

**TEACHER'S RATING IN THE REVISED PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL
SYSTEM FOR TEACHERS (RPAST) AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO
TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

ROSARIO P. ABELA AND ANTONIA CECILIA Y. SANDOVAL
Visayas State University, Visca, Baybay, Leyte

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted with the following objectives: 1) to determine the performance ratings of the secondary school teachers as evaluated by their administrators; 2) to establish the relationship between the performance ratings of the secondary school teachers as evaluated by their superiors and their teaching effectiveness as evaluated by their students; and 3) to determine whether or not there is a significant difference in the quality of teaching among the secondary teachers in the different public schools serving as respondents of the study.

Spearman Rho Correlation Coefficient was used to establish the relationship between the secondary teachers' ratings in the RPAST and their teaching effectiveness.

The study revealed that 1) the average performance efficiency ratings were 87.61, 82.40, and 65.71 for INHS, KNHS and TNHS, respectively, with descriptive equivalents of very satisfactory for INHS and KNHS and satisfactory for TNHS, 2) there was no correlation between the performance ratings of the secondary teachers and their teaching effectiveness as perceived by students because of the lower ratings from the students compared to the higher ratings given by the administrators to their teachers; and 3) there was a significant difference in the quality of teaching among the secondary teachers in the three public schools serving as respondents of the study.

KEY WORDS: *RPAST. Teaching performance. Teacher's rating. Teaching effectiveness. Student perception.*

INTRODUCTION

Recently, there has been an increasing requirement for accountability in the educational system and for the availability of information to enable some kind of assessment to be made of the performance of teachers. This requirement stems from the need to provide information to clients and customers and to improve the quality of education. One aspect of this has been the performance indicators movement, which aims to provide statements, preferably quantitative in nature.

Teacher evaluation has assumed increasing importance over the decade (Darling-Hammond and Wise, 1981). The demand for accountability in education has shifted from broad issues of finance and program management to specific concerns about the quality of teachers and classroom teaching. These concerns had led to a resurgence of interest in evaluating teachers and to the development of new systems for teacher evaluation.

In school systems that take evaluation seriously, information on factors that may be related to successful teaching is recorded and kept up to date. Included are such items as academic and professional study, scores on written examinations, experience in teaching and related work, writing, educative travel, in-service education, participation in conferences and professional organizations, and the like. Extracurricular activities, committee work, and other leadership assignments in school or community are noted. Records on health examinations, absences due to illness, and other indices of health and vigor are kept on file.

In the Philippines, rating scales have been designed to evaluate the teachers' performance. The Revised Performance Appraisal System for Teachers (RPAST) has been used by the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS) as the instrument for the said objective.

In this system, the teachers are rated by their immediate superiors based on factors that may be related to successful teaching. Nevertheless, the relationship that exists between the teacher's performance ratings and their teaching effectiveness as perceived by students is not yet established; hence, the conduct of the study.

METHODOLOGY

Locale of the Study

This descriptive comparative study was conducted in three public high schools in Northwestern Leyte, namely: 1) Isabel National High School (INHS), Isabel, Leyte; 2) Kananga National High School (KNHS), Kananga, Leyte; and 3) Tabango National High School (TNHS), Tabango, Leyte.

These schools were selected because of their accessibility to the researcher, similarity in terms of curriculum implementation, and school funding.

Population of the Study

All teachers handling classes with the third year and fourth year levels in the selected schools studied were evaluated by their administrators and their third year and fourth year students.

Pre-testing of Questionnaire

The questionnaire was pre-tested with the teachers at the Matag-ob National High School (MNHS), Matag-ob, Leyte. This was done to assess the instrument's comprehensibility and to point out aspects for improvement, especially in the three areas where the respondents encountered difficulties.

Data Collection

The data were gathered personally by the researcher from November 4 to November 7, 1997 using questionnaires composed of two parts. A permit to conduct the study was obtained from the Regional Director, DECS Region VIII, Tacloban City, prior to data collection.

To determine the performance ratings of teachers in the RPAST, copies of the evaluation sheet were requested personally from the files of the personnel office of each school and were entered into a separate data sheet. This teacher evaluation system adopted by the school was based on DECS Order No. 101, Series 1990.

Data Analysis

Data were gathered and classified, tabulated and analyzed in accordance with the objectives of the study.

Descriptive statistics such as means, ranges, frequency counts and percentages were used.

To establish the relationship between the secondary teacher's ratings in the RPAST with their teaching effectiveness, the Spearman Rho Correlation Coefficient was used.

To compare the quality of teaching performance of the secondary teachers in the three public schools serving as respondents of the study, Kruskal-Wallis Test was used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

PERFORMANCE EFFICIENCY RATINGS OF
SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Table 1 presents the performance efficiency ratings of the 38 teacher-respondents from the national secondary schools of Isabel, Kananga and Tabango in the province of Leyte.

Table 1. Performance efficiency ratings of secondary school teachers

Criteria for Rating	INHS		KNHS			
	Mean	STD	Mean	STD	Mean	STD
A	32.00	0.00	28.43	4.78	14.10	3.64
B	32.32	1.06	32.66	2.17	32.11	2.85
C	6.69	0.19	6.49	0.48	5.97	0.90
D	4.80	0.23	4.22	0.57	4.30	0.70
E	4.80	0.28	4.90	0.27	4.38	0.88
F	4.07	0.24	3.94	0.64	2.22	0.12
G	2.93	0.13	2.76	0.18	2.58	0.44
H	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.06	0.11
Total	87.61	1.29	82.40	3.78	65.71	7.22

Based on the mean total of performance efficiency ratings of the secondary school teachers, INHS had the highest mean total of 87.61 followed by KNHS with a mean total of 82.40 and last by TNHS with a mean total of 65.71.

These results may either indicate a very satisfactory performance among the teachers of INHS and KNHS and a satisfactory performance among the teachers of TNHS or more generous administrator-raters of

INHS and KNHS than that of TNHS because of the varying degree of teacher performance. The results support the claim of Medley and Coker (1987), that today, almost all educational decisions are based on judgements, which according to them are only slightly more accurate than they be because evaluation of teachers are only based on pure chance.

RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHERS' RATING IN THE RPAST TO THE LEVEL OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AS PERCEIVED BY STUDENTS

A. Effectiveness Based on Personality Factors

Instructional Competence

As reflected in Table 2, there was a negative correlation between the instructional competence of the teacher as perceived by the administrator and his effectiveness based on personality factors as perceived by students. This was indicated by the negative Spearman Rho of -0.00437 . Its significant value (0.9347) further indicates that the greater the ratings given by the administrators to their subordinates in this sub-area, the lesser were the ratings that the teachers received from their students.

These results showed contrasting opinions between those of the administrators and students concerning the instructional competence of the teachers. The different bases for rating might have caused such a variation. While the administrators rated the instructional competence of the teachers according to their very occasional classroom visitations and overall impression of the teachers' intelligence, the students might have rated their teachers based on the daily observation of their instructional competence.

Management of Learning Environment

The study revealed a positive relationship between the teachers' ratings in the management of learning environment and the students' opinion of their teaching effectiveness. The significant value (0.6235) validates the favorable perception of the administrators together with the positive perception of the students on their teachers' effectiveness. This association would explain that the management of learning environment could be greatly influenced by the personality traits of a teacher. Hence, a likeable, conscientious and forthright teacher could enhance the proper management of the students' learning environment.

Table 2. The relationship of teacher's rating in the different sub-areas of RPAST to the level of teaching effectiveness based on a set of standard criteria as perceived by students

Correlation Coefficient					
	Pupil/Student Achievement	Instructional Competence	Management of Learning Environment	Professionalism	Attitudes and Values
A. Effectiveness Based on Personality Factors					
1	0.00958	0.01953	0.08493	-0.22289	-0.08503
2	-0.14330	-0.04509	0.02986	-0.32168	-0.21566
3	-0.33048	0.12478	-0.04185	-0.14113	-0.16020
4	-0.19341	0.00781	-0.01305	-0.25555	-0.05072
5	0.09852	-0.01503	-0.03719	-0.25048	0.08010
6	-0.29566	-0.00214	0.09278	-0.04838	-0.36685
7	-0.24735	-0.10031	-0.08336	-0.29386	-0.56104
8	0.21640	-0.00234	0.13278	-0.17773	0.09822
9	-0.14449	-0.06363	-0.06998	-0.38782	-0.16770
10	-0.12225	-0.02604	-0.09909	-0.34054	-0.01110
AVG-A	-0.11974	-0.00437	0.02614	-0.31852	-0.14414

Table 2 (cont'd)

Correlation Coefficient					
	Pupil/Student Achievement	Instructional Competence	Management of Learning Environment	Professionalism	Attitudes and Values
1	-0.03516	0.03255	0.07059	-0.25538	-0.19506
2	-0.37139	0.08335	-0.16355	-0.23537	-0.34133
3	-0.17285	-0.14374	0.00362	-0.27321	-0.29353
4	-0.32002	-0.04198	-0.12731	-0.36390	-0.31333
5	-0.19989	-0.08234	-0.09195	-0.28406	-0.08337
6	-0.27529	0.03495	0.02715	0.24543	-0.17881
7	0.04026	-0.08880	0.08842	-0.22700	-0.04399
8	-0.17555	-0.10530	-0.02447	-0.35829	-0.06299
9	-0.22017	0.00277	-0.04523	-0.40645	-0.12091
10	0.15256	-0.10707	0.19872	-0.35189	-0.15708
AVG-B	-0.15426	-0.06587	-0.01674	-0.36173	-0.21760

Parent/Community Interaction

As presented in Table 2, parent/community interaction as perceived by superiors was negatively associated with the teaching effectiveness of teachers as perceived by students. The Spearman Rho of -0.05681 has a significant value of 0.2857 at 0.05 significant level.

These findings would imply that the teachers' interaction with parents or community did not influence their teaching effectiveness according to the students' perception. Most possibly, the students merely took into account the teacher-student interaction in and outside of the classroom as the basis in evaluating their teachers.

Table 2 (cont'd)

Correlation Coefficient				
CRITERIA	Punctuality and Attendance	Parent/Community Interaction	Plus Factor	TOTAL
A. Effectiveness Based on Personality Factors				
1	0.00339	-0.05228	0.14639	0.03224
2	-0.13154	0.01628	0.24428	-0.15759
3	-0.32182	-0.20076	0.17352	-0.29140
4	-0.14429	-0.18725	0.13893	-0.18380
5	-0.04347	-0.02533	0.15919	0.09708
6	-0.24316	-0.11046	0.01734	-0.25253
7	-0.27249	-0.15554	0.03218	-0.31064
8	0.13986	-0.03037	0.03530	0.26036
9	-0.23253	-0.07372	0.24103	-0.24103
10	-0.22992	-0.01400	0.15624	-0.14376
AVG-A	-0.18883	-0.05681	0.18542	-0.13246
B. Effectiveness Based on Behavior Factors				
1	-0.08210	-0.13798	0.19765	-0.00863
2	-0.35642	-0.29855	0.13836	-0.36125
3	-0.22969	-0.31019	0.19647	-0.21035
4	-0.32285	-0.19285	0.17207	-0.33920
5	-0.18929	-0.07984	0.17894	-0.18292
6	-0.29162	-0.10952	0.20950	-0.33308
7	-0.03006	-0.16532	0.21342	0.03803
8	-0.23848	-0.33500	0.16424	-0.21731
9	-0.30534	-0.22099	0.24032	-0.23386
10	0.02457	-0.11902	0.10714	0.11971
AVG-B	-0.23792	-0.23668	0.21904	-0.18241

C. Effectiveness Based on Behavior Factors

Instructional Competence

A similar trend was obtained with the rating on instructional competence. The negative Spearman Rho indicates a negative correlation between the instructional competence of the teacher as perceived by the administrator and his effectiveness based on behavior factors as perceived by students. Its significant value further indicates contrasting views between those of the administrators and students. The teachers perceived to be competent by the administrators were considered less effective by the students.

While teacher competence deals with the quality of the teacher, teacher effectiveness deals with his teaching by reference to student outcomes. As stated by Anderson (1989), teacher effectiveness depends not only on competence and performance but also on the responses pupils make, just as competence cannot predict performance under different situations, teacher performance cannot predict outcomes under different situations.

Management of Learning Environment

According to the findings of the study, there was a negative relationship between the teachers' ratings in the management of learning environment and the students' evaluation of their teaching effectiveness based on behavioral qualities. The significant value would imply that the management of learning environment did not influence the teaching effectiveness of teachers. It is not, therefore, assured that a mentor who promotes the desirable management of learning environment would be rated effective by his students.

COMPARISON OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE AMONG THE SECONDARY TEACHERS

Table 3 presents the comparison in the quality of teaching performance among the secondary teachers of INHS, KNHS and TNHS as perceived by the administrators.

For Variable A (student achievement), the mean scores obtained through the Kruskal-Wallis test were as follows: INHS (29.0); KNHS (20.94); and TNHS (5.0) These results indicated moderate or average performance among the INHS teachers, moderately low performance among the KNHS teachers and low performance among the TNHS teachers based on the aforementioned variable.

Table 3. Comparison of teaching performance among the secondary teachers

Variables	SCHOOLS								
	INHS		KNHS		TNHS				
	N : : Score	Sum of : Score	Mean : Score	N : : Score	Sum of : Score	Mean : Score			
A	11 :	319.0	: 29.0	18 :	377.0	: 20.94	9 :	45.0	: 5.0
B	11 :	220.0	: 20.0	18 :	320.0	: 17.78	9 :	201.0	: 22.33
C	11 :	254.0	: 23.09	18 :	367.0	: 20.39	9 :	120.0	: 13.33
D	11 :	295.5	: 26.86	18 :	276.5	: 15.36	9 :	169.0	: 18.78
E	11 :	187.5	: 17.04	18 :	434.0	: 24.11	9 :	119.5	: 13.2
F	11 :	275.0	: 25.0	18 :	421.0	: 23.39	9 :	45.0	: 5.0
G	11 :	290.5	: 26.41	18 :	312.0	: 17.33	9 :	138.5	: 15.39
H	11 :	198.0	: 18.0	18 :	343.0	: 19.06	9 :	200.0	: 22.22
TOTAL	11 :	340.0	: 30.91	18 :	356.0	: 19.78	9 :	45.0	: 5.0

Some of the factors causing the differences in student achievement ratings among the three schools studied might have been the distinct quality of students and dissimilar review schemes implemented in preparation for NSAT, regional and division examinations. The teachers in the school who obtained the highest ratings on student achievement might have provided more rigid and comprehensive review classes than those teachers in the schools who obtained lower ratings on student achievement.

For variable D (professionalism), the three schools got the following mean scores: INHS (26.86);KNHS (15.36) and TNHS (18.78) showing a moderate performance for INHS, low performance for KNHS and moderately low performance for TNHS.

The teachers' ratings on professionalism showed remarkable differences among the three schools probably because of the varying degree of educational attainment in terms of the master's degree or graduate units earned by the members of the faculty.

For variable E (attitudes and values), the following mean scores were obtained: INHS, 17.04 (moderately low performance), KNHS, 24.11 (moderate performance); and TNHS, 13.28 (low performance).

There was a significant difference in the ratings of attitudes and values among the three schools studied because of the different perceptions of the administrators regarding the attitudes and values displayed by their teachers. In relation to this, the existence of conflicts among teachers in a school would usually demerit those teachers involved in this criterion.

For variable F (punctuality and attendance), INHS, KNHS and TNHS obtained the following mean scores: 25.0, 23.39 and 5.0, respectively. These results indicated moderate performance of INHS and KNHS teachers and low performance of TNHS teachers.

These results imply that INHS and KNHS teachers were more particular of attending their classes early and regularly than the TNHS teachers who earned lower ratings in this specific criterion.

For variable G (parent/community interaction), the following mean scores were obtained: INHS (26.41); KNHS (17.33) and TNHS (15.39). These data indicated moderate performance for INHS, moderately low performance for KNHS and low performance for TNHS teachers.

These results imply that most of the INHS teachers were more actively involved in parent/community interaction than the KNHS teachers. TNHS teachers obtained the lowest ratings compared to INHS and KNHS teachers most probably because generally, most of them failed to take an active involvement in any parent/community interaction.

For variable total, the following mean scores were obtained: INHS (30.91), KNHS (19.78) and TNHS (5.0) indicating high performance for INHS, moderate performance for KNHS and low performance for TNHS. Hence, there was a significant difference in the quality of teaching performance among the secondary teachers in the three school-respondents.

These results would show that INHS teachers performed very well according to the criteria set and have applied their competencies in teaching students, thus gaining more favorable impression from their administrator than the KNHS and TNHS teachers.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The findings of the study revealed that eleven secondary teachers from INHS and eighteen secondary teachers from KNHS were all rated very satisfactory by their administrators, whereas nine secondary teachers from TNHS were all rated satisfactory by their administrator.

The consistency of teachers' ratings within the schools and the slight variation of ratings among schools may be due to the administrators' varied styles and standards in rating their teachers and not necessarily to the significant difference in their actual teaching performance inside/outside of the classroom.

Moreover, the teachers' ratings in the RPAST were negatively and insignificantly correlated with their teaching effectiveness based on personality and behavior factors as perceived by students.

Considering the disagreement between the administrators' perception of the teachers' performance and the students' perception on the teachers' teaching effectiveness, one possible reason might be the lack of rating skills or adequate bases for rating on the part of the administrators and students as well. Hence, it is recommended that administrator-raters as well as student-raters should be trained to increase the reliability of results. Likewise, a similar study may also be conducted measuring teaching effectiveness in terms of students' gains in the achievement test.

Finally, the mean scores obtained through the Kruskal-Wallis test showed a significant difference in the quality of teaching performance among the secondary teachers in the three public schools based on RPAST ratings. This remarkable difference may be partly due to the different raters in the study or to the existing variation in performance among the teachers evaluated. It is therefore recommended that students who could always observe their teachers be involved in giving their teachers performance ratings to make the evaluation more valid and meaningful.

LITERATURE CITED

- DARLING-HAMMOND** and **WISE, A.E.** 1981. A conceptual framework for examining views of teaching and education policies. The Rand Corporation. Santa Monica, California
- MEDLEY, D.M.** and **COKER, H.** 1987. The accuracy of principals' judgement of teachers' performances. *Journ. Educ. Res.* 80: 242-243. Micro Publication Division, Heldref Publication, 400 Albemarle St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20016
- ANDERSON, L.W.** 1989. *The effective teacher*, 1st ed. McGrawHill Publishing Company, New York. U.S.A. p. 18