

Critical Barriers in Schools and Teachers' Performance in Basic Education: Basis for Designing a Teacher Improvement Plan

Quennie P. Umali^a, Elisa N. Chua^b

^aquennie.umali@deped.gov.ph, ^belisa.chua@lspu.edu.ph

^aDepartment of Education- Schools Division of San Pablo City, San Pablo City Laguna, Philippines

^bLaguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City Laguna, Philippines

Abstract

The study examined the critical barriers affecting schools and teachers' performance in delivering quality basic education in the Dapdapan District, Schools Division of San Pablo City, for the School Year 2024–2025 to become a basis to design a teacher improvement plan. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered from eleven schools with 158 public elementary teachers in the Dapdapan District through a six-part survey questionnaire. Results revealed that work-related barriers, particularly teaching-learning resources and workload, were perceived as moderate barriers. Statistical analysis showed no significant relationship between the teachers' professional profile and their performance or the school's performance. Likewise, no significant differences were found in perceptions of performance when grouped according to professional profile and school size, though a significant difference was noted based on SBM level. Importantly, critical barriers were found to have a significant relationship with both school and teacher performance. Based on the findings, a Teacher Improvement Plan was proposed. The study suggests that school heads may manage teacher workload effectively, address shortages in teaching-learning resources and enhance school leadership. Continuous professional development and supportive work environment may be promoted to provide quality education, and strengthen overall school performance.

Keywords: critical barriers; teacher performance; school performance; teaching-learning resources; workload; teacher improvement plan

Background

Quality of education plays a crucial role in shaping the future of a nation (Pacay, 2023). As it contributes significantly in molding individuals and preparing the future generations for contributing to their communities, it is considered a significant ingredient in changing the world (Kiran, 2021), and a means to meet the needs of the society for national development.

The quality of education is the main goal of schools which it provides to its students. It still remains a pressing concern in many countries, including the Philippines. In the context of the Philippine education system, it still continues to face significant challenges that prevent many Filipinos from accessing quality education despite ongoing efforts to improve the education system (PIDS, 2021).

Public elementary schools in the Philippines face several persistent challenges, particularly regarding the quality of teaching. These challenges include inadequate teacher preparation and professional development, limited resources, high student-to-teacher ratios, workloads and insufficient support from school administration. The EDCOM II (Second Congressional Commission on Education) report identified these issues as critical barriers to achieving quality education (Second Congressional Commission on Education, 2024).

Yu (2023) identified crucial issues in the Philippine education as for the teacher's perspective: teacher's salary increase, weak preservice and in-service training of teachers, mismatched teacher specialization and subjects taught in class, congested curriculum and teacher's ineffective pedagogical skill.

For any country, the key to success depends on how it develops its education sector and the effectiveness of the education system was compared to the success of the students.

In the 2022 and 2018 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the 2019 Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) result, it was revealed that Filipino elementary students performed very poorly or below the average of participating OECD countries. With the PISA results also reflecting the learners' performance in the National Achievement Test (NAT) for Grade 6 (SY 2020–2021), which shows that students are nearly proficient in Filipino, with a mean percentage score of 54%, but achieved only a low proficiency in Math (41%), English (44%), Araling Panlipunan (44%), and Science (44%). This was the case for most of our public or private schools.

These findings showed that the Filipino students consistently do poorly in school and a reflection of both the quality of education they received as well as the quality of teaching.

To solve this, the Second Congressional Commission on Education or EDCOM II was created through Republic Act (RA) 11899, which aims to address this education crisis, provide diagnosis of the challenges that affect learning outcomes and highlighted findings in twelve out of its twenty-eight Priority Areas, ranging from early childhood to higher education.

EDCOM II pointed out the Priority Areas concerning the basic education and affecting teacher's performance such as Priority 5: Learning Resources and its availability that impact and hinder effective teaching and learning, Priority 7: Curriculum and Instruction which has the main insights of the issues, challenges in the implementation and the practical difficulties for teachers in delivering the curriculum as intended and Priority 18: In-Service Training and Development, Including Teacher Welfare including the burdens that hinder teachers from delivering quality education and pursuing their professional development. (Second Congressional Commission on Education, 2024).

Every time there are mishaps and impediments in education the concern always points down to the main service provider of education- the teacher (Toston, 2023).

Additionally, it was mentioned in the DepEd Order No. 042 S. 2017 that quality learning is contingent upon quality teaching.

Through quality teachers, the Philippines can develop holistic learners who are steeped in values, equipped with 21st century skills, and able to propel the country to development and progress. This is in consonance with the Department of Education vision of producing: "Filipinos who passionately love their country and whose values and competencies enable them to realize their full potential and contribute meaningfully to building the nation" (DepEd Order No. 36, s. 2013). Hence, enhancing teacher quality becomes of utmost importance for long-term and sustainable nation building.

It is necessary to consider the teachers' concerns regarding the implementation and delivery of the teaching-learning process in order to provide quality education.

Guided by the DepEd Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS)- PPST, Individual Professional Development Plan (IPPD) or the Teacher Improvement Plan as used in the study, is a necessity in the development of a teacher as it acts as a roadmap for educators to continually enhance their skills and knowledge. Various activities for teacher professional development are formulated and carefully planned individually to help them achieve both their professional and instructional competence which affects the organizational goals as well as the learning outcomes.

Professional development is the only strategy school systems have to strengthen educators' performance levels which is cited in their Teacher Improvement Plan and a part also of the School Improvement Plan. The professional development gives educator a better performance and raise student achievements. At present, there is a growing need to upgrade teaching profession. Many schemes and means can be initiated by the school heads which will help the teacher in their professional development which includes seminars and trainings

According to Darling-Hammond (2017), like their students, teachers must have access to high-quality educational opportunities situated within supportive learning environment. To provide learning experiences that create change for the learners and to achieve the aim of the school, teachers must keep up-to-date of the important changes occurring in education.

Challenged by these issues and expectations, teacher improvement plan stands to be a necessity and imperative among teachers to provide the quality education every Filipino must have.

The researcher's seven years of teaching experience did not exempt her from the challenges and expectations caused by many barriers in the workplace. Most of the time, the researcher felt the weight of the work because of these barriers, leaving her emotionally and physically drained while keeping her good performance in the school. Inadequate professional development opportunities, workloads, limited teaching-learning resources are some of the barriers met by the researcher as well as her colleagues and unfortunately hinder the teacher to perform well consistently and to effectively teach inside the classroom. It is in this reason that this study was proposed with the hope of identifying how these critical barriers in basic education affects the schools' and teachers' performance.

Methodology

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between critical barriers in basic education and school and teacher performance. The research involved 158 public teachers from Dapdapan District Division of San Pablo City, who were associated with eleven public elementary schools during the 2024-2025 school year. The questionnaire was divided into six parts: professional profile, school profile, perception about critical barriers in basic education, perception about school performance, and teacher's performance.

The research instrument to measure the school performance which was used in the Department of Education known as the School-Based Management Self-Assessment Checklist as stated in the DepEd Order no. 007, s. 2024 – Policy Guidelines on the Implementation of the Revised School-Based Management (SBM) System are adapted. However, the researcher selected and added indicators to be more aligned for the research.

The research questionnaire of the study to measure the performance of the teachers was adapted from the Ohio Department of Education (2020) evaluation rubric for teacher's performance where only indicators aligned to the research were selected.

The questionnaire was validated by the thesis adviser, panel members, and English experts and involved consultations with experts, approval from the School Division Superintendent of San Pablo, and permission from the principal/school head of the Dapdapan District. The collected data was used to design a Teacher Improvement Plan, which included a structured professional development program through Learning Action Cell (LAC) that offers regular workshops and coaching sessions tailored to teachers' specific needs.

Statistical tools were used to analyze and interpret the data, including frequency, distribution, mean, standard deviation, and percentage. Pearson Product Moment Correlation-Coefficient (r) was used to verify the significant relationship between the respondents' profile and their assessed level of perception on the critical barriers in basic education. Correlation analysis was also applied to determine the relationship among critical barriers in basic education and school and teacher performance.

Result and Discussion

1. Descriptive of the Respondent's Professional Profile

This presents the professional profile of the 158 respondents. Most of these respondents, 75 or 48%, have completed some units in their Master's degree. Furthermore, a sizable percentage 30% or 48 has earned a Master's degree, demonstrating this category's high degree of advanced education.

On the other hand, less than one-fifth of the group has not advanced past undergraduate education, and a percentage of 20% or 31 only have a bachelor's degree. Few have attained the highest academic achievement since only 1% have completed a doctorate, and only 1% have taken doctoral units.

Regarding the respondents' teaching positions, majority holds the ranks of Teacher I, 53 or 34%; Teacher II, 31 or 20%; and Teacher III, 64 or 41%. Additionally, Master Teachers I and II are less represented, comprising only 5% or 8 and 1% or 2 of the respondents, respectively.

Additionally, based on the results, most have been in the profession for 6–10 years, 57 or 36%, followed by those with 1–5 years, 31 or 20%. The 11–15 years of service groups represent 26 or 17% and the remaining 2% were serving for 31 years or more. This indicates that a significant portion of the respondents are relatively early in their teaching careers.

As to the respondents' grade level and subject area taught in the study. 84, or 53%, teach Primary (Kinder to Grade 3) students, followed by those teaching intermediate (Grades 4 to 6) students, which have 68 or 43%. Meanwhile, 6, or 4%, teach both levels, primary and intermediate.

The data also reveals that majority of the respondents, comprising 99%, or 157 teachers, handle multiple subject preparations, while only 1% teach a single subject. This shows that most teachers are responsible for teaching various subjects rather than specializing in one.

Moreover, most teachers have attended 3 to 6 training sessions in the past two years, with 64, or 41%, attending 3–4 sessions and 73, or 46%, attending 5–6 sessions. Three (3), or 2%, had no training, while two (2), or 1%, attended just 1–2 sessions. Furthermore, 16 or 10% attended more than seven training programs, indicating a commitment to continuous professional development among some educators.

Lastly, most respondents had a "Very Satisfactory" ratings, 102 or 64.6%, followed by "Outstanding" ratings, 54 or 34.2%. Only 1.3% or two teachers were rated as "Satisfactory." In the Department of Education (DepEd), IPCR is a performance management tool used to assess the performance of teachers and other DepEd employees as to Outstanding (4.51 - 5.00), Very Satisfactory (3.51 - 4.50), Satisfactory (2.51 - 3.50), Fair (1.51 - 2.50) and Poor (1.00 - 1.50).

2. Descriptive of the Respondent's School Profile

As to the school size and SBM level of the respondents, it reveals that most of the teachers, 134 or 85%, are from medium-sized schools, while 24 or 15% work in small schools. In the Department of Education, a "medium school" refers to a school categorized by its size based on the number of teachers it has (9 to 29 teachers), as stipulated in DepEd Memorandum No. 43. s. 2017.

With regards to the SBM level, most schools are at SBM (School-Based Management) Level II, 135 or 85%, while a smaller percentage has reached Level III, 23 or 15%. According to the DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2012, SBM had three levels: Level I (Developing), Level II (Maturing), and Level III (Advanced).

Table 1

Assessed Teacher-Related Critical Barriers in terms of Professional Development and Training

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
The professional development opportunities offered...			
1. are relevant and applicable to the teacher's subject area taught.	3.79	0.45	AE/ NB
2. address the teaching challenges.	3.75	0.45	AE/ NB
3. contribute to the teacher's competency.	3.75	0.45	AE/ NB
4. focus on reading, writing, and mathematics.	3.72	0.51	AE/ NB
5. help implement new teaching strategies more effectively.	3.73	0.47	AE/ NB
6. provide a limited implementation of learning due to resource availability.	3.58	0.62	AE/ NB
7. are limited to none free, especially those accredited by the PRC.	3.51	0.61	AE/ NB
Overall	3.79	0.23	Always Experienced/ Not a Barrier

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Always Experienced/Not a Barrier (AE/NB), 2.5-3.49 –Sometimes Experienced/Moderate Barrier (SE/MB), 1.5-2.49 –Slightly Experienced/High Barrier (SLE/HB), 1.0-1.49 – Not Experienced at all/Critical Barrier (NE/CB)

The table above shows that the teachers generally perceived professional development and training as being always experienced, with an overall mean of 3.79 and the standard deviation (SD) of 0.23, suggest that it is not a barrier.

The results indicated that teachers view professional development opportunities offered to them as highly relevant,

applicable and effective.

The data show that professional development opportunities are implemented; this is because each school in the district provide school learning action cell (LACs) to bridge the gap in professional development. Session topics included are from the needs-assessment of teachers. Schools do not limit the speakers for each session to themselves, but invites resource persons that can greatly contribute to the said SLAC topic. Aside from this, coaching sessions, feedback based on observations or records of classroom practice, and workshops were highly practiced.

However, item 6 and 7 got the lowest mean, indicating that teachers regularly experience professional development programs and learn from it, but cannot always apply due to resource limitations. Teachers also acknowledge that access to free, accredited training is limited. These were not considered a barrier for the respondents even with lowest mean, possibly because teachers find creative or alternative ways to implement new strategies, like using low-cost or locally available materials. Teachers still find alternative training to comply with PRC requirements, they pay for trainings when necessary and attend free webinars even if not accredited. Teachers value continuous, school-supported professional development that improves their teaching practice more than whether it is PRC-accredited.

Table 2

Assessed Teacher-Related Critical Barriers in terms of Subject Matter Competency

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
As a teacher, I.....			
1. teach subjects that are within my capacity, capability, and specialization.	3.79	0.42	AE/ NB
2. I have the required academic background to teach my subject area effectively.	3.74	0.49	AE/ NB
3. can answer students' questions related to the subject matter.	3.86	0.40	AE/ NB
4. find the breadth and depth of the subject content I am required to teach to be quite extensive.	3.76	0.47	AE/ NB
5. know and understand the subject matter I teach.	3.88	0.38	AE/ NB
6. create engaging lessons relevant to the knowledge within the discipline and to other content areas.	3.86	0.40	AE/ NB
7. I feel that my understanding of the subject matter I teach needs improvement.	3.63	0.58	AE/ NB
Overall	3.79	0.25	Always Experienced/ Not a Barrier

Legend: 3.5-4.0–Always Experienced/Not a Barrier (AE/NB), 2.5-3.49–Sometimes Experienced/Moderate Barrier (SE/MB), 1.5-2.49–Slightly Experienced/High Barrier (SLE/HB), 1.0-1.49 – Not Experienced at all/Critical Barrier (NE/CB)

Table 2 represents the assessed teacher-related critical barriers in basic education in terms of subject matter competency. The computed over all mean is 3.79 with standard deviation of 0.25 indicates that teachers' perception is positive or always experienced, suggest that it is not a barrier.

The data show that teachers-respondents' generally view themselves as confident and competent in their subject matter knowledge; this is because each school head in the district carefully match teaching assignments to teachers' academic backgrounds and areas of expertise, ensuring effective instruction in each subject area. Also, teachers often participate in seminars, workshops, and training sessions, collaborate with colleagues through Learning Action Cells (LAC sessions) to update their knowledge and skills in their subject areas and seek advice from more experienced teachers. These help them to address gaps in their understanding, to stay current with new developments in their fields and adjust their teaching strategies accordingly.

According to Mafa-Theledi (2024), Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Subject Matter Content Knowledge stand as the essential quality for teaching success. Teachers expressing higher levels of competence in their teaching subjects implement broader and more efficient teaching methods in their classrooms.

These findings align with the study of Kiamba et. al (2017) which showed the benefits of knowledge of subject matter which include enabling the teachers to teach well using different teaching methodologies, give varied and alternative questions and ability to clarify misconceptions on subject matter.

Table 3

Assessed Teacher-Related Critical Barriers in terms of Teaching Pedagogy

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
As a teacher, I.....			
1. use a range of teaching strategies that enhance learner achievement in literacy and numeracy skills.	3.78	0.46	AE/ NB
2. adapt my teaching style to meet the needs of all learners.	3.78	0.46	AE/ NB
3. I am equipped to change my teaching methods even without adequate training and support.	3.58	0.58	AE/ NB

4. design activities and assessments that accurately measure students' understanding of the subject matter.	3.77	0.47	AE/ NB
5. effectively assess student learning due to adequate training in assessment methods.	3.63	0.60	AE/ NB
6. am able to cover the required content with incorporating creative and engaging teaching methods.	3.73	0.48	AE/ NB
7. apply the knowledge gained from professional development sessions to my classroom practices.	3.84	0.42	AE/ NB
Overall	3.73	0.26	Always Experienced/ Not a Barrier

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Always Experienced/Not a Barrier (AE/NB), 2.5-3.49–Sometimes Experienced/Moderate Barrier (SE/MB), 1.5-2.49–Slightly Experienced/High Barrier (SLE/HB), 1.0-1.49 – Not Experienced at all/Critical Barrier (NE/CB)

The data in Table 3 reveal positive teacher responses toward their pedagogical competence. The mean score of 3.73 indicates teachers always experienced this aspect and suggest that it is not a barrier.

This implies that teachers demonstrate a general sense of competence regarding their pedagogical abilities; this is because teachers in the district immediately incorporated new strategies and insights learned —such as differentiated instruction, literacy-based approaches, and use of digital tools— in school or district Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, INSET (In-Service Training), and Region- or Division-led training within their own classrooms as it was observed by master teachers and school heads. Thus, reflecting how a teacher translates theory into practice—a key aspect of effective pedagogy.

Another reason is that teachers show flexibility and resourcefulness by changing their teaching methods as needed. A teacher in a small school felt competent in classroom management but still struggle to simplify lessons in ways that young learners can easily understand due to the presence of both fast and slow learners in her class leading to uneven learning progress. Therefore, the teacher adapts her teaching styles to accommodate diverse learners, modifies her teaching strategies into differentiated instruction, grouping learners differently depending on the activity or learning objective, ensuring both peer support and lessons are accessible and engaging for all students regardless of their learning needs.

The overall mean suggests that teachers globally report strong pedagogical competence, especially when they receive structured professional development and have autonomy in instruction as cited in OECD (2019) - TALIS Report.

Table 4

Assessed Work-Related Critical Barriers in terms of Workload

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
As a teacher,			
1. the amount of administrative work I have is manageable.	3.44	0.59	SE/MB
2. the number of tasks I need to complete as a teacher impact the teaching-learning process.	3.55	0.56	AE/NB
3. heavy workloads affect the provision of quality education for the students.	3.49	0.61	SE/MB
4. the amount of paperwork and documentation required allows enough time for instructional planning.	3.35	0.59	SE/MB
5. the additional duties outside of teaching, such as committee work and conduct of co-curricular activities, can impact the effectiveness of classroom instruction.	3.51	0.56	AE/NB
6. the current workload allows sufficient time for student assessment and feedback.	3.46	0.57	SE/MB
7. the process of lesson planning and preparation can be quite demanding.	3.44	0.64	SE/MB
Overall	3.46	0.46	Sometimes Experienced/ Moderate Barrier

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Always Experienced/Not a Barrier (AE/NB), 2.5-3.49–Sometimes Experienced/Moderate Barrier (SE/MB), 1.5-2.49–Slightly Experienced/High Barrier (SLE/HB), 1.0-1.49 – Not Experienced at all/Critical Barrier (NE/CB)

The table above shows that the teachers perceived work-related barriers in terms of workload as sometimes experienced, suggests that a moderate barrier is observed.

Indicator 2 obtained the highest mean score of 3.55, which implies that workload and additional duties outside of teaching still affect teachers' effective delivery of lessons in the classroom.

Public elementary school teachers of Dapdapan District have many roles in their daily schedules. Those from small schools have limited teachers to do several tasks. Particularly, they are those teachers handling primary learners. They are multitasking to address the needs of their learners. So, number of tasks and additional tasks contribute to their challenges as a teacher, thus to their performance. Furthermore, the amount of work a teacher must deal inside the classroom and with abrupt reports and deadlines they need to complete during school hours make it impossible for the employees to focus on the

actual teaching-learning process.

Toropova, Myrberg, and Johansson (2018) conducted research about teacher workload together with its relationship to job satisfaction and job performance levels. Research indicates heavy workload serves as a primary factor which drives teacher stress together with burnout and causes educators to leave their profession. Overall stress levels for teachers reach higher heights when they must do additional duties besides teaching such as administrative tasks.

The findings align with EDCOM II (2023) report which flagged the “non-teaching workload” as a hidden barrier to improving learner outcomes leading to burnout and a decline in instructional quality. Teachers experience moderate workload concerns rather than extreme stress.

Table 5

Assessed Work-Related Critical Barriers in terms of Classroom Condition

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
As a teacher, I....			
1. have the appropriate classroom size for the number of students enrolled in the class.	3.66	0.58	AE/ NB
2. have the adequate space to facilitate and use different teaching methods and active learning strategies (e.g., group work, discussions, problem-solving activities) in my teaching.	3.60	0.59	AE/ NB
3. am able to implement student-centered teaching methods even with large class size.	3.65	0.52	AE/ NB
4. have a good physical condition of a classroom (like lighting, ventilation and space)	3.51	0.65	AE/ NB
5. effectively manage the whole class to focus on the learning activities prepared.	3.66	0.51	AE/ NB
6. maintain classroom discipline for all learners in my class.	3.70	0.50	AE/ NB
7. have the classroom suited to manage students effectively.	3.64	0.56	AE/ NB
Overall	3.63	0.41	Always Experienced/ Not a Barrier

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Always Experienced/Not a Barrier (AE/NB), 2.5-3.49–Sometimes Experienced/Moderate Barrier (SE/MB), 1.5-2.49–Slightly Experienced/High Barrier (SLE/HB), 1.0-1.49 – Not Experienced at all/Critical Barrier (NE/CB)

The table above shows that the teachers perceived work-related barriers in terms of classroom condition as always experienced, with an overall mean (\bar{x}) of 3.63 and a SD of 0.41, suggest that it is not a barrier.

This implies that teachers agree that their classroom environment is manageable. In the district, even when the classroom size is less than ideal, teachers generally do not consider this as a barrier for learning to occur. Teachers often rearrange classroom furniture daily or weekly to accommodate group work and movement-based activities. Some use outdoor areas or hallways as extension spaces for group activities. Teachers still find ways to cope and have a conducive classroom to ensure active participation among their classes.

Additionally, teachers use positive reinforcement systems like classroom rewards, to maintain discipline. Also, clear rules and routines are also set and practiced daily, and the use of class officers or leaders to help monitor behavior is highlighted by the teachers.

Classroom maintenance quality positively influences teachers' satisfaction and reduces their stress thus leading to enhanced instruction.

Khan, Nawaz, and Saeed (2022) study found out the influence of school environment upon both professional teaching competence and academic achievement of students. Student engagement together with teacher performance depends heavily on the classroom setting according to this research investigation.

Table 6

Assessed Work-Related Critical Barriers in terms of Curriculum

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
As a teacher, I....			
1. manage to keep up with changing curriculum standards and expectations.	3.61	0.51	AE/ NB
2. handle effectively the amount of content expected to cover in the curriculum.	3.59	0.51	AE/ NB
3. have enough time in planning and creating lessons align and fitted to the curriculum requirements.	3.51	0.56	AE/ NB
4. am able to interpret the curriculum expectations and objectives in the class.	3.61	0.50	AE/ NB
5. have the flexibility in teaching required by the current curriculum	3.63	0.52	AE/ NB

6.	have adequate time to cover all the necessary content in the curriculum.	3.54	0.52	AE/ NB
7.	have to move through lessons more quickly than ideal, as curriculum pacing requires.	3.59	0.54	AE/ NB
Overall		3.58	0.42	Always Experienced/ Not a Barrier

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Always Experienced/Not a Barrier (AE/NB), 2.5-3.49–Sometimes Experienced/Moderate Barrier (SE/MB), 1.5-2.49–Slightly Experienced/High Barrier (SLE/HB), 1.0-1.49 – Not Experienced at all/Critical Barrier (NE/CB)

The table above shows that the teachers perceived work-related barriers in terms of curriculum as always experienced, with an overall mean (\bar{x}) of 3.58 and SD of 0.42, suggest that it is not a barrier.

This implies that teachers consistently perceive themselves as capable of handling curriculum-related demands effectively despite challenges such as pacing and time constraints.

This is because teachers in the district are well-adapted to the curriculum which is evident in their use of differentiated instruction, contextualized teaching strategies, multimedia resources, and responsive lesson adjustments based on formative assessments. Teachers are also resilient and professionally committed amid evolving educational reforms such as the K to 12 enhancement and the recent MATATAG Curriculum rollout. The schools ensure consistent participation of teachers in INSETs (In-Service Trainings), LAC (Learning Action Cell) sessions, and webinars provided by DepEd, often facilitated during mid-year breaks or after class hours. Many educators take the initiative to download materials in advance, collaborate with peers to interpret curriculum shifts and be capable in executing the curriculum. The educational process depends heavily on teachers who function as curriculum implementers because they convert designed curricula into purposeful classroom learning opportunities. Teachers exercise their duties as implementers though they face various challenges together with valuable opportunities. For example, some of the teachers in the district tend to shorten the time of other topics which they think require less time than the other, instead of pacing abruptly and produce superficial understanding among learners.

Despite constraints such as non-teaching duties, school reports, and extra-curricular involvements and tight schedules, especially with compressed school calendars or suspension of classes due to typhoons or local events, teachers are shown to maximize their time during class hours, make use of modular activities, implement interventions like remedial reading and numeracy programs, catch-up Fridays, or even extended class hours to address time constraints and ensure that no learner is left behind.

This aligns with SEAMEO INNOTECH (2019) and EDCOM II (2023) findings, which highlight how curriculum overload and rigid timelines challenge teacher's ability to adapt lessons, differentiate instruction and reinforce key skills. The research of Jonker, März, & Voogt (2024) demonstrates why curriculum flexibility represents a crucial factor that supports teachers in their role of adapting their curriculum-based instruction. Fortunately, flexibility gives teachers the ability to handle different student requirements according to societal changes.

Table 7

Assessed Work-Related Critical Barriers in terms of Teaching-Learning Resources

Indicator		Mean	SD	VI
As a teacher, I....				
1.	have sufficient and updated teaching resources (books, materials, technology) to support my lessons.	3.36	0.65	SE/ MB
2.	create my own teaching materials.	3.55	0.57	AE/ NB
3.	implement innovative teaching strategies with adequate resources available.	3.44	0.59	SE/ MB
4.	believe that sufficient access to learning resources helps the learners to comprehend the lesson.	3.61	0.50	AE/ NB
5.	can easily prepare lesson with the adequate teaching-learning resources available at school.	3.46	0.62	SE/ MB
6.	have numerous reference materials to prepare the lessons.	3.34	0.67	SE/ MB
7.	feel that there are sufficient textbooks for all students in the class.	3.16	0.76	SE/ MB
Overall		3.45	0.29	Sometimes Experienced/ Moderate Barrier

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Always Experienced/No Barrier (AE/NB), 2.5-3.49–Sometimes Experienced/Moderate Barrier (SE/MB), 1.5-2.49–Slightly Experienced/High Barrier (SLE/HB), 1.0-1.49 – Not Experienced at all/Critical Barrier (NE/CB)

The table above shows that the teachers perceived work-related barriers in terms of teaching-learning resources as sometimes experienced, with an overall mean (\bar{x}) of 3.45 and sd of 0.57, suggest that moderate barrier is observed. The data reveal that teachers acknowledge the crucial role that adequate resources play in the teaching-learning process and generally agree that they are encountering concerns in accessing and utilizing sufficient and appropriate learning resources in their schools.

This is because as observed by the teachers, there is a delay in textbook printing and distribution. By the time materials arrive, the lesson for that quarter may have already been covered, making them partially unusable. Teachers have already produced, developed and used available platforms like DepEd Commons, Canva, PowerPoint, YouTube, and Facebook groups to supplement or personalize instructional materials to effectively deliver the lessons. Another reason is that book allocations from the central office may not be adjusted in real time therefore some schools receive fewer books than needed. For this reason, textbooks are shared among learners, teachers read aloud content in class and specifically they create their own materials. This creativity helps mitigate some resource gaps but also implies an additional workload and time investment for teachers.

However, it is significant to note the presence of barriers such as resource shortages and insufficient textbooks for all students, which affect lesson planning and innovative teaching, potentially affecting student engagement and learning outcomes.

Item 7 has the lowest mean score, indicating that teachers perceive a more frequent barrier regarding the availability of textbooks for every student. This is a significant concern because textbooks are fundamental learning tools, and insufficient copies can impede equitable learning opportunities. These findings align with Plata et al. (2024) claiming that there are gaps in the availability of essential instructional materials, such as textbooks, in many public schools.

Item 2 shows that teachers take initiative in creating their own materials to adapt to the gaps, yet this can be time-consuming process that may affect teaching quality in the long term. As cited in the study of Tibane et.al. (2024), teachers in underfunded schools often have to spend their own money on classroom supplies, which can lead to significant financial strain and decreased job satisfaction (Cahilog et al.,2023).

Teachers in the district continue to show resilience and dedication to learning overcome these challenges and ensure their students still receive meaningful learning experiences. Teachers are innovative and resourceful, they continuously find creative solutions and collaborate with colleagues to share materials and teaching strategies, creating a collective pool of resources in the district.

Table 8

Assessed Work-Related Critical Barriers in terms of Work Relationship

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
The school,			
1. promotes collaboration in the work environment.	3.78	0.44	AE/NB
2. prioritizes respect and trust as shown by the school head and staff.	3.80	0.46	AE/NB
3. shows a sense of belongingness for every teacher.	3.80	0.49	AE/NB
4. offers support and advice when teachers face challenges.	3.78	0.50	AE/NB
5. has a strong sense of community or teamwork among the teaching staff.	3.80	0.43	AE/NB
6. cares about the well-being of each staff in the school.	3.77	0.48	AE/NB
7. values teacher's contribution and encouraged creativity among teachers	3.81	0.42	AE/NB
Overall	3.79	0.41	Always Experienced/ Not a Barrier

Legend: 3.5-4.0—Always Experienced/Not a Barrier (AE/NB), 2.5-3.49—Sometimes Experienced/Moderate Barrier (SE/MB), 1.5-2.49—Slightly Experienced/High Barrier (SLE/HB), 1.0-1.49 – Not Experienced at all/Critical Barrier (NE/CB)

The table above shows that the teachers perceived work-related barriers in terms of work Relationship as always experienced, with an overall mean (\bar{x}) of 3.79 and SD of 0.41, suggest that it is not a barrier.

This implies that in the district teachers generally experience healthy and supportive relationships with colleagues, administrators, and other staff members. This can be attributed to many practices in the district. There is a culture of recognition where teacher innovation and initiative are encouraged. For instance, teachers who initiate school-based reading programs, ICT-integrated lessons, or create original instructional materials are given opportunities to share their work during In-Service Training (INSET) or Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions. These initiatives are often acknowledged during flag ceremonies, faculty meetings, or posted on school social media pages—boosting morale and encouraging creativity.

Another reason is that school heads practice and observe an open communication through consultative leadership. Before major decisions are made teachers are consulted through faculty meetings. With this school head made them feel trusted in leading, deciding together in projects, programs and other internal organization matters and in executing lesson plans, trusting their professional judgment.

School heads often provide teachers with flexible working arrangements whenever possible to accommodate medical or family-related concerns. This empathetic approach by the administration is deeply appreciated by teachers and helps foster a caring and supportive work environment.

The result of the survey regarding work relationship can be linked to the findings of Bella (2023) wherein there is a significant impact of workplace relationships and work satisfaction. This suggests that in order to improve job satisfaction and general well-being of workers, it is a need to consider how important it is for organizations to place a high priority on developing good relationships, encouraging teamwork, and establishing a friendly work environment.

In addition, the results align with the study of Zebon, Sattar & Ahamed (2025) that highlighted the positive influence of the Working Environment, in culture of mutual respect, collaboration, and support, which contributes to a positive work relationship among staff members.

3. Descriptive of the Assessment of Teacher-Respondents' on their School Performance

Table 9

Assessed School Performance as to Curriculum and Teaching

CURRICULUM AND TEACHING		Mean	SD	VI
1.	Grade 3 learners achieve the proficiency level for each cluster of early language, literacy, and numeracy skills.	3.75	0.44	O
2.	Grade 6 learners achieve the proficiency level in all 21 st -century skills and core learning areas in the National Achievement Test (NAT).	3.68	0.48	O
3.	Teachers prepare contextualized learning materials responsive to the needs of learners.	3.68	0.48	O
4.	Teachers conduct remediation activities to address learning gaps in reading and comprehension, science and technology, and mathematics.	3.86	0.36	O
5.	Teachers integrate topics promoting peace and DepEd core values.	3.82	0.39	O
6.	The school conducts test item analysis to inform its teaching and learning process.	3.79	0.42	O
Overall		3.76	0.31	Outstanding

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Outstanding (O), 2.5-3.49–Very Satisfactory (VS), 1.5-2.49–Satisfactory (S), 1.0-1.49 Unsatisfactory (U)

Table 9 shows the teacher-respondents assessment on their school performance, particularly in curriculum and teaching. The overall mean is 3.76, interpreted as outstanding. Item 4 got the highest mean, described as Outstanding. On the other hand, item 2 and 3 got the lowest mean, interpreted also as Outstanding. This shows that the teachers generally agree that their school possess outstanding curriculum implementation and teaching practices.

As shown in the ELLNA (Early Language, Literacy, and Numeracy Assessment) results 2024 in Dapdapdan District, most of the schools performed at a proficient level and nearly proficient level in the 3 skills for the Grade 3 learners. Three (3) schools in the Dapdapdan District namely Placido Escudero MS, Magcaseville ES and Dapdapdan ES are among the top 10 performing schools in the Division of San Pablo City for the ELLNA. Additionally, in the National Achievement Test (NAT) results 2024 in the Dapdapdan District, most of the schools performed at a proficient level and nearly proficient level for the Grade 6 learners. Out of 97 public and private elementary schools in the Division of San Pablo City, two (2) schools in the Dapdapdan District belong to top 20, namely Platon ES and Placido Escudero MS.

The 2024 ELLNA and NAT results suggest that the district demonstrates outstanding academic performance in both early and intermediate grade levels, with most schools achieving proficient or nearly proficient levels. Specifically, with Placido Escudero MS consistently performing in both assessments, data-driven identification of learner weaknesses based on assessment results was practiced. They also focused remedial activities with the key skill areas in order to bridge the gaps.

Hence, item 4 demonstrates that schools concentrate on delivering specific remediation activities for students experiencing learning gaps. This is a positive finding as it indicates that the teachers are not only focused on delivering instruction to the entire class, but also paying attention to individual student needs and providing the necessary support to help them succeed. Asio & Jimenez (2020) and Gecain (2023) studies found that there is a significant difference in the performances of the pupils after the remedial, reinforcement and enrichment activities. Therefore, the researchers concluded that remediation activities can affect the academic performance of the students. A positive teacher perspective regarding remediation success enhances the development of supportive learning environment that provide equal opportunities for all learners. However, the findings of Rosano et.al. (2025) revealed the need of content area teachers for professional development in reading instruction, including strategies for teaching reading components and utilizing assessment data.

Table 10

Assessed School Performance as to Learning Environment

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT		Mean	SD	VI
1.	The school has zero bullying and child abuse incidence.	3.89	0.31	O
2.	The school conducts culture-sensitive and sufficient extracurricular activities that enhance student learning.	3.86	0.36	O
3.	The school provides access to learning experiences and promoted inclusivity for the all types of learners including disadvantaged, OSYs, and adult learners.	3.75	0.44	O
4.	The school provides a safe and conducive learning	3.79	0.42	O

environment.			
5. The physical facilities of the school are well-maintained and accessible.	3.79	0.42	O
6. Classrooms are well-equipped with necessary learning resources.	3.68	0.48	O
Overall	3.79	0.30	Outstanding

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Outstanding (O), 2.5-3.49–Very Satisfactory (VS), 1.5-2.49–Satisfactory (S), 1.0-1.49 Unsatisfactory (U)

Table 10 shows the teacher-respondents assessment on their school performance, particularly in learning environment. The overall mean is 3.79, described outstanding.

This shows that the teachers generally agree that their school possess outstanding and strong commitment to providing a supportive and effective learning environment. This reflects that teachers are confidently teaching in a school environment where safety, inclusivity, and student support are highly prioritized and effectively implemented. But it should be noted that teachers also collectively agree that the school still have to slightly improve in ensuring full inclusivity for all types of learners.

The teacher-respondents believed that their school actively implement child protection policies and has a supportive school culture, as shown in item 1. This may be attributed to the teachers in the district who are effective in preventing harmful behaviors and ensuring the physical, emotional, and psychological well-being of its learners. Teachers were observed to integrate values education and character development in the curriculum as much as possible. Schools implement effectively DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012 (Child Protection Policy), which requires schools to establish a Child Protection Committee (CPC), anti-bullying campaigns, and regular orientations involving students, teachers, and parents.

According to Markowitz & Bassok (2022), safe school environments are essential for student learning and well-being. Similarly, in the article of Graham (2022) discusses the importance of creating safe and supportive environments, focusing on child safety and teacher wellbeing. When the school prioritizes learning environment, it benefits both the learners and the teachers. The school is our students' learning environment, and the teachers' working environment. The principle of creating a safe and supportive is essential for optimal learning and teacher effectiveness.

Table 11

Assessed School Performance as to Leadership

	LEADERSHIP	Mean	SD	VI
1.	The school develops a strategic plan.	3.89	0.31	O
2.	The school has a functional school-community planning team.	3.79	0.42	O
3.	The school has a functional Supreme Student Government/ Supreme Pupil Government.	3.89	0.31	O
4.	The school innovates in its provision of frontline services to stakeholders.	3.86	0.36	O
5.	There is a shared vision among school personnel and stakeholders regarding the goals for school improvement.	3.89	0.31	O
6.	There is a commitment among school personnel and stakeholders to continuously improve the school environment for better learning outcomes.	3.82	0.39	O
	Overall	3.86	0.31	Outstanding

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Outstanding (O), 2.5-3.49–Very Satisfactory (VS), 1.5-2.49–Satisfactory (S), 1.0-1.49 Unsatisfactory (U)

Table 11 shows the teacher-respondents assessment on their school performance, particularly in leadership. The overall mean is 3.86, interpreted as outstanding. This shows that the teachers generally agree that their school possess outstanding leadership approach and stakeholder engagement.

Three items got the highest mean, which are all described as Outstanding. This is because teachers in the district are involved in school planning and decision-making processes, specifically in School Improvement Plans (SIP), and Annual Implementation Plans (AIP), which fosters a sense of empowerment and shared responsibility. Additionally, schools prioritized learner's voice and leadership. They are given opportunities to lead, participate in governance, and contribute to the school's development, with the presence of Supreme Student Government/Pupil Government.

Each school in the district value the participatory nature of leadership, where decisions are not made separately but through consultative processes involving internal stakeholders (teachers, non-teaching staff, and learners) as well as external partners (parents, LGUs, NGOs, and community leaders) as revealed by the results above. This collaborative environment not only improves school operations but also teacher morale and motivation. This kind of leadership has a direct impact on the way teachers perceive school direction and their contribution to collective goals.

The results can be aligned to the research findings of Maher & David (2024) which shows that teacher leadership has a vital impact on school improvement through collaboration between teachers and sharing good practices. Principal's effective leadership in school stands crucial for driving school improvement thus matching the positive evaluation of school leadership. Research by Leithwood et al. (2022) demonstrated that schools implementing transformational leadership

strategies through collaborative vision development yielded better academic results with improved school atmospheres.

Table 12

Assessed School Performance as to Governance and Accountability

GOVERNANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY		Mean	SD	VI
1.	The school's strategic plan is operationalized through an implementation plan.	3.86	0.36	O
2.	The school collaborates with stakeholders and other schools in strengthening partnerships.	3.79	0.42	O
3.	The school monitors and evaluates its programs, projects, and activities.	3.75	0.44	O
4.	The school maintains an average rating of <i>satisfactory</i> from its internal and external stakeholders.	3.82	0.39	O
5.	There is transparency in the school's governance and decision-making processes.	3.89	0.31	O
6.	Stakeholders are regularly informed about school performance and improvements.	3.89	0.31	O
Overall		3.86	0.29	Outstanding

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Outstanding (O), 2.5-3.49–Very Satisfactory (VS), 1.5-2.49–Satisfactory (S), 1.0-1.49 Unsatisfactory (U)

Table 12 shows the teacher-respondents assessment on their school performance, particularly in governance and accountability. The overall mean is 3.86, interpreted as outstanding.

This shows that the teachers generally agree that their school possesses outstanding school governance and accountability practices. Also, the school excels in keeping its community well-informed and involved. This is because transparency is likely observed by teachers in the district through practices such as publicly posted financial reports, open school board meetings, and consultative planning activities. Teachers observed the consistent communication of performance updates—through assemblies, meetings, or digital platforms—which enhances stakeholder trust and engagement. As a result, parents, community members, and other partners are more likely to participate actively in school initiatives, contributing to a more collaborative and supportive learning environment. However, there is still room to improve monitoring mechanisms and build deeper partnerships.

The results show that teachers believe the school performs at an excellent level and demonstrates a proper school governance system that utilizes effective stakeholder engagement to fulfil school objectives, aligned with the research of James et al. (2021) demonstrated that schools implementing high engagement levels and clear decision protocols develop better school environments to achieve successful education results. Gulcan (2023) meta-analysis explored monitoring and evaluation as vital elements for continuous development through successful plan implementation that corresponds to the strong survey results from these areas. These studies reinforce the idea that strong governance and accountability, as reflected in the table's results, directly support of school success and stakeholder satisfaction.

Additionally, according to Supriadi et.al. (2021), good school governance was constructed by six principles, namely; transparency, accountability, responsibility, autonomy, fairness, and participation. Furthermore, the good school governance improves the decision-making quality through the empowerment of teachers, the delegation of authority, and the encouragement of shared decision-making.

Table 13

Assessed School Performance as to Human Resource and Team Development

HUMAN RESOURCE AND TEAM DEVELOPMENT		Mean	SD	VI
1.	School personnel achieve an average rating of very satisfactory in the individual performance commitment and review	3.89	0.31	O
2.	The school achieves an average rating of very <i>satisfactory</i> in the office performance commitment and review	3.82	0.39	O
3.	The school conducts needs-based Learning Action Cells and Learning & Development activities	3.89	0.31	O
4.	The school facilitates the promotion and continuous professional development of its personnel	3.86	0.36	O
5.	The school recognizes and rewards milestone achievements of its personnel	3.89	0.31	O
6.	The school facilitates receipt of correct salaries, allowances, and other additional compensation in a timely manner	3.86	0.36	O
7.	Teacher workload is distributed fairly and equitably	3.82	0.39	O
Overall		3.86	0.28	Outstanding

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Outstanding (O), 2.5-3.49–Very Satisfactory (VS), 1.5-2.49–Satisfactory (S), 1.0-1.49 Unsatisfactory (U)

The table above shows the teacher-respondents assessment on their school performance, particularly in human resource and team development. The overall mean is 3.86, interpreted as outstanding.

This shows that the teachers generally agree that their school possess outstanding human resource practices and team development initiatives. Also, this reflects a school culture that values professional development, recognition, and staff well-being. Although the overall environment is highly supportive, there is room to further strengthen the fairness in workload distribution.

As shown in the profile of the teacher-respondents, most of the teachers had a "Very Satisfactory" ratings, comprising 65% of the whole population. Schools conduct regular performance evaluation, where both individual and collective goals are set, monitored, and achieved. This process is facilitated by the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS), which encourages transparency and accountability in performance assessments, ensuring that both teachers and the school meet high standards.

In the district, regular LAC sessions are practiced, these activities are designed to meet the specific needs of the teaching staff, based on data collected from classroom observations, performance assessments, and teachers' professional growth plans. These also involve sharing best practices, addressing instructional challenges, or engaging in peer mentoring ensuring that teachers are equipped with the latest skills and knowledge in their field.

The findings demonstrate that the school maintains successful human resource management practices which lead to satisfied personnel who demonstrate greater motivation and choose to stay working at their institution, which is aligned with the study of Javed et.al (2019) wherein it was found out that there was a significant impact of overall HRM practices on job satisfaction among teaching and non-teaching staff of both the government and private institutions.

Human Resource Management is primarily concerned with the management of people within organization or an institution. The teacher is responsible for applying and interpreting their knowledge and abilities in a way that achieves organizational objectives (Pandey & Sharma, 2021). Therefore, teachers are an essential element for quality education. Overall, the Human Resource and Team Development domain shows that the school excels in supporting, developing, and recognizing its staff. The school's effort in supporting all teachers result in better teaching quality and positive student achievement.

Table 14

Assessed School Performance as to Finance and Resource Management and Mobilization

FINANCE AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND MOBILIZATION		Mean	SD	VI
1.	The school inspects its infrastructure and facilities.	3.86	0.36	O
2.	The school initiates improvement of its infrastructure and facilities.	3.82	0.39	O
3.	The school achieves a 75-100% utilization rate of its Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE).	3.82	0.39	O
4.	The school liquidates 100% of its utilized MOOE.	3.79	0.42	O
5.	The school uses its resources efficiently to enhance student learning.	3.82	0.39	O
Overall		3.82	0.36	Outstanding

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Outstanding (O), 2.5-3.49–Very Satisfactory (VS), 1.5-2.49–Satisfactory (S), 1.0-1.49 Unsatisfactory (U)

The table above shows the teacher-respondents' assessment on their school performance, particularly in finance and resource management and mobilization. The overall mean is 3.82, interpreted as outstanding.

This shows that the teachers generally agree that their school possess outstanding financial and resource management practices. This is shown with every school in the district regularly monitoring the physical condition of its buildings and classrooms. This practice helps identify areas needing maintenance or upgrades before they affect the learning environment. The school conduct quarterly infrastructure inspections and work with maintenance staff to ensure timely repairs and improvements.

Schools recognized the vital role of every external partner of the district—such as parents, local government units (LGUs), non-government organizations (NGOs), and community leaders. Smaller schools might lack more resources and infrastructures because of lower allocation of MOOE. However, even at medium-sized schools, there is still a lack of resources as these schools need to cater to a larger population of students. Their engagement and support are highly valuable in addressing gaps in funding, infrastructure, and learning materials. Through collaborative efforts, these stakeholders help bridge resource limitations, contribute to school improvement projects, and promote a more inclusive and supportive learning environment for all students.

Most of the funding to the public schools is provided by the government through the MOOE funds (World Bank, 2016). School heads prioritized setting funds for utilities, minor repairs of facilities, building and grounds maintenance, and upkeep of the school. They are still seen flexible and smart in allocating their budget and prioritizing academic excellence like allocating budget for the contests of the teachers and students.

MOOE utilization together with its high rate of liquidation reflects schools and departments' commitment to financial accountability and responsible resource management. The result can be aligned to Kapur (2019) which states that in order to achieve educational goals and augment the system of education, it is necessary to manage the utilization of resources in an effectual manner. The above data shows that schools use their financial resources effectively for student

learning indicating their dedication to make the most out of budgeted funds for educational results.

In line with this, Gempes and Ochada (2018) further revealed that proper allocation, implementation and utilization of MOOE fund by the school heads should promote transparency and involvement of teachers in financial planning should as well be observed.

4. Descriptive of the Assessment of Teacher-Respondents' on their Own Performance

Table 15

Assessed Respondent's Performance in terms of Instructional Planning

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
As a teacher, I....			
1. display knowledge of how students learn and of the developmental characteristics of age groups.	3.81	0.41	O
2. understand what students know and are able to do, and use this knowledge to meet the needs of all students.	3.78	0.42	O
3. expect that all students will achieve to their full potential.	3.71	0.47	O
4. know the content they teach and use their knowledge of content-specific concepts, assumptions and skills to plan instruction.	3.85	0.36	O
5. understand the relationship of knowledge within the discipline to other content areas.	3.85	0.35	O
6. connect content to relevant life experiences and career opportunities.	3.84	0.37	O
7. analyze data to monitor student progress and learning and to plan, differentiate and modify instruction.	3.82	0.39	O
8. apply knowledge of how students think and learn to instructional design and delivery.	3.80	0.40	O
9. use information about students' learning and performance to plan and deliver instruction that will close the achievement gap.	3.84	0.37	O
Overall	3.81	0.31	Outstanding

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Outstanding (O), 2.5-3.49–Exceeds Expectations (EE), 1.5-2.49–Meets Expectations (ME), 1.0-1.49 –Needs Improvement (NI)

Table 15 shows the teacher-respondents assessment on their performance, particularly in instructional planning as outstanding, with the overall mean of 3.81.

Both item 4 and 5 got the highest mean, described as outstanding. On the other hand, item 3 got the lowest mean, interpreted also as outstanding. This shows that the teachers generally agree that they possess outstanding instructional planning.

Teachers generally are found to be excellent at knowing the content they teach and use their knowledge of content-specific concepts, assumptions, and skills to plan instruction. Effective instructional planning proves essential for student learning achievements because it helps teachers establish clear learning targets and combines suitable teaching methods and student assessment procedures (Marzano, 2017).

The results aligned with the findings of Mesler, Corbin & Martin (2021), which revealed that teachers with growth mindsets have a mild positive and statistically significant association with the development of their students' growth mindsets. Student academic results depend on teacher beliefs about student growth because students demonstrate better achievement after believing in their ability to grow.

The results of this study were also consistent with the study of Khanum and Saeed (2020) which found that teachers strongly recognized instructional planning as a fundamental component to deliver top-quality instruction. According to the teachers the quality teaching depends extensively on instructional planning which defines lesson aims through objectives thus teachers develop both confidence and organization skills after mastering the presentation content. Educators see that instructional planning functions as the foundation of every teaching stage because inadequate planning leads to unfruitful outcomes. Solid planning creates teachers who maintain their composure and remain organized since they have no teaching materials absent. Quality teaching needs this element to bring about better student learning.

Table 16

Assessed Respondent's Performance in terms of Instruction and Assessment

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
As a teacher, I....			
1. understand and use content-specific instructional strategies to effectively teach the central concepts and skills of the discipline.	3.82	0.39	O www.ijrp.org

2. select, develop and use a variety of diagnostic, formative and summative assessments.	3.80	0.40	O
3. analyze data to monitor student progress and learning and to plan, differentiate and modify instruction.	3.82	0.38	O
4. involve learners in self-assessment and goal setting to address gaps between performance and potential.	3.79	0.41	O
5. communicate clear learning goals and explicitly link learning activities to those defined goals.	3.81	0.39	O
6. create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or as a whole class.	3.84	0.37	O
7. motivate students to work productively and assume responsibility for their own learning.	3.85	0.35	O
8. treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive and caring.	3.87	0.36	O
9. maintain an environment that is conducive to learning for all students.	3.85	0.35	O
10. collaborate and communicate student progress with students, parents and colleagues.	3.85	0.35	O
Overall	3.83	0.28	Outstanding

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Outstanding (O), 2.5-3.49–Exceeds Expectations (EE), 1.5-2.49–Meets Expectations (ME), 1.0-1.49 –Needs Improvement (NI)

Table 16 shows the teacher-respondents assessment on their performance, particularly in instruction and assessment. The overall mean is 3.83, described as outstanding.

This shows that the teachers generally agree that they possess outstanding instruction and assessment. Also, the teachers generally agree that they properly translated all of their instructional plans into successful learning experiences for their learners by ensuring that the classroom is safe, comfortable, or engaging and inspires learning. Teachers typically viewed themselves as competent in utilizing a wide range of assessment strategies. But on helping students check their progress and set their own learning goals, they only view themselves to be a bit on the borderline outstanding, thus it could still be refined.

A supportive and equitable classroom environment serves as a platform for all academic, social, and emotional learning. As cited by Romero et. al (2020), from the perspective of positive environment theory, supportive environments, can promote student successful academic adaptation. Similarly, research by Johnson (2017) highlights the role of teacher in promoting an environment that supports student learning and well-being.

The results were connected with the findings of Abrams et.al (2017) which indicate teachers aligned instruction and assessments with the state curriculum with the goal of improving student performance. Students achieve their full potential because the school maintains a focus on effective teaching methods that links to successful and to develop essential skills and mindsets that students require for lifelong success.

Table 17

Assessed Respondent's Performance in terms of Professionalism

Indicator	Mean	SD	VI
As a teacher, I.....			
1. share responsibility with parents and guardians to support student learning, emotional and physical development and mental health.	3.87	0.34	O
2. use effective and appropriate communication and engagement strategies with students and families, resulting in partnerships that contribute to student learning, well-being and development.	3.87	0.34	O
3. understand, uphold and follow professional ethics, policies and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.88	0.33	O
4. take responsibility for engaging in continuous, purposeful professional development.	3.87	0.33	O
5. am an agent of change who seek opportunities to positively impact teaching quality, school improvements and student achievement.	3.89	0.31	O
Overall	3.88	0.29	Outstanding

Legend: 3.5-4.0 –Outstanding (O), 2.5-3.49–Exceeds Expectations (EE), 1.5-2.49–Meets Expectations (ME), 1.0-1.49 –Needs Improvement (NI)

Table 17 shows the teacher-respondents assessment on their performance, particularly in professionalism. The overall mean is 3.88, described as outstanding.

Item 5 got the highest mean described as outstanding. This shows that the teachers generally agree that they are performing their duties within the school with a strong sense of respect and professionalism. It should be mentioned that, out of all the sub-variables under teacher performance, this one had the highest overall mean and the most constant overall mean. This suggests that among all of the teachers' performances, professionalism is thought to be their strongest attribute.

Aligned with the results is the study of Riadi, Biyanto & Prasetya (2022) which found out that the aspect of teacher professionalism has a strong enough dominance in improving the quality of education and plays a vital role in forming competent graduates by focus on student motivation.

Teachers exhibit strong professionalism, understanding their multifaceted roles within and beyond their field while continuously developing their own practice not only to impart knowledge among their learners but also to build positive connections with them along with their families, as well as the entire school community for achieving educational goals, learners' success and well-being.

5. Correlations Test Between Teacher's Professional Profile and School Performance and Teacher Performance

Table 18

Correlations Test Between Teacher's Professional Profile and School Performance

Teacher's Professional Profile	School Performance					
	Curriculum and Teaching	Learning Environment	Leadership	Governance and Accountability	Human Resource and Team Development	Finance And Resource Management and Mobilization
Educational Attainment	0.011	0.057	-0.119	-0.027	-0.102	-0.082
Teaching Position	0.069	0.025	-0.066	-0.029	-0.018	-0.056
Years in service	-0.029	-0.017	0.030	-0.014	0.057	0.065
Grade Level Taught	0.114	-0.015	0.062	-0.014	0.078	0.080
Subject Area Taught (Number of Preparations)	-0.075	-0.030	-0.048	-0.025	-0.040	-0.045
Number of Training Attended in the past two (2) years	0.075	-0.028	0.072	0.026	-0.021	-0.002
IPCR Rating	-0.006	-0.106	-0.098	-0.117	-0.041	-0.109

**Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).

As shown on Table 18, there is no significant relationship found between the teacher's professional profile and school performance.

This lack of correlation can be attributed to the following. Most teachers have similar qualifications and training attended, yet differ significantly in their actual classroom practices, motivation, or ability to implement what they learn, limiting the variation that is needed for a correlation to occur. These unmeasured qualitative differences are not captured by the professional profile data but could influence school performance.

The results aligned to the study of Özgenel & Mert (2019) which concludes that while teacher performance predicts school effectiveness, most basic profile factors like gender and years of service do not have a significant direct relationship with school performance.

School performance may also have a role on the results, as curriculum delivery, leadership and governance often follow national and local policies and memorandum reducing the influence of individual profile traits of teachers. Also, the school performance indicators used in this analysis like governance, finance management are largely influenced by school leadership and administrative practices, not directly by individual teachers. School outcomes are defined more by existing leadership and collaboration systems than personal individual traits of teachers. Teachers may attend many trainings in a short span but without proper depth and application, its possible impact on schools is minimal to none. Lastly, IPCR assessments on teachers are uniformly high offering the real insight of teachers' performance or school-level contributions.

Table 19

Correlations Test Between Teacher's Professional Profile and Teacher Performance

Teacher's Professional Profile	Teachers' Performance		
	Instructional	Instruction and	Professionalism

	Planning	Assessment	
Educational Attainment	-0.062	-0.015	-0.046
Teaching Position	-0.012	0.082	-0.042
Years in service	0.021	0.059	-0.041
Grade Level Taught	0.029	0.091	0.044
Subject Area Taught (Number of Preparations)	0.037	0.065	-0.035
Number of Training Attended in the past two (2) years	-0.052	0.073	0.007
IPCR Rating	-0.012	-0.010	-0.025

**Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).

As shown on Table 23, there is no significant relationship found between the teacher's professional profile and their performance. The absence of significant relationships among the variables may be accounted for by the distribution and nature of the respondents' profiles. Most respondents held MA degrees, reducing the potential impact of educational attainment on teacher performance. Teaching positions were also seen to be mostly at Teacher I to III where there is slow promotion and may not reflect competence of teachers. Years in service were also seen to have no association. These align with the study of Santos, et al. (2022), results showed that teaching position and teaching experience had no significant relationship with teaching performance.

Grade level taught has no influence as both primary and intermediate levels show different but equally-demanding difficulties. Almost all teachers are experiencing multiple subjects and/or multiple preparations, leaving no difference in impact. And lastly, the IPCR rating of almost all teachers were found to be Very Satisfactory or Outstanding which minimizes its ability to distinguish varying performance at varying IPCR ratings. These results suggest that in this context, profile characteristics of respondents do not strongly relate to self-rated teacher performance due to existing standardized systems, minimal variance and other institutional factors.

6. Test of Significant Difference on the Respondents' Perception of Teacher and School Performance When Grouped According to their Professional Profile and School Profile

Table 20

Test of Significant Difference on the Respondents' Perception of Teacher and School Performance When Grouped According to Educational Attainment

	F	P	Interpretation
Teacher Performance			
Instructional Planning	1.837	0.124	Not Significant
Instruction and Assessment	1.214	0.307	Not Significant
Professionalism	2.01	0.096	Not Significant
School Performance			
Curriculum and Teaching	2.612*	0.038	Significant
Learning Environment	1.794	0.133	Not Significant
Leadership	1.683	0.157	Not Significant
Governance and Accountability	0.576	0.68	Not Significant
Human Resource and Team Development	0.308	0.873	Not Significant
Finance And Resource Management and Mobilization	1.78	0.136	Not Significant

**Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).

Based on Table 20, only Curriculum and Teaching subfactor under School Performance was found to have significant difference among respondents when grouped according to their educational attainment. Also, all teacher performance subfactors have no significant difference found within the sample groups. Specifically, teachers with higher educational attainment were found to have higher perception of their school performance when compared to younger teachers.

This may be the case as teachers with higher educational attainment possess higher knowledge in curriculum and pedagogy in theory. Because of their broader exposure to educational theories, curriculum models, and pedagogical practices gained during their graduate studies, teachers may better recognize and in a better position to recognize strengths as well as weaknesses in the implementation of the curriculum and thus provide more critical but appreciative judgments. Their education background equips them better to analyze how the school contextualizes teaching materials, remediates, and inculcates core values—directly measured indicators in Table 13.

Also, postgraduate education in the present is more focused in research and reflective practice based on well-studied and established concepts, making them more adept in assessing the viability of implementation of such programs. Postgraduate teachers also have backed up their ideal theory with experience and actual practice inside the classroom, making them more aware of any strengths and shortcomings they experience.

www.ijrp.org

Furthermore, the difference in perception of teaching and curriculum is also corroborated by earlier research in

subject matter competence (Table 6) and professional development and training (Table 5). More qualified teachers will be more inclined towards deeper reflective practice and professional development, which can make them more sensitive to the quality of curriculum implementation in schools.

However, even if teachers have higher educational attainment as part of their professional qualifications, most of them are still handling lower teaching positions, thus experiencing the same subject assignments, class size, instructional demands, standardized teaching practices and evaluation, which may explain why teachers even at different educational attainment has agreement on their teacher performance metrics.

Furthermore, the consistently high ratings of performance across groups of teachers (as in Tables 19-21) may mask deeper insights, especially from those postgraduate teachers. Teachers may have higher evaluation standards due to their academic training. Thus, the difference in Table 24 points towards the effect of academic advancement on the way teachers evaluate the core of their school's instructional delivery.

Table 21

Test of Significant Difference on the Respondents' Perception of Teacher and School Performance When Grouped According to Teaching Position

	F	p	Interpretation
Teacher Performance			
Instructional Planning	0.449	0.773	Not Significant
Instruction and Assessment	0.941	0.442	Not Significant
Professionalism	0.556	0.695	Not Significant
School Performance			
Curriculum and Teaching	0.526	0.717	Not Significant
Learning Environment	0.655	0.624	Not Significant
Leadership	0.994	0.413	Not Significant
Governance and Accountability	1.039	0.389	Not Significant
Human Resource and Team Development	0.606	0.659	Not Significant
Finance And Resource Management and Mobilization	0.427	0.789	Not Significant

***Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).*

Based on Table 21, there are no significant differences found between respondents on their perception of teacher and school performance when grouped according to their teaching rank.

This means that all teachers have almost the same view of their performance inside the classroom and as part of a school system and organization.

This result may be caused by the following reasons. In many public schools in the Philippines, teachers may be promoted to a higher rank but there will be no change in classroom responsibilities especially for those teachers with Ranks of Teachers I to III. Worse is that teachers stay in the same rank for years. These teachers may still be teaching the same grade level, the same subjects and attend the same number of trainings given by DepEd. This may cause for the teachers to have the same perception on their performance in teaching and in school as a whole.

Adding to the case is that specialized leadership duties are very limited to every school, given mostly to Head Teachers and Master Teachers but their quantity and presence in a school still depends on the size of the school, leaving some barangay schools having only 1 to 3 teachers with leadership and management duties. Add to this, Even Master Teachers and Head Teachers still undergo the same trainings as their lower-rank colleagues. If rank is not paired with new roles, decision-making power or differentiated activities, this will not change the teachers' growth perception of their performance and to the whole school system as well.

Table 22

Test of Significant Difference on the Respondents' Perception of Teacher and School Performance When Grouped According to Years in Service

	F	p	Interpretation
Teacher Performance			
Instructional Planning	0.474	0.827	Not Significant
Instruction and Assessment	0.263	0.953	Not Significant
Professionalism	0.408	0.873	Not Significant
School Performance			
Curriculum and Teaching	0.238	0.963	Not Significant
Learning Environment	0.608	0.724	Not Significant
Leadership	1.43	0.207	Not Significant
Governance and Accountability	0.625	0.71	Not Significant
Human Resource and Team Development	0.446	0.847	Not Significant
Finance And Resource Management and Mobilization	0.514	0.797	Not Significant

***Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).*

Based on Table 22, there are no significant differences found between respondents on their perception of teacher and school performance when grouped according to their years in service.

This means that all teachers have almost the same view of their performance inside the classroom and as part of a school system and organization regardless of how long they are in the teaching field. Teachers with 1 year or 30 years of experience have the same perception of their teaching and school performance.

Just like with the previous profiles, all teachers, regardless of length of tenure, work under the same systemic constraints in the public education sector. Teachers also are exposed to the same training and seminars regardless of their teaching experience which may result in them experiencing a plateau with their professional growth. Newer teachers, even though inexperienced, have balanced their teaching performance by doing newer pedagogical training. This misses the opportunity for seasoned teachers to leverage their experience through peer mentoring, coaching and participation in curriculum review and implementation at the school level.

Table 23

Test of Significant Difference on the Respondents' Perception of Teacher and School Performance When Grouped According to Grade Level Taught

	F	P	Interpretation
Teacher Performance			
Instructional Planning	0.661	0.518	Not Significant
Instruction and Assessment	0.484	0.618	Not Significant
Professionalism	0.537	0.585	Not Significant
School Performance			
Curriculum and Teaching	0.334	0.716	Not Significant
Learning Environment	0.437	0.647	Not Significant
Leadership	2.15	0.12	Not Significant
Governance and Accountability	1.197	0.305	Not Significant
Human Resource and Team Development	1.58	0.209	Not Significant
Finance And Resource Management and Mobilization	0.462	0.631	Not Significant

***Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).*

Based on Table 23, there are no significant differences found between respondents on their perception of teacher and school performance when grouped according to their grade level taught.

This shows that teachers perceived their own performance or even their school's performance the same as their peers regardless of their grade level taught.

This was caused by the same level of demand experienced by elementary teachers but in different ways. Early childhood teachers are experiencing demand in teaching essential and foundational skills while intermediate level teachers are focused on inculcating content mastery with Grade 4 to 6. Also, schools and divisions rarely differentiate support or evaluation based on grade levels, which makes the working conditions and expectations the same for all teachers. This result highlights the professional resilience of teachers holding consistent standards despite handling different grades.

Table 24

Test of Significant Difference on the Respondents' Perception of Teacher and School Performance When Grouped According to Number of Trainings

	F	P	Interpretation
Teacher Performance			
Instructional Planning	0.694	0.597	Not Significant
Instruction and Assessment	0.27	0.897	Not Significant
Professionalism	0.387	0.818	Not Significant
School Performance			
Curriculum and Teaching	1.175	0.324	Not Significant
Learning Environment	1.402	0.236	Not Significant
Leadership	1.048	0.385	Not Significant
Governance and Accountability	0.108	0.979	Not Significant
Human Resource and Team Development	1.207	0.31	Not Significant
Finance And Resource Management and Mobilization	0.978	0.421	Not Significant

***Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).*

www.ijrp.org

Based on Table 24, there are no significant differences found between respondents on their perception of teacher and school performance when grouped according to the number of trainings attended.

Even if the teachers have 0-4 trainings or even 5 or more trainings, their self-rating of their teaching competence as well as their perception of school quality remains statistically similar across.

This result was caused by different reasons. First, the result shows that the quantity of training attended by teachers has not given significant uplift of the teachers' view of their competence in teaching. Most teachers might passively attend the SLAC sessions and seminars provided by the district for the sake of compliance and possible promotion only. With this, attending more sessions did not directly result in better performance of the teacher and of the school in the case of the teacher-respondents. Also, this may be caused by teachers being restricted because of lack of resources, time, opportunity and support in applying their newly acquired knowledge in the classroom setting. This means that teachers must also consider impact-based evaluation of their training in connection to their perceived performance in order to gauge properly if their trainings can actually affect their quality of teaching performance that will also benefit the school's performance in the long run.

Table 24

Test of Significant Difference on the Respondents' Perception of Teacher and School Performance When Grouped According to IPCR Ratings

	F	p	Interpretation
Teacher Performance			
Instructional Planning	1.02	0.363	Not Significant
Instruction and Assessment	0.1655	0.848	Not Significant
Professionalism	0.8353	0.436	Not Significant
School Performance			
Curriculum and Teaching	0.7628	0.468	Not Significant
Learning Environment	1.1592	0.316	Not Significant
Leadership	0.9551	0.387	Not Significant
Governance and Accountability	0.1952	0.823	Not Significant
Human Resource and Team Development	0.2697	0.764	Not Significant
Finance And Resource Management and Mobilization	0.0318	0.969	Not Significant

***Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).*

Based on Table 24, there are no significant differences found between respondents on their perception of teacher and school performance when grouped according to the number of IPCR Ratings.

This reflects that teacher, whether they are rated as very satisfactory or outstanding, perceive their own performance and their schools' performance similarly.

Statistically speaking, this result may stem from the fact that the IPCR ratings of all teachers are clustered at the top 2 categories which are "Very Satisfactory" and "Outstanding" which is not enough to detect significant variations of the responses. And even if respondents were rated with higher ratings, teachers most likely do not receive new duties or roles that would make a more positive impact to their growth as teachers and to the growth of the school. This means that evaluation of teachers must also be done beyond the standardized IPCR in order to properly assess teacher performance and school performance as well.

Table 25

Independent Samples t-Test on the Respondents' Perception of Teacher and School Performance When Grouped According to School Size

	T	P	Interpretation
Teacher Performance			
Instructional Planning	1.98592	0.161	Not Significant
Instruction and Assessment	0.08291	0.774	Not Significant
Professionalism	0.00865	0.926	Not Significant
School Performance			
Curriculum and Teaching	0.26152	0.61	Not Significant
Learning Environment	3.26377	0.073	Not Significant
Leadership	0.17093	0.68	Not Significant
Governance and Accountability	0.01862	0.892	Not Significant
Human Resource and Team Development	0.0362	0.849	Not Significant
Finance And Resource Management and Mobilization	0.02991	0.863	Not Significant

***Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).*

As shown on Table 25, there are no significant differences found between respondents on their perception of teacher and school performance when grouped according to the size of the school they belong to.

That means the teachers, either from small or medium schools, hold the same perception of their self-performance

and their school.

This may be explained by the fact that both small and medium schools are operating under the same national department policies, funding schemes, training programs and guidelines which may reduce possible differences that may arise on teacher's performance. Also, all public schools face similar challenges on fund allocation from the Department. On the other hand, this result may suggest that small and medium sized schools foster a positive work culture that can also positively affect the teachers and the schools at the same level. This positive view shows that teachers are well-adapted to their learning environment available to them and thus reflects their view of their teaching performance and schools' overall performance.

Table 26

Independent Samples t-Test on the Respondents' Perception of Teacher and School Performance When Grouped According to SBM Level

	T	P	Interpretation
Teacher Performance			
Instructional Planning	1.217	0.272	Not Significant
Instruction and Assessment	1.315	0.253	Not Significant
Professionalism	0.353	0.554	Not Significant
School Performance			
Curriculum and Teaching	1.395	0.239	Not Significant
Learning Environment	6.216*	0.014	Significant
Leadership	10.201	0.002	Significant
Governance and Accountability	0.684	0.409	Not Significant
Human Resource and Team Development	5.416	0.021	Significant
Finance And Resource Management and Mobilization	1.961	0.163	Not Significant

**Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).

As shown on Table 26, there are no significant differences found between respondents on their perception of teacher's performance as they are grouped according to their Schools' SBM Level.

However, respondents under SBM Level 2 and 3 were found to significantly differ on some of their perceptions of their schools' performance, specifically under Learning Environment, Leadership, and Human Resource and Team Development.

Under teacher performance, teachers from both SBM Level II and III follow the same curriculum, IPCR qualification and process, and training structures which may lead to the same instructional and school organizational pattern. This may also stem from the fact that both SBM II and III teachers face almost the same teaching conditions in their respective schools like multiple loads, large classes and limited resources.

As for the Learning Environment, teachers in Level III schools had more positive views about having a safe, inclusive, and well-maintained environment compared to those in Level II. This matches with Table 14, which highlighted how important child protection, classroom conditions, and inclusive learning opportunities are. Level III schools were shown to have higher SBM implementations, particularly on their maintenance policies of their facilities, stronger child policies, and more inclusive and effective student support. As the teachers see their schools to be safer, more inclusive and student-friendly, teachers feel that they can focus more to enhance their main function to teach thus improving their performance and in relation, their school as well.

As for the Leadership, teachers in Level III schools had a more positive view of school leadership. As noted in the Table 11, indicators like strategic planning, innovation, and shared vision were "Always Manifested" or "Outstanding" in these schools. Level III schools employ shared leadership and better stakeholder participation. This means that teachers in Level III schools are more democratic in nature, data-driven in doing their decision-making, and are focused on continuous improvement. Inculcating this kind of leadership in a school gives a positive impression of an effective, visionary and democratic leader that would inspire teachers to do better in delivering quality education to the youth.

And as for Human Resource & Team Development, Level III school teachers perceive highly of their schools' strategic planning in continuing teachers' professional development. This is consistent with the findings in Table 13. Human Resource administrators were also viewed by Level II School teacher to be highly transparent in their promotion, recognition and merit as well as their more effective peer mentoring. Teachers who feel supported and valued by open and responsive HR practices are likely to report greater satisfaction with their school's capacity to facilitate professional growth. This climate fosters teamwork and facilitates long-term commitment by teachers. These experiences help teachers feel more supported and valued, which in turn will increase their morale in doing their primary job as teachers which will directly affect the schools' overall performance.

These differences among Learning Environment, Leadership, and Human Resource and Team Development are interdependent and reinforcing. Effective and inclusive learning environment (Table 10) results in respect and trust, the pillars of participative leadership (Table 11), and effective leadership builds systems in favor of teacher development and team construction (Table 13). The results thus verify that SBM maturity not only improves school infrastructure and systems but also teacher experience, morale, and school institutional excellence perceptions.

7. Correlations Between Teacher's Level of Perception on the Critical Barriers in Basic Education and School Performance

Table 27

Correlation Between Teacher's Level of Perception on the Critical Barriers in Basic Education and School Performance

		School Performance					
teacher related	Professional Development and Training	Curriculum and Teaching	Learning Environment	Leadership	Governance and Accountability	Human Resource and Team Development	Finance And Resource Management And Mobilization
		.331**	0.019	.306**	.254**	.354**	.369**
	Subject Matter Competency	.211**	0.087	.303**	.229**	.334**	.308**
	Teaching Pedagogy	0.109	0.035	0.156	0.090	.173*	0.119
work related	Workload	.325**	0.090	.240**	0.112	.176*	.183*
	Classroom Condition	.393**	.193*	.429**	.292**	.508**	.476**
	Curriculum	.568**	.158*	.561**	.223**	.529**	.440**
	Teaching-Learning Resources	.452**	0.070	.226**	0.063	.277**	.310**
	Work Relationship	.434**	0.142	.465**	.249**	.636**	.511**

**Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).

As seen on Table 27, the factor "Professional Development and Training" has moderate correlation to almost all school performance factors except learning environment as it is structural in nature and not teacher development. When teachers see professional development as meaningful and supportive, schools are seen as stronger in leadership, HR, governance and financial planning.

For Subject Matter Competency, all factors under school performance got a moderate but significant relationship except again for the learning environment. Teachers who feel confident in what they teach tend to view school operations more favorably as it shows that they are aligned with the school goal, thus they are doing it in a right and effective way.

On the other hand, Teaching Pedagogy has a weak but significant correlation with HR and Team Development. When schools invest in professional collaboration, mentoring, and team development, teachers are more likely to adopt or recognize effective pedagogical practices and tend to view their schools as more supportive in terms of capacity building. Teaching pedagogy deals within classroom-level, and works independently from the school's overall management systems, which explains why it has no strong influence on school-level assessments. This result shows that there are other factors under school performance which were not included in the study that has a connection to HR Development and Teacher's pedagogical standpoint.

For workload, there is a weak to moderate significant relationship to Curriculum, Leadership, HR and Team Development as well as Finance and Resource Management. This mainly is shown by probable reduced stress and better focus in teaching by the teachers as these critical barriers are addressed one by one.

As for Classroom condition, the entirety of school performance has between weak to moderate positive correlation which are all significant. When classroom conditions are well-maintained and enhanced, all aspects of school performance tend to be viewed more positively as the classrooms are one of the most noticeable physical attributes of schools' progress and development. Well-maintained schools means that there is good management, ample number of resources and budget for maintenance and more.

As for curriculum, all factors under school performance were also seen to be significantly related to it. This emphasizes that when teachers feel confident and capable in executing curriculum demands despite existing barriers from different sources, their views of their school in general will also be lifted up. This can be caused by the pride that they take in overcoming barriers and challenges while also maintaining their improvement in executing the curriculum.

For teaching-learning resources, only 4 factors were found to be significantly related: Curriculum and Teaching, Leadership, HR Development and Finance. This is probably the result as teachers see that they have more resources, they will have a good impression on the leadership finance of their district and school as they provide better equipment and learning materials even if having low MOOE budget which further boosts perception of school efficiency.

And for work relationships, all of the factors were found to be significantly related, even having strong positive correlation with HR and Team Development factors. This shows that as teachers see that they have good working relationship among each other, they generally view their school to have higher performance as it shows proper dynamics between teachers and staff, good collaborations in curriculum and teaching delivery and also showing good financial decisions were made for

the benefit of everyone.

Table 28

Correlation Between Teacher's Level of Perception on the Critical Barriers in Basic Education and Teacher Performance

		Teachers' Performance		
		Instructional Planning	Instruction and Assessment	Professionalism
teacher related	Professional Development and Training	.266**	.211**	.182*
	Subject Matter Competency	.218**	.167*	0.138
	Teaching Pedagogy	0.114	0.049	0.051
work related	Workload	.273**	0.142	.189*
	Classroom Condition	.380**	.305**	.455**
	Curriculum	.570**	.458**	.462**
	Teaching-Learning Resources	.284**	.308**	.378**
	Work Relationship	.438**	.516**	.538**

**Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$ (2-tailed). * Significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (2-tailed).

For Table 28, almost all teacher and work-related barriers were found to have significant relationship to teacher's performance, though the strength varies. Professional Development and Training is directly related to teacher's performance as its 3 components, instructional planning, application, assessment and professionalism, can all be improved as a teacher pursues continuing professional development. Teachers who see training as helpful tends to plan more on their teaching sessions across all parts from the start to finish with correct assessment tools to utilize.

Two (2) factors under teacher's performance were seen to be significantly related to subject matter competency. This means that subject matter mastery is seen as a vital part of a teacher's success in delivering quality education to the learners. As teachers truly understand the complexity and other underpinnings of teaching one lesson, they can plan and set up proper instruction and assessment strategies for the whole class while still having professionalism in handling the discussion and correctness of the information shared in class.

However, teaching pedagogy was not found to be significantly related with teacher's performance. Despite having a high perception of teachers in their teaching pedagogy, the results suggest otherwise that teachers may actually overrate themselves as pedagogy also talks about teacher's personal beliefs and such. Having a pedagogical stand does not automatically mean that teachers have a good quality of teaching but still a good starting point for those who want to serve later on.

As for work-related critical barriers, workload is only significantly related to instructional planning and professionalism but not the actual instruction and assessment. This may suggest that teachers who experience more manageable workloads tend to have more time to plan their learning setups and be more professionally composed even if faced with difficult situations. On the other hand, instruction and assessment is not directly associated with teacher performance because there is a student component on it in which even if part of the teacher's job is to plan and execute the lessons properly, its outcome will also rely on students' output after the class in which teachers can use to gauge if they are successful in assessing and teaching students.

As for classroom condition, there is a significant relationship with the teacher's performance. This is because as teachers have better rooms and equipment, it will be much easier for teachers to diversify their way of delivering the lessons, making it more interactive and fun, which in turn will show the teacher's professionalism in optimizing student learning. Teachers feel more effective in teaching if they have a very conducive and inclusive learning environment.

As for curriculum, teachers who truly understand the curriculum will most likely be able to manage curriculum demands to be achieved by the students through correct and ample planning of the learning process from start to finish. And this demands greater effort and professionalism from them to push further greater teaching performance and competence.

Teaching-learning resources are also significantly related to teacher performance. Having adequate resources, budget and other infrastructures supports all the three components of teacher performance. Teachers can plan varied instructional models and assessments as they are more flexible due to availability of resources that they can use. This also shows professionalism as teachers maximizes all resources that they could get in order to deliver good education with the class.

Lastly, work relationships are also significantly related to a teacher's performance. And this is also observed as the strongest correlation under professionalism. This shows that as teachers who work in collaborative and respectful learning environment are not only good at teaching itself but also, they maintain high ethical and moral standards as professionals.

8. Proposed Teacher Improvement Plan

www.ijrp.org

The Teacher Improvement Plan is intended to identify specific areas for improvement of performance and for identifying guidance and support needed to help the teacher improve. This plan will be the basis of professional learning

activities provided by the school for teachers to improve themselves.

The following serves as the basis for designing a Teacher Improvement Plan:

First, a development priority area relates to focus and delivery of professional development training. Although evidence shows that the majority of teachers participate in training workshops regularly (Table 1), correlation test results (Tables 19 and 28) report that mere participation in training itself does not really enhance the impact of teachers. However, those teachers who perceive professional development to be meaningful and transferable—that is, curriculum, assessment, and instructional practice—report better outcomes in terms of teaching planning and professional conduct (Table 28). Accordingly, the strategy for improvement needs to focus on needs-led training that is target-specific, seeking to redress particular performance shortfalls, and preferably generated from needs assessment to be followed through by coaching or mentoring.

Another significant priority area derived from the data was the impact of non-teaching workload on instructional quality. While moderate workload difficulties were frequently reported (Table 4), the data showed that workload has a significant impact on instruction planning and professional behavior (Table 28). Teachers who have lighter, more manageable workloads are more effective planners and exhibit more professional behavior. Further, schools who are in Level III in School-Based Management (SBM) reported lower levels of perceived workload, suggesting that enhanced internal organization and effective delegation of tasks can alleviate the problem.

The third intervention area addresses the availability and access to instructional and learning materials. It is evident from Tables 7, 27, and 28 that an adequate inventory of resources is strongly correlated with instructional performance, planning, and school assessment in general. Teachers lacking necessary materials tend to use personal finances or extended preparation time, potentially resulting in burnout. In order to overcome this issue, the equitable distribution of textbooks, learning materials, and information technologies, particularly in small schools or resource-constrained districts, must be given high priority by schools.

Tables 8 and 28 show that positive working relationships are key predictors of teacher performance, particularly professionalism. Valued, supported, and effective team members of colleagues are more motivated and committed. Therefore, school collegiality and culture development are another key area of the improvement plan.

Lastly, support needs to be anchored to the curriculum since curriculum-related barriers were the most significant predictor of teacher performance in all of the categories (Table 28). Teachers that were confident that they could work with the curriculum were always most effective and professionally engaged. Still, Table 6 indicates that most still have pacing, amount of content, and time-management issues.

Based on the findings from multiple data tables, particularly Table 28, which highlighted strong correlations between teacher performance and various professional and organizational factors, the researcher crafted and proposed this Teacher Improvement Plan.

PROJECT PRIME (Professionalizing Instruction through Mentoring, Empowerment, and Resource Enhancement) was proposed as a Teacher Improvement Plan which aims to respond to five identified priority areas particularly in areas such as professional development, workload management, resource availability, collegial culture, and curriculum implementation.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the abovementioned findings, the following conclusions are formulated:

1. There is no significant relationship between the teacher's professional profile and the school performance and teachers' performance. Therefore, the hypothesis is sustained.
2. There is no significant difference between the teachers' perception on teacher and school performance when grouped according to their professional profile and school size; however, a significant difference is observed when grouped according to their SBM level. Therefore, the hypothesis is partially supported.
3. There is a significant relationship between the teachers' level of perception on the critical barriers in basic education and school and teachers' performance. Therefore, the hypothesis is not sustained.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and conclusions presented, the researcher has arrived at the following recommendations:

1. In the study, a moderate barrier was observed in work-related barriers as to workload. School heads may consider managing teacher workload effectively by minimizing non-teaching tasks, hiring additional non-teaching personnel and offering wellness and support systems, thereby allowing teachers to concentrate more on instructional responsibilities and reduce burnout.

2. In the study, it was shown that a moderate barrier was observed in work-related barriers as to teaching-learning resources. Schools and education policymakers may address classroom conditions and teaching-learning resource shortages by upgrading classroom condition, investing in classroom improvement and ensuring the availability of adequate teaching and learning resources to support effective instruction and learner engagement.

3. In the study, a significant difference in perceptions by SBM level were found in school performance areas. The results suggest that school heads may continuously strengthen their school leadership, enhance the learning environment,

foster team development to improve overall school effectiveness through sharing of best practices between schools at different SBM levels.

4. Schools may organize continuous in-service trainings and learning action cells (LAC) aligned with actual classroom challenges, that enhance teachers' subject matter expertise, instructional skills, and leadership abilities to effectively address critical barriers and improve overall school and teacher performance.

5. Teachers are encouraged to participate in regular and relevant professional growth opportunities focused on curriculum delivery, assessment, and classroom strategies to enhance instructional planning and professionalism.

6. Promoting a healthy work relationship by school leaders, teachers and stakeholders to support the continuous improvement of school and teacher excellence is recommended. A school environment built on inclusivity will both support feedback processes and encourage innovation which results in maintaining exceptional performance in various situations.

7. Educational institutions may regularly evaluate the situation to identify and manage moderate barriers affecting teaching outcomes which indirectly affect school performance. There may be regular supervision of teachers to monitor their actual condition.

8. Future researchers may be motivated to conduct further studies by employing other variables.

REFERENCES

Bella, K.Majini. (2023). EXPLORING THE IMPACT OF WORKPLACE RELATIONSHIPS AND EMPLOYEE JOB SATISFACTION. International Journal of Scientific Research in Modern Science and Technology. 2. 55-62. 10.59828/ijrmst.v2i8.136.

Gecain, S. (2023). Effectiveness of Remedial, Reinforcement and Enrichment (RRE) Activities in Improving the Performance of Grade 5 and 6 Pupils in Math. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.

Graham, A., Canosa, A., Boyle, T. et al. Promoting students' safety and wellbeing: ethical practice in schools. Aust. Educ. Res. 50, 1477–1496 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-022-00567-8>

James, B., et al. (2021). *Stakeholder Engagement and School Performance: A Mixed-Methods Study*. Journal of School Leadership, 31(5), 456-478.).

Khanum , B, Saeed M . (2020). Exploring Teachers' Perceptions and Practices Regarding Instructional Planning: A Multiple Case Study. PAKISTAN SOCIAL SCIENCES REVIEW ,4(3),766-776, doi:10.35484/pssr.2020(4-III)54

Mafa-Theledi, Olivia. (2024). Teachers' Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Subject Matter Content Knowledge: Is the Framework Still Relevant in Teaching of STEM. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science. VIII. 836-846. 10.47772/IJRISS.2024.804061.

Maher, Asma & David, Solomon Arulraj. (2024). THE IMPACT OF TEACHER LEADERSHIP ON SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT: EXPLORING THE EXPERIENCES AND VIEWS OF SCHOOL LEADERS AND TEACHERS IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN SHARJAH. Globus Journal of Progressive Education. 14. 18-30. 10.46360/globus.edu.220241004.

Mesler, Rhiannon & Corbin, Catherine & Martin, Brittany. (2021). Teacher mindset is associated with development of students' growth mindset. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology. 76. 101299. 10.1016/j.appdev.2021.101299.

Pacay, R.M. (2023). The Impact of Low-Quality Education in the Philippines. <https://medium.com/@rhus.pacay.au/title-the-impact-of-low-quality-education-in-the-philippines-53689b93cfc2>

Riadi, M. E., Biyanto, B., & Prasetya, B. (2022). The Effectiveness of Teacher Professionalism in Improving the Quality of Education. KnE Social Sciences, 7(10), 517–527. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v7i10.11253>

Tibane, Carlit Casey & Mafa-Theledi, Olivia & Masebe, Tshidiso & Mathye, Peter. (2024). Examining the Effect of Resource Constraints on Teaching and Learning of Grade 12 Mathematics in Gauteng Community Learning Centres. International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research. Vol. 23, No. 10, pp. 453-474, October 2024. 453-474. 10.26803/ijlter.23.10.22.

Yu, David. (2023). Issues in PH education: A teacher's perspective. Philippine Daily Inquirer. <https://opinion.inquirer.net/166337/issues-in-ph-education-a-teachers-perspective#ixzz8jha8ACnn>

Zebon, Md. Abdul Hye & Sattar, Abdus & Ahamed, Md. (2025). An Empirical Study of Exploring the Predictors of University Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Bangladesh: A Structural Equation Modeling

