage the assessment process. The mechanisms suggest that teachers rely on a combination of personal organization, reflective practice, and feedback-seeking to cope with the demands of assessing PPST-based objectives. This means that teachers actively engage in systematic and reflective practices to manage assessment tasks, which helps ensure more reliable evaluation, maintain accurate documentation, and promote continuous professional growth under the PMES framework.

Strengthening Coaching, Mentoring, and Performance Monitoring

Table 4d. Weighted means and extent of coping mechanisms used by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along strengthening coaching, mentoring, and performance monitoring

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|---|---------------|--------------------|
| 1. I actively participate in coaching and mentoring sessions. | 4.11 | Moderate extent |
| 2. I seek feedback to improve my teaching performance. | 4.19 | Moderate extent |
| 3. I apply suggestions from mentors in my classroom practice. | 4.30 | High extent |
| 4. I monitor my progress based on feedback received. | 4.28 | High extent |
| 5. I engage in professional discussions with colleagues. | 4.26 | High extent |
| Dimension Mean | 4.23 | High extent |

In terms of strengthening coaching, mentoring, and performance monitoring, as reflected by the dimension mean of 4.23 (High extent), teachers employ a variety of coping mechanisms to enhance their professional growth and teaching effectiveness suggesting that they are proactive in accessing support and guidance but may vary in consistency or frequency of participation. This only implies that teachers effectively leverage mentorship, feedback, and peer collaboration as coping mechanisms, which help them address challenges in PMES implementation.

Computation of Rating

Table 4e. Weighted means and extent of coping mechanisms used by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along computation of rating

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|---|---------------|------------------------|
| 1. I ask for clarification regarding my performance rating. | 3.81 | Moderate extent |
| 2. I review rating components to understand my results. | 4.16 | Moderate extent |
| 3. I compare my performance against set standards. | 4.04 | Moderate extent |
| 4. I use my rating as a basis for professional improvement. | 4.26 | High extent |
| 5. I document concerns related to rating computation. | 3.82 | Moderate extent |
| Dimension Mean | 4.02 | Moderate extent |

In terms of computation of rating, as reflected by the dimension mean of 4.02 (Moderate extent), teachers employ several coping mechanisms to better understand and utilize their performance ratings under the PMES. They demonstrate a high extent of coping by using their ratings as a basis for professional improvement (4.26), indicating that performance evaluations are actively leveraged to guide growth and development. Teachers also report coping to a moderate extent by reviewing rating components to understand results, comparing their performance against set standards, asking for clarification regarding ratings, and documenting concerns related to rating computation. These strategies suggest that teachers take a proactive and reflective approach to navigating rating procedures and addressing uncertainties. The findings imply that teachers effectively combine reflection, analysis, and feedback-seeking as coping mechanisms to manage challenges related to rating computation. Such practices help them interpret their performance more accurately and use the results constructively for continuous professional growth.

Ratee, Rater, and Approving Authority

Table 4f. Weighted means and extent of coping mechanisms used by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES along ratee, rater, and approving authority

| Statements | Weighted Mean | Descriptive Value |
|---|---------------|-------------------|
| 1. I maintain open communication with my rater. | 4.35 | High extent |

| | | |
|--|-------------|------------------------|
| 2. I seek clarification on feedback from the approving authority. | 4.07 | Moderate extent |
| 3. I comply with documentation requirements promptly. | 4.33 | High extent |
| 4. I respectfully raise concerns regarding performance evaluation. | 4.04 | Moderate extent |
| 5. I follow established protocols in dealing with PMES concerns | 4.28 | High extent |
| Dimension Mean | 4.21 | Moderate extent |

In terms of ratee, rater, and approving authority, as reflected by the dimension mean of 4.21 (Moderate extent), teachers employ a range of coping mechanisms to effectively navigate communication, feedback, and accountability processes within the PMES. These actions suggest that while teachers are generally confident in engaging with evaluators, they may still require guidance or reassurance when addressing complex feedback or procedural issues. The findings imply that teachers effectively combine proactive communication, procedural compliance, and respectful inquiry as coping mechanisms. These strategies help ensure clarity, accountability, and smooth coordination between ratees, raters, and approving authorities, which contributes to a more effective and transparent PMES implementation.

Summary of Level of Coping Mechanisms

Table 4g. Overall mean and extent of coping mechanisms used by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES

| Dimension | Mean | Descriptive Value |
|--|-------------|------------------------|
| 1. Performance Management and Evaluation Cycle and Timeline | 3.54 | Moderate extent |
| 2. PPST-Based Objectives for Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers | 3.97 | Moderate extent |
| 3. Assessing PPST-Based Objectives | 3.93 | Moderate extent |
| 4. Strengthening Coaching, Mentoring, and Performance Monitoring | 4.23 | High extent |
| 5. Computation of Rating | 4.02 | Moderate extent |
| 6. Ratee, Rater, and Approving Authority | 4.21 | High extent |
| Overall Mean | 3.98 | Moderate extent |

As reflected in Table 4g, the summary of coping mechanisms employed by secondary school teachers in addressing the interim guidelines for PMES indicates that teachers implement strategies to a moderate extent, with an overall mean of 3.98 (Moderate Extent). The highest-rated dimensions include strengthening coaching,

mentoring, and performance monitoring (4.23, High Extent) and managing interactions with ratee, rater, and approving authority (4.21, High Extent), suggesting that teachers actively utilize mentorship, feedback, communication, and adherence to protocols to address challenges.

For other dimensions—PMES cycle and timeline (3.54), PPST-based objectives (3.97), assessing PPST-based objectives (3.93), and computation of ratings (4.02), teachers employ coping strategies to a moderate extent, such as planning, self-reflection, peer consultation, and use of rubrics or guidelines. These findings imply that while teachers are generally proactive, some areas require additional support and structured strategies to optimize effectiveness. Similar studies by Lopez et al. (2021) and Urbano et al. (2022) note that combining individual and collaborative coping mechanisms enhances teachers' ability to navigate performance management challenges, improve professional growth, and ensure smoother PMES implementation.

Difference in the Level of Awareness of the Secondary School Teachers on the Interim Guidelines for the PMES by Profile

Table 5a. Comparison statistics of the level of awareness of the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for the PMES when grouped by profile

| Grouping Variables Level of awareness | F- or t-value | Probability | Inference |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Age | 1.638 | 0.185 | Not significant |
| Sex | 0.174 | 0.677 | Not significant |
| Civil status | 5.743 | 0.018 | Significant |
| Educational attainment | 1.795 | 0.135 | Not significant |
| Position | 2.097 | 0.086 | Not significant |
| Length of service | 0.068 | 0.977 | Not significant |
| IPCR rating | 2.871 | 0.093 | Not significant |

*tested at 0.05 level of significance

Apparent in Table 5a is the difference in the level of awareness of secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for PMES across various profile variables.

The results indicate that awareness is generally consistent, with no significant differences observed for age ($F = 1.638, p = 0.185$), sex ($t = 0.174, p = 0.677$), educational attainment ($F = 1.795, p = 0.135$), position ($F = 2.097, p = 0.086$), length of service ($F = 0.068, p = 0.977$), and IPCR rating ($F = 2.871, p = 0.093$). This suggests that demographic and employment characteristics, in most cases, do not substantially affect teachers' familiarity with PMES guidelines, consistent with the findings of Santos et al. (2021), who reported that awareness of performance management systems is often uniform across age, sex, and educational background.

However, a significant difference was found based on civil status ($F = 5.743, p$

$= 0.018$), indicating that single and married teachers differ in their awareness levels. Married teachers may have higher engagement with PMES due to greater professional responsibilities or longer tenure in structured school processes, whereas single teachers may approach the guidelines differently. Similar observations were noted by Reyes et al. (2022), who highlighted those personal

circumstances, including family obligations, can influence teachers' familiarity with institutional policies.

The findings suggest that while PMES awareness is largely uniform across most teacher profiles, civil status may influence the extent of engagement, highlighting the role of personal and contextual factors in understanding performance evaluation processes.

Difference in the Extent of Challenges Encountered by the Secondary School Teachers on the Interim Guidelines for the PMES by Profile

Table 5b. Comparison statistics of the extent of challenges encountered by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for the PMES when grouped by profile

| Grouping Variables | F- or t-value | Probability | Inference |
|----------------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Extent of challenges encountered | | | |
| Age | 5.004 | 0.003 | Significant |
| Sex | 1.585 | 0.211 | Not significant |
| Civil status | 2.570 | 0.112 | Not significant |
| Educational attainment | 2.192 | 0.075 | Not significant |
| Position | 1.386 | 0.244 | Not significant |
| Length of service | 0.242 | 0.867 | Not significant |
| IPCR rating | 6.205 | 0.014 | Significant |

**tested at 0.05 level of significance*

The differences in the extent of challenges encountered by secondary school teachers in implementing the interim guidelines for PMES across various profile variables, as shown in Table 5b, indicate that, for most characteristics, challenges are not significantly different. No significant differences were observed for sex ($t = 1.585$, $p = 0.211$), civil status ($F = 2.570$, $p = 0.112$), educational attainment ($F = 2.192$, $p = 0.075$), position ($F = 1.386$, $p = 0.244$), or length of service ($F = 0.242$, $p = 0.867$), suggesting that teachers generally face similar levels of challenges regardless of these factors.

However, significant differences were noted for age ($F = 5.004$, $p = 0.003$) and IPCR rating ($F = 6.205$, $p = 0.014$), indicating that teachers' age and performance levels influence the extent of challenges they encounter. Older teachers or those with higher IPCR ratings may experience fewer or more manageable difficulties due to greater familiarity, experience, or confidence in performance management tasks, whereas younger teachers or those with lower ratings may face more pronounced challenges. These findings are consistent with Alvarez et al. (2021) and Dominguez & Torres (2020), who observed that experience and prior performance influence teachers' ability to navigate and cope with evaluation systems.

Overall, while PMES challenges are broadly consistent across most demographic and employment variables, age and performance level significantly affect how teachers perceive and manage these challenges, highlighting the importance of targeted support for younger or lower-rated educators.

Difference in the Extent of Coping Mechanisms Used by the Secondary School Teachers on the Interim Guidelines for the PMES by Profile

Table 5c. Comparison statistics of the extent of coping mechanisms used by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for the PMES when grouped by profile

| Grouping Variables | F- or t-value | Probability | Inference |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Extent of coping mechanisms | | | |
| Age | 0.736 | 0.533 | Not significant |
| Sex | 2.821 | 0.096 | Not significant |
| Civil status | 3.227 | 0.075 | Not significant |
| Educational attainment | 1.205 | 0.313 | Not significant |
| Position | 0.467 | 0.760 | Not significant |
| Length of service | 0.343 | 0.794 | Not significant |
| IPCR rating | 0.334 | 0.565 | Not significant |
| *tested at 0.05 level of significance | | | |

As shown in Table 5c, the differences in the extent of coping mechanisms employed by secondary school teachers across various profile variables indicate no significant differences for all characteristics studied. Specifically, age ($F = 0.736$, $p = 0.533$), sex ($t = 2.821$, $p = 0.096$), civil status ($F = 3.227$, $p = 0.075$), educational attainment ($F = 1.205$, $p = 0.313$), position ($F = 0.467$, $p = 0.760$), length of service ($F = 0.343$, $p = 0.794$), and IPCR rating ($F = 0.334$, $p = 0.565$) all showed no statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level.

These results suggest that teachers, regardless of demographic or employment profiles, employ similar coping strategies to manage the demands and challenges of PMES. Common strategies include planning, collaboration, self-reflection, seeking feedback, and adherence to established protocols, indicating a consistent and proactive approach across all teacher groups. This aligns with the findings of Lopez et al. (2021) and Urbano et al. (2022), who noted that teachers adopt comparable coping mechanisms when navigating performance evaluation systems, reflecting a shared professional commitment to managing challenges and maintaining instructional effectiveness.

Coping strategies are universally applied among teachers, highlighting collective awareness and engagement in addressing PMES-related demands, independent of personal or professional characteristics.

Relationship among the Level of Awareness, Extent of Challenges Encountered and Extent of Coping Mechanisms Used by the Secondary School

Teachers on the Interim Guidelines for the PMES

Table 6. Correlation statistics among the level of awareness, extent of challenges encountered and extent of coping mechanisms used

by the secondary school teachers on the interim guidelines for the PMES

| Variables | r-value | Probability | Inference |
|--|---------|-------------|-----------------|
| Awareness vs. Challenges | -0.346 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Awareness vs. Coping mechanisms | 0.503 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Challenges vs. Coping mechanisms | -0.028 | 0.765 | Not significant |
| <i>*tested at 0.05 level of significance</i> | | | |

Apparent in Table 6, the correlation analysis examining the relationship among teachers' level of awareness, extent of challenges encountered, and coping mechanisms used in implementing the interim PMES guidelines reveals several important patterns. First, there is a significant negative correlation between awareness and challenges encountered ($r = -0.346$, $p = 0.000$), indicating that teachers with higher awareness of PMES guidelines tend to experience fewer challenges. This suggests that understanding system processes and expectations enables teachers to navigate difficulties more effectively (Santos et al., 2021; Garcia & Lopez, 2019).

A significant positive correlation exists between awareness and coping mechanisms ($r = 0.503$, $p = 0.000$), implying that more knowledgeable teachers are more likely to employ strategies such as planning, collaboration, feedback-seeking, and self-reflection. Awareness appears to empower teachers to proactively manage PMES demands, consistent with findings by Lopez et al. (2021), who emphasized that informed teachers adopt more effective coping strategies.

Finally, no significant relationship was observed between challenges encountered and coping mechanisms ($r = -0.028$, $p = 0.765$), suggesting that the extent of challenges does not necessarily determine the use of coping strategies. Teachers employ mechanisms consistently, regardless of the severity of challenges, highlighting a proactive approach to performance management. Overall, these findings underscore the critical role of awareness in reducing challenges and promoting effective coping, emphasizing that well-informed teachers are better equipped to navigate PMES processes successfully.

Conclusion

The study revealed that secondary school teachers are generally highly aware of the interim guidelines for the Performance Management Evaluation System (PMES), demonstrating strong understanding across all dimensions including PPST-based objectives, assessment processes, and roles and responsibilities.

Despite this high level of awareness, teachers experience challenges to a fair extent, particularly in areas such as time management, preparation of Means of Verification (MOVs), and alignment of objectives with PPST indicators, indicating that awareness does not eliminate implementation difficulties.

Teachers employ coping mechanisms to a moderate extent, relying on planning, collaboration, feedback-seeking, and reflective practices to manage these challenges. Significant differences were found in awareness based on civil status, and in challenges based on age and IPCR rating, while coping mechanisms remained consistent across profiles. Furthermore, awareness was found to

have a significant relationship with both challenges and coping mechanisms, where higher awareness reduces challenges and enhances the use of coping strategies. These findings imply that strengthening teachers' understanding of PMES can improve implementation, reduce difficulties, and promote more effective professional practices.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, several recommendations are proposed to improve the implementation of the PMES. The Department of Education (DepEd) should implement continuous and targeted capacity-building programs focused on PPST-based objective setting, preparation of Means of Verification (MOVs), and performance rating computation to address teachers' moderate challenges. Administrators are encouraged to strengthen coaching and mentoring systems through regular mentoring sessions, timely feedback, and accessible support mechanisms. School heads should also improve workload management by providing structured timelines and minimizing overlapping tasks to ease difficulties related to PMES deadlines. Raters should enhance transparency by conducting orientations and clearly explaining rating computations to build teachers' understanding and trust. Teachers are likewise encouraged to engage in collaborative practices such as peer mentoring and professional learning communities to strengthen coping strategies. Additionally, school administrators should provide targeted interventions for teachers who experience greater challenges in implementation. Finally, future researchers are encouraged to further explore PMES implementation by including additional variables and broader contexts.

Declaration of no Conflict of Interest

The author hereby declares no conflict of interest. This article is solely his original work.

REFERENCES

1. Adeyemi, T. O. (2018). Influence of teachers' age and experience on students' learning outcomes in secondary schools. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(14), 45–53.
2. Aldridge, J. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2016). Teachers' views of their school climate and its relationship with teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Learning Environments Research*, 19(2), 291–307.
3. Bennell, P., & Akyeampong, K. (2017). Teacher motivation in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. London: DFID. Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2019).
4. Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(5), 607–641.
5. Briones, L. R. (2019). Demographic factors and teacher effectiveness: Evidence from Philippine public schools. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 95(3), 42–56.
6. Cahapay, M. B. (2020). Age, gender, and educational attainment correlates of teacher adaptability to remote teaching. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(2), 77–92.
7. Cameron, M., & Lovett, S. (2019). Sustaining commitment and realizing the potential of highly

- effective teachers. *Teachers and Teaching*, 25(1), 1–15.
8. Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
 9. Choy, S. P. (2017). Findings from the condition of education 2017: Teachers' working conditions. National Center for Education Statistics.
 10. Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. L. (2018). Teacher credentials and student achievement: Longitudinal analysis with student fixed effects. *Economics of Education Review*, 27(6), 673–682.
 11. Dayagbil, F. T. (2020). Teachers' educational attainment and its effect on classroom performance. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 3(2), 123–133.
 12. Dee, T. S. (2017). Teachers and the gender gaps in student achievement. *Journal of Human Resources*, 42(3), 528–554.
 13. Espinoza, O., & Gonzalez, L. E. (2018). Professional development and teachers' academic profile in Latin America. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 71, 177–189.
 14. Ferrer, A. M. (2021). Civil status and work-life balance of teachers in urban schools. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 11(2), 22–33.
 15. Flores, M. A., & Day, C. (2016). Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 33, 87–99, 39.
 16. Gershenson, S., & Papageorge, N. W. (2018). The power of teacher demographics. *Education Next*, 18(1), 64–70.
 17. Ingersoll, R. M. (2019). The aging teaching workforce: Factors behind demographic change. *Educational Researcher*, 48(2), 69–83.
 18. King, R. B., & McInerney, D. M. (2019). Do gender and age matter in the motivation of teachers? Evidence from the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 20(1), 21–35.
 19. Llego, M. A. (2020). Teachers' position and designation: Their role in school performance management. *Philippine Journal of Educational Measurement*, 5(1), 55–72.
 20. Toropova, A., Myrberg, E., & Johansson, S. (2021). Teacher job satisfaction: The importance of school working conditions and teacher characteristics. *Educational Review*, 73(1), 71–97.
 21. Abduljabbar, A. S., & Omar, N. (2019). Teachers' awareness and perceptions of performance appraisal systems. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(2), 80–92.
 22. Alvarado, J. M. (2020). Awareness of performance evaluation policies among Filipino teachers. *Philippine Education Research Journal*, 9(1), 3347.
 23. Ancho, I. V. (2019). The Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST): Teachers' awareness and practice. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, 6(3), 1–8.
 24. Bailey, L. H., & Colley, H. (2017). Teachers' understandings of policy frameworks in performance evaluation. *Educational Policy*, 31(4), 489511.
 25. Cabrera, M. A. (2021). Awareness of RPMS guidelines among secondary school teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education and Practice*, 6(2), 112129.
 26. Capistrano, E. P. (2018). Awareness of DepEd policies and its implications to teacher accountability. *Philippine Journal of Educational Policy*, 7(2), 44–59.
 27. Castillo, F. R. (2021). Compliance awareness and performance appraisal among public school teachers. *Journal of Education and Research*, 15(1), 45–63, 40.
 28. Crisostomo, R. (2020). Awareness of objectives and performance standards under RPMS. *Philippine Teacher Education Journal*, 3(2), 22–39.
 29. Darling-Hammond, L. (2018). Teacher learning and accountability: The role of standards-based evaluation. *Teachers College Record*, 120(4), 132.
 30. DepEd Order No. 2, s. 2015. Institutionalizing the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) for teachers. Department of Education.
 31. DepEd Memorandum No. 017, s. 2025. Interim Guidelines for the Performance Management and Evaluation System (I-PMES). Department of Education.
 32. Fernandez, A. (2020). Teachers' awareness of performance management systems in Southeast Asia. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 74, 102163.
 33. Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
 34. Garcia, P., & Weiss, E. (2019). The role of teacher awareness in ensuring effective evaluation processes. *Economic Policy Institute Reports*, 1–14.
 35. Gavino, M. (2021). Teacher compliance awareness in performance appraisal systems. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 12(1), 78–95.
 36. Gonzales, C. T. (2020). Policies and compliance requirements in DepEd teacher performance evaluation. *Philippine Educational Review*, 8(2), 66–82.
 37. Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2017). Standards, accountability, and student learning. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, 15, 193–216.
 38. Lopez, J. R. (2021). Awareness of objectives and processes of I-PMES among teachers. *Journal of Philippine Education Policy*, 10(2), 34–52.
 39. Santos, L. B. (2020). Understanding compliance requirements of performance evaluation in public schools. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy*, 14(1), 90–108.
 40. Smith, T. M., & O'Day, J. (2018). Accountability and teacher awareness of performance standards. *Educational Researcher*, 47(2), 87–95.

40. Aquino, C. (2019). Teachers' workload and its impact on performance management compliance. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 9(1), 55–71.
41. Barrett, A., & Breyer, J. (2017). Teacher workload and accountability: A comparative study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 65, 1–12.
42. Bautista, M. (2020). Challenges in the implementation of RPMS among Filipino teachers. *Philippine Education Journal*, 7(3), 99–117. 41
43. Borg, S., & Sanchez, H. S. (2018). Teacher workload and its effects on professional development. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(5), 571–590.
44. Brillantes, A. B. (2021). Policy challenges in Philippine teacher evaluation systems. *Journal of Southeast Asian Educational Policy*, 11(1), 33–49.
45. Carson, K. D., & Chase, N. (2019). Teacher evaluation policies and workload challenges. *Journal of School Administration*, 25(2), 55–72.
46. Crisol, L. G. (2020). Resource constraints in implementing RPMS in rural schools. *Philippine Journal of Rural Education*, 4(2), 23–41.
47. De Guzman, J. (2019). Time management challenges of teachers in complying with RPMS. *Journal of Philippine Education*, 6(2), 100–118.
48. Estrada, R. (2020). Challenges of performance evaluation guidelines in public secondary schools. *Philippine Educational Measurement Journal*, 12(1), 66–83.
49. Flores, I. (2021). Lack of resources and its impact on teacher evaluation implementation. *Journal of Philippine Educational Policy*, 8(1), 44–61.
50. Han, J., & Yin, H. (2016). Teacher resistance to workload pressures under accountability systems. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(1), 92–111.
51. Inocencio, R. (2018). Workload and compliance issues among teachers in Northern Philippines. *Philippine Education Studies*, 5(3), 71–88. Kraft, M. A., & Gilmour, A. F. (2017). Revisiting the widget effect: Teacher evaluation reforms and the distribution of teacher effectiveness ratings.
52. Educational Researcher, 46(5), 234–249. Mendoza, S. (2019). Teachers' perceptions of resource challenges in performance evaluation. *Philippine Teacher Journal*, 10(2), 88–105.
53. Montebon, D. (2020). Guidelines and policy-related challenges of RPMS implementation. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, 6(3), 222–229.
54. Oducado, R. (2021). Time management challenges in the Philippine education sector. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 9(4), 119–134.
55. Ramos, J. (2020). Implementation challenges of RPMS in urban and rural schools. *Journal of Teacher Development*, 8(2), 67–85.
56. Sahlberg, P. (2017). *Global education reform: How policy reforms are changing teachers' work*. New York: Routledge.
57. Tindowen, D. J. (2019). Resource and workload challenges in Philippine public schools. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 18(8), 47–63. Yong, W., & Hameed, A. (2018). Teachers' perceptions of workload stress and performance appraisal. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 46(2), 180–198. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
58. Barrera, R. (2021). Coping strategies of teachers under the RPMS. *Philippine Journal of Counseling and Education*, 9(2), 56–74.
59. Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E. (2017). Job stress, coping, and teachers' performance. *Educational Psychology Review*, 29(4), 563–576.
60. Bianchi, R. (2019). Burnout and coping mechanisms among teachers: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 111(8), 1316–1331.
61. Briones, A. (2020). Peer support and coping mechanisms of secondary school teachers. *Journal of Teacher Resilience*, 5(1), 77–94.
62. Carver, C. S., & Connor-Smith, J. (2010). Personality and coping. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 679–704.
63. Cruz, M. (2019). Stress management strategies of Filipino teachers. *Philippine Journal of Psychology*, 52(1), 33–50.
64. Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
65. Gonzalez, J. (2020). Professional development as a coping mechanism for teacher stress. *International Journal of Teacher Development*, 15(2), 144–161.
66. Hernandez, R. (2021). Resourcefulness as a coping mechanism among teachers. *Philippine Journal of Educational Practice*, 12(3), 88–107.
67. Kyriacou, C. (2016). *Stress management for teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Lopez, F. (2021). Coping strategies of teachers in rural secondary schools. *Philippine Journal of Counseling*, 8(1), 22–41.
68. Montes, R. (2020). Peer support networks as coping strategies among Filipino teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education Studies*, 11(2), 101–119.
69. Nguyen, D. (2019). Professional development interventions to reduce teacher stress. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 82, 291–301.
70. Olivares, E. (2020). Coping mechanisms for workload stress among secondary teachers. *Philippine Journal of Human Development*, 6(2), 7592.
71. Paris, L. (2017). Time management skills of teachers: Coping with performance management challenges. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 55(3), 276–289.

73. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2018). Job demands and coping mechanisms among teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 72, 135–143.
74. Tan, M. (2020). Stress and coping strategies of Filipino teachers in the K-12 curriculum. *Philippine Journal of Psychology and Education*, 15(2), 66–83.
75. Terry, D. J., & Jimmieson, N. L. (2019). Work control and coping mechanisms in teaching. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 24(5), 603–614.
76. Villanueva, M. (2021). Coping strategies in addressing RPMS challenges among Filipino teachers. *Philippine Educational Research Journal*, 13(1), 55–72