



**TECHNIUM**  
**SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL**

**Vol. 30, 2022**

**A new decade  
for social changes**

[www.techniumscience.com](http://www.techniumscience.com)

ISSN 2668-7798



9 772668 779000

# Implementation of Results-Based Performance Management System: An Approach for Social Change in the Educational System

**Mabe G. Catalogo, Araceli C. Doromal**

<sup>1</sup>Tabao National High School, Negros Occidental, Philippines, <sup>2</sup>University of Negros Occidental-Recoletos, Bacolod City, Philippines

mabe.catalogo001@deped.gov.ph, araceli\_doromal@yahoo.com

**Abstract.** Performance Management System (PMS) is instrumental to employees' productivity and organizational competence. Entering into the quality assurance era, the Department of Education (DepEd) engaged in a paradigm shift in its management system and executed Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). Thus, this descriptive study assessed the extent of RPMS implementation in selected schools in the Philippines. Using the questionnaire adopted from DepEd Order No. 2, series of 2015, data were collected from 862 assessors involving teachers, headteachers, and supervisors. Employing descriptive analysis, findings showed the great extent of RPMS implementation in general, and according to classification, school level, and position of assessors. It also revealed that the four RPMS phases are implemented to a great extent, though a subsidence of execution of the work processes is noted as the phases progress. Also, certain practices were superficially carried out and implementation challenges were apparent. This signifies opportunities for improvement in the management system. Thus, the department should create cluster performance management teams, reassess the implementing guidelines, and organize technical assistance trainings to set foot towards total quality implementation and further actuate social change.

**Keywords.** Results-Based Performance Management System, educational management, quantitative-descriptive, public schools, Philippines

## 1. Introduction

With the changing attributes of 21st century learners, and the aim to put public schools in place with international standards, the demand to change the prevailing management system is critical entering into the new decade (Hernando-Malipot, 2018). The effort of the school system to invest in quality management can significantly bring social change by upgrading the quality of teachers and of students eventually (Yulianto, 2021). Social change in the educational system is articulated through the various quality management systems to ensure quality performance of the workforce in the school organization for continuous improvement (Sharma & Monteiro, 2016). Performance management is crucial to a functional organization as it makes certain that the employee's accomplishments are heading towards realizing the organization's

results-based principles and objectives (United Nations International Labor Organization, 2015).

Apparently, performance management systems evolved in various perspectives. A performance management system (PMS) functions as a work process made up of interconnected activities that must collectively operate efficiently (Mone & London, 2018). More specifically, an organizational PMS workflow typically include setting objectives, constant performance review, feedback, coaching, identifying developmental needs, and complimenting excellent performance through rewards (Schleicher et al., 2018).

In the Philippine context, performance management systems have been existing in schools through the Competency-Based Performance Appraisal System for Teachers (CB-PAST). However, it needs continuous improvement (Meneses, 2016). Consequently, the management system evolved into Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) grounded from Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) that establishes quality assurance. It is basically assessment in nature, catering opportunities for social change towards the improvement of teachers' performance. It is a cycle composed of 4 phases specifically performance planning and commitment, performance monitoring and coaching, performance review and evaluation, and performance rewards and development planning (DepEd Order No. 2 s. 2015).

Several studies were conducted on the influence of RPMS implementation to teachers' performance (Licaycay & Rivera, 2015), teachers' attitude (Fernandez, 2016) and RPMS implementation assessed by teaching and non-teaching employees (Dizon et al., 2018). However, there is a limited study on RPMS implementation in raters' and ratees' perspectives. This is the gap in the literature which this paper would like to fill in. Hence, this study assessed the extent of implementation of RPMS in selected public schools in the Philippines. It also determined the practices and challenges in the implementation of RPMS by the raters and ratees.

## 2. Framework of the study

This study theorized that the Results-Based Performance Management System's full implementation indicates the schools' compliance with DepEd Order No. 2 series 2015 and bring forth social change in the quality management system through the improved work performance of the teachers. This is anchored with Total Quality Management (TQM) theory.

Total Quality Management (TQM) Theory (Deming, 1986) maintains that total quality can be attained when key principles of performance management system are built in an organization. Fundamentally, an ideal PMS must embody employees' complete or total involvement, well-defined work processes, the interconnection of the systems, continuous improvement, and factual or evidence-based performance assessments (Kiran, 2017).

## 3. Methods

Quantitative-descriptive design was used to assess the extent of school year 2018-2019 RPMS implementation in selected public schools in the Visayas region, Philippines. A total population of 862 internal and external assessors composed of 726 teachers/ratees, 128 raters/headteachers and 8 supervisors served as respondents of RPMS implementation assessment. Table 1 shows the demographic profile of the respondents.

Table 1. Profile of the Respondents

Variable	N	%
Classification		
Small (no district instructional supervision)	171	19.8

Medium (with district instructional supervision)	691	80.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>862</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>School Level</b>		
Elementary School (K-6)	242	28.1
Junior High School (7-10)	620	71.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>862</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Position of Assessors</b>		
Ratee (Teachers I-III)	726	84.2
Rater (Head Teachers I-IV)	128	14.9
Supervisor	8	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>862</b>	<b>100</b>

The key provisions of RPMS were used as indicators in the questionnaire to gather data. The extent of RPMS implementation was assessed using 3-point Likert scale. Descriptive analysis using mean and standard deviation were employed to determine the extent of implementation of RPMS while frequency count, percentage distribution and ranking were used to identify the emerging practices and challenges in the implementation.

#### **4. Results and discussion**

##### *4.1. RPMS implementation as a whole*

In general, Table 2 revealed that the schools implement RPMS to a great extent ( $M=2.70$ ,  $SD=0.35$ ) which implies that RPMS is extensively carried out and implemented among public schools. This also indicates that the content of the work process of RPMS was implemented at all times with complete and substantial evidence that meet the standards. It shows that schools acted and immediately implemented the mandate from the central office. The efficiency of implementation of a performance management system in an organization is mainly credited to a sustainable policy where it is built (Toytok & Yavuz, 2018). Personnel engaged in the PMS must have appropriate information and expertise to effectively implement the management system (Kiara, 2017).

##### *4.2. RPMS implementation per phase*

Table 2 further showed the breakdown of the extent of RPMS implementation based on the four phases. Notably, phase 1, or *Performance Planning and Commitment Phase*, is implemented to a great extent and obtained the highest mean ( $M=2.75$ ,  $SD=0.40$ ) among the 4 phases of RPMS. This means that the work process in Phase 1 of RPMS was implemented comprehensively among schools at all times. This implies that schools firmly adhere to setting, discussing, and committing to goals, objectives, and targets and knowing the performance scoring process.

The results affirmed that of Dizon et al. (2018) where the performance planning and commitment phase is also implemented greatly. Employees give this phase a high regard because it is where they are informed of what and how to accomplish and why they must perform such actions (Woyessa, 2015). Moreover, an organization's personnel participate in the planning stage because they know that it is their main obligation and committing to the goals gives them a sense of ownership (Musnicka, 2017). It is a highly practiced phase because it

determines the success of the attainment of the mission, vision, and values of the Department of Education (Comighud, 2019).

Correspondingly, phase 2, or the *Performance Monitoring and Coaching phase*, is implemented to a great extent ( $M=2.70$ ,  $SD=0.40$ ). This indicates that the work processes in phase 2 are carried out widely in schools at all times. This means that they widely execute tracking, documenting, providing intervention, and feedback on the performance of the ratees. This implies that raters and ratees adhered to the standard protocols of the management system. The findings of the study are similar to that of Dizon et al. (2018), which revealed that performance monitoring and coaching are implemented to a great extent.

Similarly, phase 3, or the *Performance Review and Evaluation phase*, is implemented to a great extent ( $M=2.69$ ,  $SD=0.38$ ). This denotes that the implementing guidelines in phase 3 are widely carried out at all times. It also indicates that overall, the schools extensively administered the processes of reviewing the teachers' performance, reflect on the accomplishments through evaluating the achieved objectives, assess the actual overall performance of the ratees, and agree on the final performance rating. This can be attributed to the practice of rigorous documentation among the teachers vis a vis practices. The results agreed with Mayhew's (2019) assertion, which stressed out that performance review and evaluation are equally important as the other three phases.

Likewise, phase 4, or the *Performance Rewards and Development Planning phase*, is implemented to a great extent ( $M=2.66$ ,  $SD=0.42$ ). This signifies that schools widely identify strengths and development needs. This implies that teachers are already crafting their development plans to rectify the areas for improvement in the previous phases. In contrary, Singh (2015) stressed that more schools have the basic characteristics of the systems which is more on the administrative side. However, fewer schools focus on the development-orientation aspect of the performance management system.

Meanwhile, it can be noticed in Table 2 that a glaring inverse pattern exists among the phases and their means. This indicates that the mean decreases as the system progresses from phases 1 to 4. Though the phases are implemented extensively, numerical evidence revealed subsidence of execution of the work processes as the cycle continues to advance. This decreasing trend should not be taken for granted as this is a right set of circumstance to bring about positive changes in the system. This aspect is seen as an opportunity for improvement in the quality management system in schools thus bringing social change particularly in teachers' performance. The findings are contradictory to the results of Dizon et al. (2018) and Comighud (2019), where the means of the 4 phases do not show any pattern of decreasing trend. It is noteworthy that the components, tasks, and the different phases operate jointly as parts of a system thus issues relating to impartial treatments of the 4 phases of the performance management system must be addressed (Schleicher et al., 2018).

#### 4.3. *RPMS implementation according to classification*

The extent of RPMS implementation according to classification is also presented in Table 2. Descriptively, the medium schools division ( $M=2.72$ ,  $SD=0.34$ ) exhibited a higher mean than the small schools division ( $M=2.60$ ,  $SD=0.39$ ). This indicates that RPMS implementation of medium schools divisions is more extensive than small schools division. This implies that the four phases of RPMS were broadly carried out and were documented among schools belonging to medium schools division than those in small schools division.

This can be attributed to the rationalized organizational structure of the division offices. Based on the approved staffing patterns in the organization, medium schools division office is

clustered further into district offices where schools are closely supervised. Thus, cascading and monitoring the implementation of RPMS is more focused. In effect, this reinforces efficient information dissemination as well as implementation in schools.

Variance in performance management system implementation actually exists across workgroups of a single organization according to Scleicher et al. (2018). This is due to several internal factors such as organization's size, structure, strategy, culture, and management style (Striteska et al., 2018). Exemplary management competence of a sub-agency is also associated with its autonomy in enhancing implementation responsibilities, sound mission-oriented customs, and exceptional leadership behavior (Van Dooren et al., 2015).

#### *4.4. RPMS implementation according to school level*

In terms of school level, it can be noted in Table 2 that elementary schools ( $M=2.71$ ,  $SD=0.37$ ) showed a higher mean than junior high schools ( $M=2.69$ ,  $SD=0.35$ ). This means that elementary schools assess RPMS as widely implemented in their level than in junior high schools. This can be attributed to fewer faculty members of elementary schools compared to junior high schools. The findings differ from that of Toytok and Yavuz (2018), where high schools obtained a higher mean than primary schools. This is because high school institutions prepare students for tertiary education, contributory to which is also the use of a different monitoring policy.

#### *4.5. RPMS implementation according to position of assessors*

As to the position of assessors, supervisors ( $M=2.79$ ,  $SD=0.22$ ) exhibited higher mean than ratees ( $M=2.70$ ,  $SD=0.36$ ) and raters ( $M=2.68$ ,  $SD=0.35$ ) as reflected in Table 2. This denotes that the supervisors perceive that the provisions or work processes of RPMS are widely implemented based on their assessment compared to the assessment of raters and ratees. This can be attributed to the indirect involvement of supervisors in the execution of the work processes of RPMS as compared to the direct immersion of raters and ratees in the process.

The findings of the study confirmed that of Shahjehan et al. (2010), which indicated that the values given by managers on the assessment of performance management systems are higher than non-managers. The judgment of the performance differs because it may depend on where they equate their assumptions. One aspect to consider is basing the performance on the accomplishment rather than the nature of its operation. In such a case, how the process was carried out doesn't matter as long as the results validate the execution (Van Dooren et al., 2015).

Table 2. Extent of Implementation of Results-Based Performance Management System  
 Legend: GE= Great Extent

Variables	Phase 1 Planning & Commitment			Phase 2 Monitoring & Coaching			Phase 3 Review & Evaluation			Phase 4 Rewards & Development Planning			As a whole		
	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int
<b>Classification</b>															
Small	2.63	0.45	GE	2.63	0.44	GE	2.57	0.42	GE	2.58	0.43	GE	2.60	0.39	GE
Medium	2.77	0.38	GE	2.71	0.39	GE	2.72	0.37	GE	2.68	0.41	GE	2.72	0.34	GE
<b>School Level</b>															
Elementary	2.73	0.42	GE	2.73	0.41	GE	2.69	0.42	GE	2.70	0.41	GE	2.71	0.37	GE
Junior HS	2.75	0.40	GE	2.68	0.40	GE	2.69	0.37	GE	2.64	0.42	GE	2.69	0.35	GE
<b>Position of Assessors</b>															
Ratee	2.74	0.40	GE	2.70	0.40	GE	2.69	0.39	GE	2.66	0.41	GE	2.70	0.36	GE
Rater	2.75	0.41	GE	2.69	0.41	GE	2.65	0.38	GE	2.64	0.43	GE	2.68	0.35	GE
Supervisor	2.93	0.11	GE	2.70	0.45	GE	2.78	0.13	GE	2.75	0.32	GE	2.79	0.22	GE
<i>As a Whole</i>	<i>2.75</i>	<i>0.40</i>	<i>GE</i>	<i>2.70</i>	<i>0.40</i>	<i>GE</i>	<i>2.69</i>	<i>0.38</i>	<i>GE</i>	<i>2.66</i>	<i>0.42</i>	<i>GE</i>	<i>2.70</i>	<i>0.35</i>	<i>GE</i>

#### 4.6. Practices in RPMS implementation

Table 3 presents practices carried out by the ratees and raters in RPMS implementation. Noteworthy practices were identified to prevail during the conduct of the processes of the system. This means that observable behavioral changes in the performance management schemes have transpired during the implementation. This is evident because periodical rater-ratee interaction, efficiency in classroom deliverables, receptivity to corrective actions and deep engagement in the respective roles and functions currently exist in school organizations. Although there are practices that are considered as opportunities for improvement, this gives the academe the opportunity to initiate more transformation in the educational domain's culture and practices.

In support to the identified practices Mone and London (2018) noted that employees are responsible for their own performance improvement to enhance their professionalism. Teachers evidently work on their performance development mainly because it is for their improvement and provides updates career developments (Molefhi, 2015). Classroom observation as an aspect of performance management also brought great improvement in teachers' practices in lesson delivery schemes (Jonyo & Jonyo, 2017).

Table 3. Practices RPMS Implementation

<b>Practices</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Phase 1. Performance Planning and Commitment</b>			
Ratee			
Identify, discuss and agree on individual KRAs	585	80.6	1
Suggest and share my own ideas during performance planning	431	59.4	10
Rater			
Agree on specified time of classroom observation	115	89.8	1
Agree on the rating that the ratee desires to achieve	85	66.4	6
<b>Phase 2. Performance Monitoring and Coaching</b>			
Ratee			
Agree on the schedule and prepare for classroom observation	659	90.8	1
Track and record significant incidents	481	66.3	8
Rater			
Conduct classroom observation	117	91.4	1
Instruct the ratee to keep track of his performance	95	74.2	7
<b>Phase 3. Performance Review and Evaluation</b>			
Ratee			
Listen to the suggestions and comments of the rater	612	84.3	1
Review midyear performance with the rater	472	65.0	8
Rater			
Identify performance indicators that were achieved by the ratee	106	82.8	1
Initial rating for the midyear review is done	76	59.4	8
<b>Phase 4. Performance Rewards and Development Planning</b>			
Ratee			
Identify development needs	594	81.8	1
Implement action plan	348	47.9	6
Rater			
Identify and discuss the ratee's development needs	112	87.5	1
Ask the ratee to prepare an action plan	52	40.6	4

#### 4.7. Challenges in RPMS implementation

Table 4 presents the challenges of in each phase of RPMS implementation. These identified challenges imply the flexible and adaptive nature of the management system. As its implementation brought modifications into the organization, the components of the system have to acclimatize into the changes. Such adjustments happened in its human resource particularly their practices, attitudes and perspectives. In addition, these challenges serve as feedback of the implemented system. Meaning to say, this is an indication of a healthy management system that is revolving in the education department because of the available opportunities for enhancement. This is one aspect of total quality management that is vital in bringing social change in the educational system.

Several pieces of literature back up these findings. Kiara (2017) pointed out that the status of performance management system implementation relies on the commitment, ownership, and proper attitude of those that carry it out. Moreover, raters must be given enough

opportunity to monitor the performance of ratees because it is vital in providing a quality rating (Schleicher et al., 2018).

Table 4. Challenges in RPMS Implementation

<b>Challenges</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>Phase 1. Performance Planning and Commitment</b>			
Ratee			
Planning stage is time consuming	428	59.0	1
Rater			
Setting the date for pre-conference because of class schedule conflict	101	78.9	1
<b>Phase 2. Performance Monitoring and Coaching</b>			
Ratee			
Insufficient time for preparation and execution	283	39.0	1
Rater			
Warranty of quality time of monitoring and coaching due to many workloads	79	61.7	1
<b>Phase 3. Performance Review and Evaluation</b>			
Ratee			
Compilation or gathering of documents	346	47.7	1
Rater			
Doing follow-ups due to time constraints	80	62.5	1
<b>Phase 4. Performance Rewards and Development Planning</b>			
Ratee			
Preparation of action plan is a challenge	398	54.8	1
Rater			
Low level of commitment in making action plans	57	44.5	1.5
Action plans are not 100% implemented	57	44.5	1.5

## 5. Conclusion

The great extent of RPMS implementation conveys the prevailing philosophy of performance and accountability in schools. In addition, the execution of the mechanisms in the four phases of RPMS brought social change in the educational system. Changes in the perspective, attitude and social interaction transpired during the process as the persons directly involved become sensitive of its quality implementation, conscious of documentation, allow constructive behavior modification, and open the line of constant communication. These contribute to the cultivation of a culture of total quality implementation in schools. Altogether this creates a synergy towards social progress. Finally, the direction of the organization towards total quality management is in prospect, as the identified practices and challenges open opportunities to continuously improve. Thus, the education department is encouraged to form local performance management teams, collectively review the implementing guidelines, and conduct capacity building programs.

## References

- [1] M. HERNANDO-MALIPOT: DepEd maintains RPMS policy helps teachers improve the delivery of quality basic education. *Manila Bulletin*. September 2018. Retrieved

from <https://news.mb.com.ph/2018/09/21/deped-maintains-rpms-policy-helps-teachers-improve-delivery-of-quality-basic-education/>

- [2] M. M. YULIANTO: The Needs of Training to Improve Teaching Competence in Preparing Society 5.0. *Technium Social Science Journal*, ISSN 2668-7798, 1 (20), 275-286 (2021).
- [3] R. SHARMA, S. MONTEIRO: Creating Social Change: The Ultimate Goal of Education for Sustainability. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, ISSN 2010-3646, 6 (1), 72-76 (2016).
- [4] UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION: Performance Management. April 2015. Retrieved from <https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/how-the-ilo-works/results-based-management/performance/lang--en/index.htm>
- [5] E. MONE, M. LONDON: Employee Engagement through Effective Performance Management: A Practical Guide for Managers Second Edition. *EB ISBN 9781315626529*. New York, 2018.
- [6] D. SCHLEICHER, H. BAUMANN, D. SULLIVAN, P. LEVY, D. HARGROVE: Putting the System Into Performance Management Systems: A Review and Agenda for Performance Management Research. *Journal of Management*, DOI: 10.1177/0149206318755303, 44(6), 2209-2245 (2018).
- [7] E. L. MENESES: Performance Status of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in the District of San Simon, Pampanga: An Analysis. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(12), 422-429 (2016).
- [8] DEPED ORDER NO. 2 S. 2015: Guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education. 2015. Retrieved from [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/DO\\_s2015\\_02.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/DO_s2015_02.pdf)
- [9] N. LICAYCAY, R. RIVERA: The Effect of Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) On Teachers Performance. *Academia*. (2015).
- [10] M. FERNANDEZ: The Impact of Result-Based Performance Management System on the Teachers' Attitude. *Academia*. (2016).
- [11] A. D. DIZON, A. B. S. PEDRO, M. MUNSAYAC, J. PADILLA, M. C. G. PASCUAL: Level Of Implementation Of The Results-Based Performance Management System In The Department Of Education Division Of Gapan City, Philippines. *International Journal of Research-Granthaalayah*, ISSN- 2350-0530(O), ISSN- 2394-3629(P), 6(1), 484-503 (2018). DOI: 10.29121/granthaalayah.v6.i1.2018.1658
- DEPED ORDER NO. 2 S. 2015: Guidelines on the Establishment and Implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS) in the Department of Education. 2015. Retrieved from [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/DO\\_s2015\\_02.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/DO_s2015_02.pdf)
- [12] W. E. DEMING: *Out of the Crisis*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Educational Services. (1986).
- [13] D. R. KIRAN: *Total Quality Management: Key Concepts and Case Studies*. Elsevier Inc. (2017). DOI: 10.1016/C2016-0-00426-6
- [14] E. H. TOYTOK, M. YAVUZ: The Relationship Between Performance Management Practices and Organizational Deviations in Schools. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, ISSN-2324-805X, 6(11a), 111-120 (2018). DOI: 10.11114/jets.v6i11a.3807
- [15] R. K. KIARA: Challenges of Implementing Performance Management Systems in Kenyan Parastatals: A Case of Kenya Electricity Generating Company (Kengen). *United States*

*International University-Africa Digital Repository*, Corpus ID: 114881065. (2017). DOI: 10.1002/9781119202547

A. D. DIZON, A. B. S. PEDRO, M. MUNSAYAC, J. PADILLA, M. C. G. PASCUAL: Level Of Implementation Of The Results-Based Performance Management System In The Department Of Education Division Of Gapan City, Philippines. *International Journal of Research-Granthaalayah*, ISSN- 2350-0530(O), ISSN- 2394-3629(P), 6(1), 484-503 (2018). DOI: 10.29121/granthaalayah.v6.i1.2018.1658

[16] Y. E. WOYESSA: The Effectiveness of Performance Management Systems at the Central University of Technology, Free State. Electronic Theses and Dissertation. (2015).

[17] A. MUSNICKA: Performance Management Process and Its Importance. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.potential.com/articles/performance-management-process-and-its-importance/>.

[18] S. M. COMIGHUD: Instructional Supervision and Educational Administration. Goal setting, monitoring, and feedbacking practices as performance management mechanisms. 2019 UBT International Conference, Kosovo (2019). Retrieved from <https://knowledgecenter.ubtuni.net/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2225&context=conferene.Dfgdfgtyhtyh>

A. D. DIZON, A. B. S. PEDRO, M. MUNSAYAC, J. PADILLA, M. C. G. PASCUAL: Level Of Implementation Of The Results-Based Performance Management System In The Department Of Education Division Of Gapan City, Philippines. *International Journal of Research-Granthaalayah*, ISSN- 2350-0530(O), ISSN- 2394-3629(P), 6(1), 484-503 (2018). DOI: 10.29121/granthaalayah.v6.i1.2018.1658

[19] R. MAYHEW: The importance of an Employee Evaluation. Chron (2019). Retrieved from <https://smallbusiness.chron.com>.

[20] M. SINGH: Performance Management System for School Teachers. *International Journal on Education Growth and Research*, 1, 12-20 (2015).

A. D. DIZON, A. B. S. PEDRO, M. MUNSAYAC, J. PADILLA, M. C. G. PASCUAL: Level Of Implementation Of The Results-Based Performance Management System In The Department Of Education Division Of Gapan City, Philippines. *International Journal of Research-Granthaalayah*, ISSN- 2350-0530(O), ISSN- 2394-3629(P), 6(1), 484-503 (2018). DOI: 10.29121/granthaalayah.v6.i1.2018.1658

S. M. COMIGHUD: Instructional Supervision and Educational Administration. Goal setting, monitoring, and feedbacking practices as performance management mechanisms. 2019 UBT International Conference, Kosovo (2019). Retrieved from <https://knowledgecenter.ubtuni.net/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2225&context=conferene.Dfgdfgtyhtyh>

D. SCHLEICHER, H. BAUMANN, D. SULLIVAN, P. LEVY, D. HARGROVE: Putting the System Into Performance Management Systems: A Review and Agenda for Performance Management Research. *Journal of Management*, DOI: 10.1177/0149206318755303, 44(6), 2209-2245 (2018).

D. SCHLEICHER, H. BAUMANN, D. SULLIVAN, P. LEVY, D. HARGROVE: Putting the System Into Performance Management Systems: A Review and Agenda for Performance Management Research. *Journal of Management*, DOI: 10.1177/0149206318755303, 44(6), 2209-2245 (2018).

[21] M. STRITESKA, D. ZAPLETAL, L. JELINKOVA: An Empirical Study of Key Factors to Effectively Operate Performance Management System. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 17. (2018).

- [22] W. VAN DOOREN, G. BOUCKAERT, J. HALLIGAN: Performance Management in the Public Sector Second Edition. *EB ISBN 9781315817590*. London, 2015.  
E. H. TOYTOK, M. YAVUZ: The Relationship Between Performance Management Practices and Organizational Deviations in Schools. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, ISSN-2324-805X, 6(11a), 111-120 (2018). DOI: 10.11114/jets.v6i11a.3807
- [23] A. SHAHJEHAN, J. A. QURESHI, Z. REHMAN, B. AFSAR: Performance Management Systems: A comparative analysis. *African Journal of Business Management*, ISSN 1993-8233, 4(9), 1856-1862 (2010).  
W. VAN DOOREN, G. BOUCKAERT, J. HALLIGAN: Performance Management in the Public Sector Second Edition. *EB ISBN 9781315817590*. London, 2015.  
E. MONE, M. LONDON: Employee Engagement through Effective Performance Management: A Practical Guide for Managers Second Edition. *EB ISBN 9781315626529*. New York, 2018.
- [24] T. MOLEFHI: Challenges Facing the Implementation of Performance Management System (PMS): A Case of Southeast region Junior Secondary Schools in Botswana. [Dissertation, University of Botswana]. *Academic Journals*. (2015).
- [25] D. O. JONYO, B. O. JONYO: Performance Management in Kenyan Public Schools: Implications and Challenges. *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3, 19-35 (2017).  
R. K. KIARA: Challenges of Implementing Performance Management Systems in Kenyan Parastatals: A Case of Kenya Electricity Generating Company (Kengen). *United States International University-Africa Digital Repository*, Corpus ID: 114881065. (2017). DOI: 10.1002/9781119202547  
D. SCHLEICHER, H. BAUMANN, D. SULLIVAN, P. LEVY, D. HARGROVE: Putting the System Into Performance Management Systems: A Review and Agenda for Performance Management Research. *Journal of Management*, DOI: 10.1177/0149206318755303, 44(6), 2209-2245 (2018).