

# **PMES Tool for Teachers I-III (Proficient Teachers)**

**S.Y. 2024-2025**

## KRA 1: Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
1. Applied knowledge of content within and across curriculum teaching areas. (PPST 1.1.2)	<p>Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/s or inter-observer agreement form/s done through onsite / face-to-face / in-person classroom observation.</p> <p><i>If onsite / face-to-face / in-person classes are not implemented,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or</li> <li>• through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.</li> </ul>	Quality	Demonstrated Level 7 in Objective 1 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 6 in Objective 1 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 5 in Objective 1 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 4 in Objective 1 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 3 in Objective 1 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms
		Efficiency	Objective was met within the allotted time		Objective was met but instruction exceeded the allotted time		No acceptable evidence was shown

\* The demonstration teaching must always reflect the teaching-learning process.

### Notes:

1. In computing the rating for Quality: (i) get the corresponding RPMS 5-point scale rating of each COT rating; (ii) calculate the average of the RPMS ratings; and (iii) find the transmuted RPMS rating. **See sample computation below:**

Means of Verification	COT Rating	RPMS 5-point Scale Rating	Average	RPMS Rating for Quality
COT Rating Sheet 1	6	4	3.500	4
COT Rating Sheet 2	5	3		(Very Satisfactory)

RPMS Rating Transmutation Table	
Outstanding (5)	4.500-5.000
Very Satisfactory (4)	3.500-4.499
Poor (1)	1.000-1.499

2. In computing the rating for Efficiency: (i) rate the Efficiency by referring to the rubric above; (ii) compute the final rating by averaging the Efficiency ratings from the two (2) full-period classroom observations. **The average rating shall be categorized using the Efficiency Range Table below:**

Range of Average	Efficiency Final Rating
4.00-5.00	5
2.00-3.99	3
1.00-1.99	1

## KRA 1: Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
2. Used research-based knowledge and principles of teaching and learning process (PPST 1.2.2)	<p><b>Any one (1)</b> of the following used in the classroom observation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lesson Plan (e.g., DLP, DLL, WHLP, WLL, Lesson Exemplars, and the likes)</li> <li>• Activity Sheet</li> <li>• Assessment materials</li> <li>• Others (specify)</li> </ul> <p><b>with annotation describing the use of research-based knowledge and principles of teaching and learning process</b></p>	Quality	<p><b>Integrated at a strategic level</b> relevant and innovative research-based knowledge and principles, with clear rationale and reflection of its significant value to the teaching and learning process</p>	<p><b>Applied at a contextual level</b> research-based knowledge and principles, with appropriate and clear rationale of their use</p>	<p><b>Applied at a procedural level</b> research-based knowledge and principles, with limited but sufficient explanation of their use</p>	<p><b>Adopted at a surface level</b> basic research-based knowledge and principles, with minimal or no explanation of rationale for its use</p>	No acceptable evidence was shown

Note:

In computing the rating for Quality: (i) rate each of the MOVs against the performance indicators; (ii) get the final rating for Objective 9 by averaging the ratings; and (iii) find the appropriate RPMS rating based on the transmutation table. **See sample computation below:**

Means of Verification	Rating	Average	RPMS Rating for Quality
Lesson Plan with annotation for 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter Classroom Observation	4		
Assessment Material with annotation for 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter Classroom Observation	5	4.500	5 (Outstanding)

RPMS Rating Transmutation Table	
Outstanding (5)	4.500-5.000
Very Satisfactory (4)	3.500-4.499
Satisfactory (3)	2.500-3.499
Unsatisfactory (2)	1.500-2.499
Poor (1)	1.000-1.499

## KRA 1: Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
3. Ensured the positive use of ICT to facilitate the teaching and learning process. (PPST 1.3.2)	Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/s or inter-observer agreement form/s done through onsite / face-to- face / in-person classroom observation.  If onsite / face-to-face / in-person classes are not implemented, <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or</li><li>through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.</li></ul>	Quality	Demonstrated Level 7 in Objective 3 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 6 in Objective 3 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 5 in Objective 3 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 4 in Objective 3 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 3 in Objective 3 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms  or  No acceptable evidence was shown
	Efficiency		Objective was <b>met within the allotted time</b>	Objective was <b>met</b> but instruction <b>exceeded</b> the allotted time		No acceptable evidence was shown	

\* The demonstration teaching must always reflect the teaching-learning process.

Notes:

1. In computing the rating for Quality: (i) get the corresponding RPMS 5-point scale rating of each COT rating; (ii) calculate the average of the RPMS ratings; and (iii) find the transmuted RPMS rating. **See sample computation below:**

Means of Verification	COT Rating	RPMS 5-point Scale Rating	Average	RPMS Rating for Quality
COT Rating Sheet 1	6	4	3.500	4 (Very Satisfactory)
COT Rating Sheet 2	5	3		

RPMS Rating Transmutation Table	
Outstanding (5)	4.500-5.000
Very Satisfactory (4)	3.500-4.499
Poor (1)	1.000-1.499

## KRA 1: Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
4. Used a range of teaching strategies that enhance learner achievement in literacy and numeracy skills. (PPST 1.4.2)	<p>Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/s or inter-observer agreement form/s done through onsite / face-to-face / in-person classroom observation.</p> <p>If onsite / face-to-face / in- person classes are not implemented,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or</li> <li>through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.</li> </ul>	Quality	Demonstrated Level 7 in Objective 2 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 6 in Objective 2 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 5 in Objective 2 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 4 in Objective 2 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 3 in Objective 2 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms or No acceptable evidence was shown
		Efficiency	Objective was met within the allotted time		Objective was met but instruction exceeded the allotted time		No acceptable evidence was shown

\* The demonstration teaching must always reflect the teaching-learning process.

### Notes:

1. In computing the rating for Quality: (i) get the corresponding RPMS 5-point scale rating of each COT rating; (ii) calculate the average of the RPMS ratings; and (iii) find the transmuted RPMS rating. **See sample computation below:**

Means of Verification	COT Rating	RPMS 5-point Scale Rating	Average	RPMS Rating for Quality
COT Rating Sheet 1	6	4		4
COT Rating Sheet 2	5	3	3.500	(Very Satisfactory)

RPMS Rating Transmutation Table	
Outstanding (5)	4.500-5.000
Very Satisfactory (4)	3.500-4.499
Poor (1)	1.000-1.499

2. In computing the rating for Efficiency: (i) rate the Efficiency by referring to the rubric above; (ii) compute the final rating by averaging the Efficiency ratings from the two (2) full-period classroom observations. **The average rating shall be categorized using the Efficiency Range Table below:**

Range of Average	Efficiency Final Rating
4.00-5.00	5
2.00-3.99	3
1.00-1.99	1

## KRA 2: Content Knowledge and Pedagogy & Learning Environment

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
<b>5. Used effective verbal and non-verbal classroom communication strategies to support learner understanding, participation, engagement and achievement. (PPST 1.7.2)</b>	<b>Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/s or inter-observer agreement form/s done through onsite / face-to-face/ in-person classroom observation.</b>  <i>If onsite / face-to-face / in-person classes are not implemented,</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or</li> <li>• through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.</li> </ul>	Quality	Demonstrated <b>Level 7</b> in Objective 5 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 6</b> in Objective 5 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 5</b> in Objective 5 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 4</b> in Objective 5 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 3</b> in Objective 5 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms  or  No acceptable evidence was shown
		Efficiency	Objective was <b>met within the allotted time</b>		Objective was <b>met</b> but instruction <b>exceeded</b> the allotted time		No acceptable evidence was shown

\* The demonstration teaching must always reflect the teaching-learning process.

### Notes:

1. In computing the rating for Quality: (i) get the corresponding RPMS 5-point scale rating of each COT rating; (ii) calculate the average of the RPMS ratings; and (iii) find the transmuted RPMS rating. **See sample computation below:**

Means of Verification	COT Rating	RPMS 5-point Scale Rating	Average	RPMS Rating for Quality
COT Rating Sheet 1	6	4		
COT Rating Sheet 2	5	3	3.500	4 (Very Satisfactory)

RPMS Rating Transmutation Table	
Outstanding (5)	4.500-5.000
Very Satisfactory (4)	3.500-4.499
Poor (1)	1.000-1.499

## KRA 2: Content Knowledge and Pedagogy & Learning Environment

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
<b>6. Maintain supportive learning environments that nurture and inspire learners to participate, cooperate and collaborate in continued learning. (PPST 2.4.2)</b>	<b>Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/s or inter-observer agreement form/s done through onsite / face-to-face / in-person classroom observation.</b>  <i>If onsite / face-to-face / in- person classes are not implemented,</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or</li> <li>• through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.</li> </ul>	<b>Quality</b>  <b>Efficiency</b>	Demonstrated <b>Level 7</b> in Objective 6 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms  <b>Objective was met within the allotted time</b>	Demonstrated <b>Level 6</b> in Objective 6 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms  <span style="background-color: black; color: white; display: inline-block; width: 100px; height: 100px;"></span>	Demonstrated <b>Level 5</b> in Objective 6 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms  <span style="background-color: black; color: white; display: inline-block; width: 100px; height: 100px;"></span>	Demonstrated <b>Level 4</b> in Objective 6 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms  <span style="background-color: black; color: white; display: inline-block; width: 100px; height: 100px;"></span>	Demonstrated <b>Level 3</b> in Objective 6 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms  <span style="background-color: black; color: white; display: inline-block; width: 100px; height: 100px;"></span> or No acceptable evidence was shown
					<b>Objective was met but instruction exceeded the allotted time</b>		No acceptable evidence was shown

\* The demonstration teaching must always reflect the teaching-learning process.

### Notes:

1. In computing the rating for Quality: (i) get the corresponding RPMS 5-point scale rating of each COT rating; (ii) calculate the average of the RPMS ratings; and (iii) find the transmuted RPMS rating. **See sample computation below:**

Means of Verification	COT Rating	RPMS 5-point Scale Rating	Average	RPMS Rating for Quality
COT Rating Sheet 1	6	4	3.500	4 (Very Satisfactory)
COT Rating Sheet 2	5	3		

RPMS Rating Transmutation Table	
Outstanding (5)	4.500-5.000
Very Satisfactory (4)	3.500-4.499
Poor (1)	1.000-1.499

## KRA 2: Content Knowledge and Pedagogy & Learning Environment

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
7. Applied a range of successful strategies that maintain learning environments that motivate learners to work productively by assuming responsibility for their own learning. (PPST 2.5.2)	<p>Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/s or inter-observer agreement form/s done through onsite / face-to- face / in-person classroom observation.</p> <p>If onsite / face-to-face / in- person classes are not implemented,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or</li> <li>through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.</li> </ul>	Quality	Demonstrated Level 7 in Objective 7 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 6 in Objective 7 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 5 in Objective 7 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 4 in Objective 7 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated Level 3 in Objective 7 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms or No acceptable evidence was shown
		Efficiency	Objective was met within the allotted time		Objective was met but instruction exceeded the allotted time		No acceptable evidence was shown

\* The demonstration teaching must always reflect the teaching-learning process.

Notes:

1. In computing the rating for Quality: (i) get the corresponding RPMS 5-point scale rating of each COT rating; (ii) calculate the average of the RPMS ratings; and (iii) find the transmuted RPMS rating. **See sample computation below:**

Means of Verification	COT Rating	RPMS 5-point Scale Rating	Average	RPMS Rating for Quality
COT Rating Sheet 1	6	4		
COT Rating Sheet 2	5	3	3.500	4 (Very Satisfactory)

RPMS Rating Transmutation Table	
Outstanding (5)	4.500-5.000
Very Satisfactory (4)	3.500-4.499
Poor (1)	1.000-1.499

## KRA 3: Diversity of Learners & Curriculum and Assessment

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
8. Design, adapt and implement teaching strategies that are responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents (PPST 3.3.2)	<p><b>Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/s or inter-observer agreement form/s</b> done through onsite / face-to-face / in-person classroom observation.</p> <p><i>If onsite / face-to-face / in- person classes are not implemented,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or</li> </ul> <p>through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.</p>	Quality	Demonstrated <b>Level 7</b> in Objective 8 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 6</b> in Objective 8 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 5</b> in Objective 8 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 4</b> in Objective 8 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 3</b> in Objective 8 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms or No acceptable evidence was shown
		Efficiency	Objective was <b>met within the allotted time</b>		Objective was <b>met</b> but instruction <b>exceeded</b> the allotted time		No acceptable evidence was shown

\* The demonstration teaching must always reflect the teaching-learning process.

### Notes:

1. In computing the rating for Quality: (i) get the corresponding RPMS 5-point scale rating of each COT rating; (ii) calculate the average of the RPMS ratings; and (iii) find the transmuted RPMS rating. **See sample computation below:**

Means of Verification	COT Rating	RPMS 5-point Scale Rating	Average	RPMS Rating for Quality
COT Rating Sheet 1	6	4		
COT Rating Sheet 2	5	3	3.500	4 (Very Satisfactory)

RPMS Rating Transmutation Table	
Outstanding (5)	4.500-5.000
Very Satisfactory (4)	3.500-4.499
Poor (1)	1.000-1.499

## KRA 3: Diversity of Learners & Curriculum and Assessment

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
9. Planned and delivered teaching strategies that are responsive to the special educational needs of learners in difficult circumstances*, including: geographic isolation; chronic illness; displacement due to armed conflict, urban resettlement or disasters; child abuse and child labor practices. <i>(PPST 3.4.2)</i>	<b>Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/s or inter-observer agreement form/s</b> done through onsite / face-to-face / in-person classroom observation.  <i>If onsite / face-to-face / in-person classes are not implemented,</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or</li> <li>through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.</li> </ul>	Quality	Demonstrated <b>Level 7</b> in Objective 9 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 6</b> in Objective 9 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 5</b> in Objective 9 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 4</b> in Objective 9 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 3</b> in Objective 9 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms  or  No acceptable evidence was shown
		Efficiency	Objective was <b>met within the allotted time</b>		Objective was <b>met but instruction exceeded</b> the allotted time		No acceptable evidence was shown

\* The demonstration teaching must always reflect the teaching-learning process.

Notes:

1. In computing the rating for Quality: (i) get the corresponding RPMS 5-point scale rating of each COT rating; (ii) calculate the average of the RPMS ratings; and (iii) find the transmuted RPMS rating. **See sample computation below:**

Means of Verification	COT Rating	RPMS 5-point Scale Rating	Average	RPMS Rating for Quality
COT Rating Sheet 1	6	4	3.500	4
COT Rating Sheet 2	5	3		(Very Satisfactory)

RPMS Rating Transmutation Table	
Outstanding (5)	4.500-5.000
Very Satisfactory (4)	3.500-4.499
Poor (1)	1.000-1.499

## KRA 3: Diversity of Learners & Curriculum and Assessment

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
<b>10. Adapted and implemented learning programs that ensure relevance and responsiveness to the needs of all learners. (PPST 4.3.2)</b>	<p><b>Any one (1) of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proof of implementation of learning programs (e.g., progress report, accomplishment report)</li> <li>2. Proof of contextualization, localization and indigenization of learning programs (e.g., progress report, technical report)</li> <li>3. Proof of adaptation of learning programs (e.g., progress report, accomplishment report)</li> <li>4. Action plan / activity proposal / activity matrix for adaptation and implementation of learning programs with annotation describing the relevance and responsiveness of the learning programs to the needs of all learners</li> </ol>	<b>Quality</b>	<p><b>Implemented</b> contextualized, localized and indigenized learning programs to ensure relevance and responsiveness to the needs of all learners, as evidenced by MOV No. 1</p>	<p><b>Contextualized, localized indigenized</b> adapted learning programs to ensure relevance and responsiveness to the needs of all learners, as evidenced by MOV No. 2</p>	<p><b>Adapted</b> learning programs that ensure relevance and responsiveness to the needs of all learners, as evidenced by MOV No. 3</p>	<p><b>Planned</b> for the adaptation and implementation of existing learning programs as evidenced by MOV No. 4</p>	No acceptable evidence was shown

## KRA 4: Community Linkages and Professional Engagement

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
11. Maintained learning environments that are responsive to community contexts. (PPST 6.1.2)	<p><b>Any one (1) of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Communication letter</b> about a program / project / activity that highlights maintaining learning environments that are responsive to community contexts</li> <li>2. <b>Minutes</b> of a consultative meeting / community stakeholders meeting about a program / project / activity that highlights maintaining learning environments that are responsive to community contexts with proof of attendance</li> <li>3. Program / Project / Activity <b>Plan</b> that highlights maintaining learning environments that are responsive to community contexts</li> <li>4. <b>Report</b> on the implementation/ completion of a program, project, and/or activity that maintains learning environments responsive to community contexts</li> </ol>	Quality	<p><b>Collaborated with the community stakeholders</b> in the implementation / completion of a program, project, and/or activity that maintains learning environments responsive to community contexts as evidenced by MOV No. 4</p>	<p><b>Planned with the community stakeholders</b> a program, project, and/or activity that maintains learning environments responsive to community contexts as evidenced by MOV No. 3</p>	<p><b>Conducted a consultative meeting with the community stakeholders</b> on a program, project, and/or activity that maintains learning environments responsive to community contexts as evidenced by MOV No. 2</p>	<p><b>Communicated with the community stakeholders</b> about a program, project, and/or activity that maintains learning environments responsive to community contexts as evidenced by MOV No. 1</p>	No acceptable evidence was shown

## KRA 4: Community Linkages and Professional Engagement

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
12. Reviewed regularly personal teaching practice using existing laws and regulations that apply to the teaching profession and the responsibilities specified in the Code of Ethics for Professional Teachers. (PPST 6.3.2)	<p>Any one (1) of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Minutes/Notes</b> of coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</li> <li>2. <b>Teaching materials</b>, with annotation highlighting the objective, e.g., <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lesson plan</li> <li>• activity sheet</li> <li>• assessment materials</li> <li>• others (please specify)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. <b>Reflection notes</b> of teachers on the coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs/other collegial discussions that highlights the objective <b>with proof/s f attendance</b></li> </ol>	Quality	<p><b>Consistently</b> conducted review of personal teaching practice using laws and regulations that apply to the profession and the responsibilities in the Code of Ethics for Professional Teachers, as shown in the MOV submitted</p>	<p><b>Frequently</b> conducted review of personal teaching practice using laws and regulations that apply to the profession and the responsibilities in the Code of Ethics for Professional Teachers, as shown in the MOV submitted</p>	<p><b>Occasionally</b> conducted review of personal teaching practice using laws and regulations that apply to the profession and the responsibilities in the Code of Ethics for Professional Teachers, as shown in the MOV submitted</p>	<p><b>Rarely</b> conducted review of personal teaching practice using laws and regulations that apply to the profession and the responsibilities in the Code of Ethics for Professional Teachers, as shown in the MOV submitted</p>	<p>No acceptable evidence was shown</p>

## KRA 4: Community Linkages and Professional Engagement

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
13. Complied with and implemented school policies and procedures consistently to foster harmonious relationships with learners, parents, and other stakeholders. (PPST 6.4.2)	<p><b>Any one (1) of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Proof of communication</b> about an implemented school policy / procedure sent to parents / guardians</li> <li>2. <b>Minutes</b> of parent-teacher conference / stakeholders' meeting about an implemented school policy / procedure with proof of attendance</li> <li>3. <b>Proof of participation / involvement</b> in a school- community partnership for the implementation of a school policy / procedure (e.g., certificate as committee member, narrative report)</li> <li>4. Accomplishment report</li> </ol>	Quality	<p><b>Sustained engagement with the learners, parents / guardians, and other stakeholders</b> regarding school policies and procedures <b>through school-community partnership/s</b> as evidenced by MOV No. 3 or 4</p>	<p><b>Discussed consistently with learners, parents / guardians, and other stakeholders</b> the implemented school policies and procedures as evidenced by MOV No. 2</p>	<p><b>Communicated consistently with learners, parents / guardians, and other stakeholders</b> the implemented school policies and procedures as evidenced by MOV No. 1</p>	<p><b>Implemented school policies and procedures without involving the learners, parents / guardians, and other stakeholders</b></p>	No acceptable evidence was shown

## KRA 5: Community Linkages and Professional Engagement Personal Growth and Professional Development

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
14. Adopted practices that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession by exhibiting qualities such as caring attitude, respect and integrity. (PPST 7.2.2)	<p><b>Any one (1) of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A reflection/journal entry that highlights practices that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession</li> <li>2. <b>Annotated evidence of practice</b>, including but not limited to the following:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Documented feedback</b> from superiors, colleagues, or other stakeholders <b>directly reflecting</b> the ratee's good practices that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession</li> <li>• <b>Remarks</b> from superiors, colleagues, or master teacher / school head about one's qualities (e.g., entries in Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form [PMCF] or in Mid-Year Review Form)</li> <li>• Recognition from the school / school community about one's qualities</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Others (please specify)</li> </ol>	Quality	<p><b>Exhibited practices</b> that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession by exhibiting qualities such as caring attitude, respect, and integrity <b>with affirmation from different school stakeholders</b> as evidenced by MOV No. 2</p>	<p><b>Exhibited practices</b> that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession by exhibiting qualities such as caring attitude, respect, and integrity <b>with affirmation from any school stakeholder</b> as evidenced by MOV No. 2</p>	<p><b>Adopted practices</b> that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession by exhibiting qualities such as caring attitude, respect, and integrity as evidenced by MOV No. 1</p>	<p><b>Adopted a practice</b> that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession by exhibiting qualities such as caring attitude, respect, and integrity as evidenced by MOV No. 1</p>	No acceptable evidence was shown

## SUMMARY

Objective	COI / NCOI	MOVs / Proof of Demonstration and Achievement of Objectives	No. of MOVs
Obj. 1 (PPST 1.1.2)	COI	Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet or inter-observer agreement form/s done through onsite / face-to-face / in-person classroom observation	2
Obj. 3 (PPST 1.3.2)	COI		
Obj. 4 (PPST 1.4.2)	COI		
Obj. 5 (PPST 1.7.2)	COI		
Obj. 6 (PPST 2.4.2)	COI		
Obj. 7 (PPST 2.5.2)	COI		
Obj. 8 (PPST 3.3.2)	COI		
Obj. 9 (PPST 3.4.2)	COI		
Obj. 2 (PPST 1.2.2)	NCOI	<p><b>Any one (1) of the following used in each of the full-period classroom observations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lesson Plan (e.g., DLP, DLL, WHLP, WLL, Lesson Exemplars, and the likes)</li> <li>• Activity Sheet</li> <li>• Assessment materials</li> <li>• Others (specify)</li> </ul> <p><b>with annotation describing the use of research-based knowledge and principles of teaching and learning process</b></p>	2
Obj. 10 (PPST 4.3.2)	NCOI	<p><b>Any one (1) of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proof of implementation of learning programs (e.g., progress report, accomplishment report)</li> <li>2. Proof of contextualization, localization and indigenization of learning programs (e.g., progress report, technical report)</li> <li>3. Proof of adaptation of learning programs (e.g., progress report, accomplishment report)</li> <li>4. Action plan / activity proposal / activity matrix for adaptation and implementation of learning programs</li> </ol> <p><b>with annotation describing the relevance and responsiveness of the learning programs to the needs of all learners</b></p>	1
Obj. 11 (PPST 6.1.2)	NCOI	<p><b>Any one (1) of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Communication letter about a program / project / activity</b> that highlights maintaining learning environments that are responsive to community contexts</li> <li>2. <b>Minutes of a consultative meeting / community stakeholders meeting</b> about a program / project / activity that highlights maintaining learning environments that are responsive to community contexts with proof of attendance</li> <li>3. <b>Program / Project / Activity Plan</b> that highlights maintaining learning environments that are responsive to community contexts</li> <li>4. <b>Report on the implementation/ completion of a program, project, and/or activity</b> that maintains learning environments responsive to community contexts</li> </ol>	1

Obj. 12 (PPST 6.3.2)	NCOI	<p><b>Any one (1) of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Minutes/Notes</b> of coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/FGDs/other collegial discussions</li> <li>2. <b>Teaching materials</b>, with annotation highlighting the objective, e.g., <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lesson plan</li> <li>• activity sheet</li> <li>• assessment materials</li> <li>• others (please specify)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. <b>Reflection Notes</b></li> </ol>	1
Obj. 13 (PPST 6.4.2)	NCOI	<p><b>Any one (1) of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Proof of participation / involvement in a school-community partnership</b> for the implementation of a school policy / procedure</li> <li>2. <b>Accomplishment report</b></li> </ol>	1
Obj. 14 (PPST 7.2.2)	NCOI	<p><b>Any one (1) of the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>A reflection/journal entry</b> that highlights practices that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession</li> <li>2. <b>Annotated evidence of practice, including but not limited to the following:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Documented feedback</b> from superiors, colleagues, or other stakeholders directly reflecting the ratee's good practices that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession</li> <li>• <b>Remarks</b> from superiors, colleagues, or master teacher / school head about one's qualities (e.g., entries in Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form [PMCF] or in Mid-Year Review Form)</li> <li>• <b>Recognition</b> from the school / school community about one's qualities</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. <b>Others (please specify)</b></li> </ol>	1
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>9</b>