

# **PMES Tool for Master Teachers I-IV (Highly 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)
<b>1. Modeled effective applications of content knowledge within and across curriculum teaching areas. (PPST 1.1.3)</b>	<b>Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/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> 1. through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or 2. through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.  <b>and proof of attendance of colleague/s</b>	Quality	Demonstrated <b>Level 8</b> in Objective 1 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 7</b> in Objective 1 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 6</b> in Objective 1 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 5</b> in Objective 1 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 4</b> in Objective 1 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms  or  No acceptable evidence was shown
		Efficiency	Objective was <b>met</b> within the allotted time		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	7	4		4
COT Rating Sheet 2	6	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>2. Collaborated with colleagues in the conduct and application of research to enrich knowledge of content and pedagogy. (PPST 1.2.3)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Proof/s of attendance</b> in coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</li> <li><b>Minutes/Notes</b> of coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</li> <li><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 of attendance</b></li> <li>Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form (PMCF), with annotations highlighting the objective</li> </ol>	Quality	<p><b>Guided colleagues</b> in planning for the conduct and application of research to enrich knowledge of content and pedagogy during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 4</p>	<p><b>Synthesized discussions with colleagues</b> on the conduct and application of research to enrich knowledge of content and pedagogy during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 3</p>	<p><b>Collaborated with colleagues</b> in the conduct and application of research to enrich knowledge of content and pedagogy during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 2</p>	<p><b>Attended coaching and mentoring sessions/ meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions</b> that apply research to enrich knowledge of content and pedagogy, as shown in MOV 1</p>	<p>No acceptable evidence was shown</p>

## 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>3. Promoted effective strategies in the positive use of ICT to facilitate the teaching and learning process. (PPST 1.3.3)</b>	<b>Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/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> 1. through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or 2. through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.  <b>and proof of attendance of colleague/s</b>	<b>Quality</b>  <b>Efficiency</b>	Demonstrated <b>Level 8</b> in Objective 2 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 7</b> in Objective 2 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 6</b> in Objective 2 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	Demonstrated <b>Level 5</b> in Objective 2 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms  or  No acceptable evidence was shown	Demonstrated <b>Level 4</b> in Objective 2 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms  or  No acceptable evidence was shown
			Objective was <b>met</b> within the allotted time		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:

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	7	4	3.500	4 (Very Satisfactory)
COT Rating Sheet 2	6	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)
<b>4. Evaluated with colleagues the effectiveness of teaching strategies that promote learner achievement in literacy and numeracy. (PPST 1.4.3)</b>	1. <b>Proof/s of attendance</b> in coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective 2. <b>Minutes/Notes</b> of coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective 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 of attendance</b> 4. Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form (PMCF), with annotations highlighting the objective	<b>Quality</b>  <b>Timeliness</b>	<b>Guided colleagues</b> in planning for the evaluation of the effectiveness of teaching strategies that promote learner achievement in literacy and numeracy during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 4	<b>Synthesized discussions with colleagues</b> on the evaluation of effectiveness of teaching strategies that promote learner achievement in literacy and numeracy during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 3	<b>Evaluated with colleagues</b> the effectiveness of teaching strategies that promote learner achievement in literacy and numeracy during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 2	<b>Attended coaching and mentoring sessions/ meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions</b> that evaluate effectiveness of teaching strategies that promote learner achievement in literacy and numeracy, as shown in MOV 1	No acceptable evidence was shown
			Evaluated with colleagues the effectiveness of teaching strategies that promote learner achievement in literacy and numeracy <b>across 4 quarters</b>	Evaluated with colleagues the effectiveness of teaching strategies that promote learner achievement in literacy and numeracy <b>across 3 quarters</b>	Evaluated with colleagues the effectiveness of teaching strategies that promote learner achievement in literacy and numeracy <b>across 2 quarters</b>	Evaluated with colleagues the effectiveness of teaching strategies that promote learner achievement in literacy and numeracy <b>only 1 quarter</b>	No acceptable evidence was shown

## 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. Displayed a wide range of effective verbal and non-verbal classroom communication strategies to support learner understanding, participation, engagement and achievement. (PPST 1.7.3)</b>	<b>Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/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> 1. through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or 2. through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.  <b>and proof of attendance of colleague/s</b>	Quality	Demonstrated <b>Level 8</b> in Objective 5 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	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  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 (e.g., done in modular approach). The supplementary material to the MOV obtained through option 3 shall also be accompanied \*  
 The demonstration teaching must always reflect the teaching-learning process.

Note: 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	7	4		4
COT Rating Sheet 2	6	3	3.500	(Very Satisfactory)

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 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. Worked with colleagues to share successful strategies that sustain supportive learning environments that nurture and inspire learners to participate, cooperate and collaborate in continued learning. (PPST 2.4.3)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Proof/s of attendance</b> in coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</li> <li>2. <b>Minutes/Notes</b> of coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</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 of attendance</b></li> <li>4. Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form (PMCF), with annotations highlighting the objective</li> </ol>	<b>Quality</b>	<b>Guided colleagues</b> in planning of successful strategies that sustain supportive learning environments that nurture and inspire learners to participate, cooperate and collaborate in continued learning during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 4	<b>Synthesized discussions with colleagues</b> on successful strategies that sustain supportive learning environments that nurture and inspire learners to participate, cooperate and collaborate in continued learning during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 3	<b>Shared with colleagues</b> successful strategies that sustain supportive learning environments that nurture and inspire learners to participate, cooperate and collaborate in continued learning during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 2	<b>Attended coaching and mentoring sessions/ meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions</b> that discuss successful strategies that sustain supportive learning environments that nurture and inspire learners to participate, cooperate and collaborate in continued learning, as shown in MOV 1	No acceptable evidence was shown

## 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>7. Modeled successful strategies and supported colleagues in promoting learning environments that effectively motivate learners to work productively by assuming responsibility for their own learning. (PPST 2.5.3)</b>	<b>Classroom Observation Tool (COT) rating sheet/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> 1. through observation of synchronous / asynchronous teaching in other modalities; or 2. through observation of a demonstration teaching* via LAC session.  <b>and proof of attendance of colleague/s</b>	Quality	Demonstrated <b>Level 8</b> in Objective 8 as shown in COT rating sheets / inter-observer agreement forms	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  or  No acceptable evidence was shown
		Efficiency	Objective was <b>met within the allotted time</b>		Objective was <b>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	7	4		4
COT Rating Sheet 2	6	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 3: Diversity of Learners & Curriculum and Planning

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR						
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)	
8. Assisted colleagues to design, adapt and implement teaching strategies that are responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents. (PPST 3.3.3)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proof/s of attendance in coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</li> <li>Minutes/Notes of coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</li> <li>Reflection notes of teachers on the coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs/other collegial discussions that highlights the objective with proof/s of attendance</li> <li>Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form (PMCF), with annotations highlighting the objective</li> </ol>	Quality	<p><b>Guided</b> colleagues in planning for the design, adaptation and implementation of teaching strategies that are responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 4</p>	<p><b>Synthesized</b> discussions with <b>colleagues</b> on the design, adaptation and implementation of teaching strategies that are responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 3</p>	<p><b>Assisted</b> <b>colleagues</b> in designing, adapting and implementing teaching strategies that are responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 2</p>	<p><b>Attended</b> <b>coaching and mentoring sessions/ meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions</b> on the design, adaptation and implementation of teaching strategies that are responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents, as shown in MOV 1</p>	No acceptable evidence was shown	

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

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
<b>9. Evaluated with colleagues 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. (PPST 3.4.3)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Proof/s of attendance</b> in coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</li> <li><b>Minutes/Notes</b> of coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</li> <li><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 of attendance</b></li> <li>Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form (PMCF), with annotations highlighting the objective</li> </ol>	Quality	Guided colleagues in planning for the evaluation the effectiveness of teaching strategies that are responsive to the special education needs of learners in difficult circumstances during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 4	Synthesized discussions with colleagues on the evaluation of effectiveness of teaching strategies that are responsive to the special education needs of learners in difficult circumstances during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 3	Evaluated with colleagues the effectiveness of teaching strategies that are responsive to the special education needs of learners in difficult circumstances during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 2	Attended coaching and mentoring sessions/ meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions that evaluate effectiveness of teaching strategies that are responsive to the special education needs of learners in difficult circumstances and numeracy, as shown in MOV 1	No acceptable evidence was shown

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

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR						
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)	
10. Worked collaboratively with colleagues to evaluate the design of learning programs that develop the knowledge and skills of learners at different ability levels. <i>(PPST 4.3.3)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Proof/s of attendance</b> in coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</li> <li>2. <b>Minutes/Notes</b> of coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</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 of attendance</b></li> <li>4. Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form (PMCF), with annotations highlighting the objective</li> </ol>	Quality	Guided colleagues in planning for the evaluation of design of learning programs that develop the knowledge and skills of learners at different ability levels during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 4	Synthesized discussions with colleagues on the evaluation of the design of learning programs that develop the knowledge and skills of learners at different ability levels during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 3	Evaluated with colleagues the design of learning programs that develop the knowledge and skills of learners at different ability levels during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 2	Attended coaching and mentoring sessions/ meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions that evaluate the design of learning programs that develop the knowledge and skills of learners at different ability levels, as shown in MOV 1	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)
<b>11. Reflected on and evaluated learning environments that are responsive to community contexts. (PPST 6.1.3)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Synthesis of evaluation of a program / project / activity that maintains the learning environment responsive to community contexts</li> <li>Minutes of consultative meeting with parents / other external stakeholders on programs, projects, and/or activities that maintain a learning environment, highlighting the evaluations made, with proof of attendance</li> <li>Minutes of focus group discussion (FGD) with teachers on a program / project / activity that maintains a learning environment, highlighting the evaluations made, with proof of attendance</li> <li>Survey on programs / projects /activities that maintain a learning environment</li> </ol>	<b>Quality</b>	<p><b>Synthesized the evaluations from the wider school community of the programs, projects, and/or activities that maintain the learning environment responsive to community context as evidenced by MOV 1</b></p>	<p><b>Consulted parents, guardians, and/or other external stakeholders on programs, projects, and/or activities that maintain the learning environments responsive to community context to reflect on and evaluate them as evidenced by MOV 2</b></p>	<p><b>Conducted coaching and mentoring sessions/ meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions with colleagues on programs, projects, and/or activities that maintain the learning environments responsive to community context to reflect on and evaluate them as evidenced by MOV 3</b></p>	<p><b>Conducted a survey to gather feedback on programs, projects, and/or activities that are responsive to community contexts as evidenced by MOV 4</b></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. Discussed with colleagues teaching and learning practices that apply existing codes, laws and regulations that apply to the teaching profession, and the responsibilities specified in the Code of Ethics for Professional Teachers. (PPST 6.3.3)	<p>5. <b>Proof/s of attendance</b> in coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</p> <p>6. <b>Minutes/Notes</b> of coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings / FGDs / other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</p> <p>7. <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 of attendance</b></p> <p>1. Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form (PMCF), with annotations highlighting the objective</p>	Quality	<p>Guided colleagues in planning for meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions to discuss teaching and learning practices that apply existing codes, law and regulations, as shown in MOV 4</p>	<p>Synthesized discussions with colleagues on the teaching and learning practices that apply existing codes, law and regulations during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 3</p>	<p>Evaluated with colleagues the teaching and learning practices that apply existing codes, law and regulations during meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions, as shown in MOV 2</p>	<p>Attended coaching and mentoring sessions/ meetings/LAC sessions / FGDs / other collegial discussions that discuss teaching and learning practices that apply existing codes, law and regulations, as shown in MOV 1</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)	
<b>13. Exhibited commitment to and supported teachers in the implementation of school policies and procedures to foster harmonious relationships with learners, parents and other stakeholders. (PPST 6.4.3)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Evaluation report</b> on the implementation of school policies / procedures or minutes of subject area / grade level meetings or professional meetings on evaluating school policies/procedures</li> <li><b>Minutes</b> of subject area / grade level meetings or professional meetings on the implementation progress of school policies / procedures [provide at least 2 to show discussions held]</li> <li><b>Minutes</b> of subject area / grade level meeting or professional meeting on disseminating information and implementing school policies / procedures [provide at least 2 to show discussions held]</li> <li><b>Proof of implementation</b> of school policies and procedures</li> </ol>	<b>Quality</b>	<b>Evaluated</b> with teachers the implementation of certain school policies and procedures as evidenced by MOV 1	<b>Conducted</b> discussions with teachers on the <b>progress of implementation</b> of certain school policies and procedures as evidenced by MOV 2	<b>Discussed</b> with teachers certain school policies and procedures for <b>uniform implementation</b> as evidenced by MOV 3	<b>Implemented</b> school policies and procedures as evidenced by MOV 4	No acceptable evidence was shown	

## KRA 5: Personal Growth and Professional Development

OBJECTIVE	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR					
		QET	Outstanding (5)	Very Satisfactory (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Unsatisfactory (2)	Poor (1)
<b>14. Identified and utilized personal professional strengths to uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession to help build a positive teaching and learning culture within the school. (PPST 7.2.3)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. IPCRF-DP</li> <li>2. A reflection/journal entry that highlights practices that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession</li> <li>3. <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>• Remarks 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>4. Others (please specify)</li> </ol>	Quality	<b>Identified and utilized personal professional strengths to uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession to help build a positive teaching and learning culture <b>beyond the school / Community Learning Center (CLC)</b> as evidenced by MOV 3</b>	<b>Identified and utilized personal professional strengths to uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession to help build a positive teaching and learning culture <b>within the school / Community Learning Center (CLC)</b> as evidenced by MOV 3</b>	<b>Identified and utilized personal professional strengths to uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession to help build a positive teaching and learning culture <b>within the learning area/department</b> as evidenced by MOV 2</b>	<b>Identified personal professional strengths</b> that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession as evidenced by MOV 1	No acceptable evidence was shown

## SUMMARY

Objective	COI / NCOI	MOVs / Proof of Demonstration of Objectives	No. of MOVs
Obj. 1 (PPST 1.1.3)	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 1.3.3)	COI		
Obj. 5 (PPST 1.7.3)	COI		
Obj. 7 (PPST 2.5.3)	COI	and proof of attendance of colleague/s	
Obj. 2 (PPST 1.2.3)	NCOI	At least one (1) of the following that highlights the objectives:	1
Obj. 4 (PPST 1.4.3)	NCOI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proof/s of attendance in coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/LAC sessions/FGDs/other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</li> </ul>	
Obj. 6 (PPST 2.4.3)	NCOI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes/Notes of coaching and mentoring sessions/ meetings/ FGDs/ other collegial discussions that highlights the objective</li> </ul>	
Obj. 8 (PPST 3.3.3)	NCOI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflection notes of teachers on the coaching and mentoring sessions/meetings/LAC sessions/ FGDs/ other collegial discussions that highlights the objective with proof/s of attendance</li> </ul>	
Obj. 9 (PPST 3.4.3)	NCOI		
Obj. 10 (PPST 4.3.3)	NCOI		
Obj. 12 (PPST 6.3.3)	NCOI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Monitoring and Coaching Form (PMCF), with annotations highlighting the objective</li> </ul>	
Obj. 11 (PPST 6.1.3)	NCOI	<b>Any one (1) of the following:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synthesis of evaluation of a program / project / activity that maintains the learning environment responsive to community contexts</li> <li>• Minutes of consultative meeting with parents / other external stakeholders on programs, projects, and/or activities that maintain a learning environment, highlighting the evaluations made, with proof of attendance</li> <li>• Minutes of focus group discussion (FGD) with teachers on a program / project / activity that maintains a learning environment, highlighting the evaluations made, with proof of attendance</li> <li>• Survey on programs/ projects / activities that maintain a learning environment</li> </ul>	1
Obj. 13 (PPST 6.4.3)	NCOI	<b>Any one (1) of the following:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation report on the implementation of school policies/ procedures or minutes of subject area / grade level meetings or professional meetings on evaluating school policies/procedures</li> <li>• Minutes of subject area/grade level meetings on the implementation progress of school policies/ procedures</li> <li>• Minutes of subject area/grade level meeting or professional meeting on disseminating information and implementing school policies/ procedures</li> <li>• Proof of implementation of school policies and procedures</li> </ul>	1
Obj. 14 (PPST 7.2.3)	NCOI	Reflection Notes	1
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>6</b>