



THE COMPETENCE AND CHALLENGES OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOLS DIVISION OF THE CITY OF ILAGAN AS INPUTS FOR A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Geraldo C. Ramos
Vilma C. Cabrera

*Saint Ferdinand College-City of Ilagan Campus, City of Ilagan,
Isabela, Philippines*

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the competence and challenges of Senior High School teachers in the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan for Academic Year 2025–2026, serving as basis for a proposed professional development plan. Using a descriptive quantitative research design, data were gathered from 195 teachers through a survey aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) and the Results-Based Performance Management System (RPMS). Statistical tools used included frequency and percentage, weighted mean, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and Pearson r correlation. Findings revealed that both proficient and highly proficient teachers consistently obtained Outstanding performance ratings across all Key Result Areas, with highly proficient teachers recording slightly higher means. In terms of challenges, proficient teachers generally experienced Slightly Challenging conditions, while highly proficient teachers reported Not Challenging at All across most domains. ANOVA results indicated significant differences in selected profile variables such as position, years of service, and training attended, while most other variables showed no significant differences. Relationship analysis showed generally weak correlations between competence and challenges, with only Personal Growth and Professional Development showing a significant relationship. Overall, results suggest that teacher competence is high and challenges are minimal, with professional development and training exposure emerging as key influencing factors in performance variation. The study recommends sustained capacity-building programs, strengthened mentoring systems, and targeted professional development interventions to further enhance instructional quality and teacher effectiveness. These inputs support the development of a data-driven professional development framework for continuous teacher improvement and institutional capacity strengthening in the division context.

Keywords: *Senior High School Teachers; PPST-RPMS; Teacher Competence; Professional Development; Instructional Challenges*

INTRODUCTION

In the pursuit of quality education in the twenty-first century, teachers occupy a pivotal role in shaping student learning outcomes and in transforming the educational system. As facilitators of knowledge, skills, and values, they exert significant influence on the success of educational programs through their competencies, pedagogical expertise, and professional commitment. The implementation of the K–12 Program in the Philippine educational system, particularly within the Senior High School Program, necessitates a high level of teacher competence across specialized tracks and strands designed to prepare learners for higher education, middle-level skill development, employment, or entrepreneurship. Moreover, the introduction of the Strengthened Senior High School Curriculum, piloted in senior high schools nationwide, has further underscored the demand for teachers who are sufficiently competent to achieve the national objectives of this reform. While this development addresses workforce needs, it has simultaneously raised concerns regarding the competencies and challenges encountered by teachers, particularly in delivering quality instruction aligned with curriculum standards.

The researcher himself, a non-education graduate serving as a senior high school teacher undertook this study to assess the competencies and challenges of public senior high school teachers in the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan, with the aim of providing inputs for a professional development plan. Specifically, the study sought to determine teachers' performance ratings in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy, learning environment and diversity of learners, curriculum and planning, assessment and reporting, community linkages and professional engagement, as well as personal growth and professional development. In addition, it examined the challenges encountered by teachers in adapting to the demands of the profession, particularly within the context of the K–12 Program and the Strengthened Senior High School Curriculum.

Research Questions

This study aimed to assess the competence and challenges of senior high school teachers in the public schools of the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan for the academic year 2025-2026.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1 Age
 - 1.2 Position
 - 1.3 Years of Service
 - 1.4 Bachelor's degree
 - 1.5 Year level assignment
 - 1.6 Subject taught
 - 1.7 Trainings attended for the past 3 years
2. How do the respondents perform based on their Individual Performance Commitment and Review ratings aligned with the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES) in the following key result areas:
 - 2.1 Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

- 2.2 Learning Environment & Diversity of Learners
- 2.3 Curriculum and Planning & Assessment and Reporting
- 2.4 Community Linkages and Professional Engagement
- 2.5 Personal Growth and Professional Development
- 3. Is there a significant difference in the individual performance rating of the respondents when grouped according to profile?
- 4. What is the extent of the challenges encountered by the respondents in terms of:
 - 4.1 Content Knowledge and Pedagogy
 - 4.2 Learning Environment & Diversity of Learners
 - 4.3 Curriculum and Planning & Assessment and Reporting
 - 4.4 Community Linkages and Professional Engagement
 - 4.5 Personal Growth and Professional Development
- 5. Is there a significant difference in the challenges encountered by the respondents when grouped according to their profile?
- 6. Is there a significant relationship between the competence and challenges encountered by the respondents?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed the descriptive research method to systematically gather data on the competencies and challenges encountered by senior high school teachers in the public schools of the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan. As emphasized by Sirisilla (2023), descriptive research provides a detailed and accurate portrayal of the characteristics and behaviors of a particular population or subject. It is particularly appropriate when the objective is to identify and analyze characteristics, frequencies, trends, and categories without manipulating variables.

Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in the public senior high schools of the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan, established under Republic Act No. 10169 in 2012 to provide quality education services. The division, covering 91 barangays and ISO-certified since 2018, ensures compliance with international quality management standards. It currently supervises 15 Senior High School institutions distributed across five districts: West, South, North, San Antonio, and Northwest. These include urban and rural schools such as Isabela National High School, ISAT campuses, and various integrated and national high schools. The distribution reflects the division's structured implementation of the SHS program across diverse geographical and administrative areas, ensuring accessible and standardized secondary education throughout the City of Ilagan.

Selection and Description of Respondents

The respondents of this study comprised the 195 senior high school teachers assigned to public schools within the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan during Academic Year 2025–2026. To ensure comprehensive representation, the study

employed total population sampling, wherein all members of the target population were included. The adoption of total population sampling guaranteed equal opportunity for all members of the target population to participate, thereby strengthening the validity and reliability of the findings. The procedure was facilitated through a direct survey method, with the researcher personally administering and delivering the questionnaires to the respondents.

Table 1 presents the distribution of respondents by school within the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan.

Table 1
Distribution of Respondents of the Study in the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan for the School Year 2025-2026

Senior High Schools	No. of Respondents
Dappat Integrated School	2
Gayong-Gayong Sur Integrated School	2
Ilagan West National High School	4
Isabela National High School	70
Isabela School of Arts and Trades- Main	47
Isabela School of Arts and Trades-Cabannungan Annex	8
Lupigue Integrated School	6
Manaring Integrated School	9
Rang-Ayan National High School	10
San Antonio National Agro-Industrial and Vocational High School	6
San Lorenzo Integrated School	8
San Pedro Integrated School	2
San Rafael National Vocational High School	6
Sindun Bayabo Integrated School	5
Sta. Isabel National High School	10
Total	195

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher first secured formal authorization from the Office of Planning and Research, the adviser, and the Schools Division Superintendent of the City of Ilagan before data collection. After validating and testing the reliability of the research instrument, questionnaires were prepared and distributed to the respondents. With the approval of school heads, data gathering was conducted both through personal distribution and an online survey link. Completed questionnaires were collected, consolidated, and systematically tabulated. The data were then processed by a statistician for appropriate statistical treatment. Finally, the results were analyzed, interpreted, and discussed to generate meaningful insights, conclusions, and implications for the study.

Statistical Treatment of Data

To analyze the data gathered, the following statistical treatments were used:

Frequency and Percentage Distribution. Frequency and percentage distribution were employed to describe the demographic profile of the respondents. Specifically, these methods were utilized to present data on age, position, years of service,

bachelor's degree, year level assignment, subject taught, and training attended. This facilitated a clear and systematic representation of the respondents' characteristics.

Weighted Mean. This was used to analyze the data pertaining to the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form (IPCRF) ratings as well as the challenges encountered by senior high school teachers. This statistical tool allowed for the identification of central tendencies in respondents' performance ratings and perceptions, thereby providing a comprehensive measure of their overall responses.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Analysis of Variance was applied to determine whether significant differences existed in the IPCRF ratings and the challenges encountered by senior high school teachers when grouped according to profile variables. This test provided insights into the extent to which demographic and professional characteristics influenced variations in performance and perceived challenges.

Pearson r-Correlation. The Pearson r-correlation was utilized to examine the relationship between the IPCRF ratings and the challenges encountered by senior high school teachers, grouped according to profile variables. This statistical method enabled the identification of the strength and direction of associations between performance ratings and the challenges faced, thereby highlighting potential interdependencies among these variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:

a. Age

Table 2
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents as to Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
24-28 years old	26	13.33
29-33 years old	75	38.46
34-38 years old	44	22.56
39-43 years old	23	11.79
44-48 years old	16	8.21
49-53 years old	8	4.10
54-55 years old	3	1.54
Total	195	100

Table 2 presents the distribution of respondents according to age. The majority fall within the 24–33 age group, followed by 34–53 years, which comprises 46.66 percent. The smallest group is aged 54–55 years, representing 1.54 percent. Overall, the data indicate that most respondents are in the early to mid-career stage, suggesting that senior high school teachers are generally in a developmental phase where pedagogical competence is still being refined, classroom management skills are being strengthened, and professional identity continues to develop. This finding is supported by Mufidah et al., (2021) who emphasized that age and teaching experience

contribute to improved professional performance, aligning with the present study's implication that younger to middle-aged teachers are still undergoing continuous growth in teaching competence.

Teaching Position

Table 3
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Teaching Position

Teaching Position	Frequency	Percentage
Teacher I	25	12.82
Teacher II	68	34.87
Teacher III	94	48.21
Master Teacher I	1	0.51
Master Teacher II	7	3.59
Total	195	100

Table 3 shows that most respondents are Teacher III (48.21%), followed by Teacher II (34.87%), Teacher I (12.82%), Master Teacher II (3.59%), and Master Teacher I (0.51%). This indicates that the sample is largely composed of experienced and professionally advancing teachers, particularly at the Teacher III level. The distribution reflects DepEd's merit-based promotion system under DepEd Order No. 66, s. 2007, the Expanded Career Progression System under Executive Order No. 174, s. 2022, and Republic Act No. 12288, s. 2025, as well as the Equivalent Record Form system for career advancement based on service, training, and qualifications. Early-career teachers (Teacher I and II) are guided by DepEd Order No. 3, s. 2016 and supported by DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017. The limited number of Master Teachers is attributed to restricted plantilla items, as noted by EDCOM II, despite eligibility for promotion under DepEd Order No. 03, s. 2025.

b. Years of Service

Table 4
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Years of Service

Years of Service	Frequency	Percentage
2-7 years	88	45.13
8-13 years	94	48.21
14-19 years	8	4.10
20-25 years	2	1.03
26-29 years	3	1.54
Total	195	100

Table 4 shows the distribution of respondents according to years of service. The largest group consists of teachers with 8–13 years of service (94 or 48.21%), followed closely by those with 2–7 years (88 or 45.13%). Only a small proportion have longer service histories, with 14–19 years (8 or 4.10%), 20–25 years (2 or 1.54%), and 26–29 years (3 or 1.54%). This pattern is consistent with the implementation timeline of the Senior High School program, which began in 2016. As such, most respondents naturally fall within the 2–13 year service range, reflecting teachers who entered or

transitioned into Senior High School during its early years. In contrast, those with more than 14 years of service represent educators who were already in the profession prior to the program's implementation and later adapted to the SHS context, bringing broader prior experience.

Overall, the distribution suggests a workforce largely composed of early- to mid-career teachers who are still developing and consolidating their instructional practice. This aligns with Nguyễn et al. (2025), who found that teachers with 6–20 years of experience show stronger career adaptability, while also emphasizing that length of service alone does not define competence and must be supported by continuous professional development.

c. Bachelor's Degree

Table 5
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Bachelor's Degree Earned

Bachelor's Degree	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED)		
<i>Major in</i>		
<i>Biology</i>	4	2.1
<i>Chemistry</i>	1	0.5
<i>English</i>	31	15.9
<i>Filipino</i>	16	8.2
<i>General Science</i>	10	5.1
<i>MAPEH</i>	3	1.5
<i>Mathematics</i>	23	11.8
<i>Physical Education</i>	4	2.1
<i>Physical Science</i>	2	1.0
<i>Physics</i>	7	3.6
<i>Social Science</i>	11	5.6
Bachelor in English Education	1	0.5
Bachelor in Filipino Education	3	1.5
Bachelor in Mathematics Education	2	1.0
Bachelor in Physical Education	1	0.5
Bachelor of Science in Industrial Education (BSIE)		
<i>Major in</i>		
<i>Electrical Technology</i>	2	1.0
<i>Automotive Technology</i>	2	1.0
<i>Electronics Technology</i>	1	0.5
<i>Food Trades Technology</i>	3	1.5
<i>Home Economics</i>	2	1.0
<i>Woodworking Technology</i>	1	0.5
<i>Mathematics</i>	1	0.5
<i>Cosmetology / Beauty Care</i>	2	1.0
Bachelor of Technical Teacher Education (BTTEd)		
<i>Major in</i>		
<i>Automotive Technology</i>	1	0.5
<i>Agricultural Crop Production</i>	1	0.5
<i>Electrical Technology</i>	2	1.0
<i>Food Service Management</i>	5	2.56
Bachelor of Technology and Livelihood Education (BTLEd)		
<i>Major in</i>		
<i>Home Economics</i>	3	1.5

<i>Industrial Arts</i>	2	1.0
<i>Agricultural and Fishery Arts</i>	1	0.5
Bachelor of Arts in English	1	0.5
Bachelor of Arts in History	1	0.5
Bachelor of Arts major in Mass Communication	1	0.5
Bachelor of Arts in Education major in English	2	1.0
Bachelor of Arts in Legal Management	2	1.0
Bachelor of Arts in Public Administration	1	0.5
Bachelor of Science in Accountancy	7	3.6
Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering	1	0.5
Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering	2	1.0
Bachelor of Science in Information Technology	11	5.6
Bachelor of Science in Medical Technologies	1	0.5
Bachelor of Science in Nursing	4	2.1
Bachelor of Science in Physical Therapy	2	1.0
Bachelor of Science in Public Administration	2	1.0
Bachelor of Science in Psychology	1	0.5
Bachelor of Science in Technical Technology	2	1.0
Bachelor of Science in Tourism Management	1	0.5
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration		
<i>Major in</i>		
<i>Financial Management</i>	1	0.5
<i>Management Accounting</i>	3	1.5
<i>Marketing Management</i>	1	0.5
Total	195	100

Table 5 presents respondents' bachelor's degree distribution. Most hold Bachelor of Secondary Education (57.4%), with majors in English (15.9%), Mathematics (11.8%), Filipino (8.2%), Social Science (5.6%), General Science (5.1%), Physics (3.6%), and Biology and Physical Education (2.1%), supporting Tabliago (2025) on English as a dominant specialization in secondary education. Other education degrees comprise 3.6%, including Filipino, Mathematics, English, and Physical Education Education programs, indicating alignment between training and teaching roles. A further 14.9% hold vocational degrees (BSIE, BTTEd, BTLEd), specializing in fields such as Food Trades, Electrical, Automotive, Home Economics, Cosmetology, and Food Service Management, reflecting targeted deployment in TechVoc strands. Meanwhile, 24.10% possess non-education degrees in IT, Accountancy, Nursing, and Business-related fields, consistent with K–12 hiring demands under DepEd Order No. 3, s. 2016 to ensure subject expertise. Overall, 75.90% are education graduates, showing a predominantly teaching-trained workforce supplemented by industry-specialized professionals.

d. Year level assignment

Table 6
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Year Level Assignment

Year Level Assignment	Frequency	Percentage
Grade 11	41	21.03
Grade 12	47	24.10
Grade 11 and Grade 12	107	54.87
Total	195	100

Table 6 shows respondents' year level assignments. Most teachers (107 or 54.87%) handle both Grade 11 and Grade 12, while 41 (21.03%) are assigned to Grade 11 only and 47 (24.10%) to Grade 12 only. This indicates that over half of the respondents teach across both levels. The pattern reflects the structure of the Senior High School curriculum, where subjects within a track are vertically aligned, allowing teachers to teach across grade levels based on specialization. It also aligns with Republic Act No. 4670 (1966), which limits teaching to six hours daily, often requiring multiple assignments. Castro et al. (2004) noted similar workload challenges in multi-subject teaching.

e. Subject Taught

Table 7
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents According to Subject Taught

Subject Taught	Frequency	Percentage
Applied Subject	9	4.62
Applied Subject/ Elective Subject	1	0.51
Applied Subject/ Specialized Subject	5	2.56
Core Subject/ Applied Subject	14	7.18
Core Subject/ Applied Subject/ Specialized Subject	5	2.56
Core Subject/ Elective Subject	13	6.67
Core Subject/ Specialized Subject	45	23.08
Core Subject	73	37.44
Elective Subject	12	6.15
Elective/Specialized Subject	2	1.03
Specialized Subject	16	8.21
Total	195	100

Table 7 presents the distribution of respondents according to the subjects they teach. The majority are assigned to Core Subjects (73 or 37.44%), followed by those teaching a combination of Core and Specialized Subjects (45 or 23.08%), indicating that most teachers handle foundational learning areas in Senior High School. Other respondents teach varied combinations of Core, Applied, Elective, and Specialized Subjects, reflecting flexible assignment practices within different tracks. Smaller proportions are exclusively assigned to Specialized (16 or 8.21%), Elective (12 or 6.15%), and Applied Subjects (9 or 4.60%). Overall, the data show that teaching assignments are multidisciplinary in nature, requiring teachers to manage diverse subject areas. This aligns with Table 5, where a mix of education and non-education degree holders may experience subject mismatch, affecting both content mastery and pedagogical delivery. As noted by Demapendan (2004), such out-of-field teaching situations often lead to challenges in instruction, requiring adaptive strategies and stronger professional development support.

f. Training attended for the past 3 years

Table 8
Distribution of Respondents According to the Level of Training Attended

Level of Training Attended	Frequency
International	6

National	131
Regional	57
Division	195
School-based	195

Table 8 shows respondents' level of training attendance. Most participated in both division- and school-based trainings (195 respondents), followed by national-level trainings (131), regional trainings (57), and international trainings (6). This indicates that teachers are highly engaged in localized professional development activities, particularly at the school and division levels, reflecting strong implementation of capacity-building programs for instructional improvement and professional growth. However, participation declines as the training level becomes more advanced, suggesting limited access to national, regional, and especially international development opportunities for most teachers. This pattern implies that while foundational professional development is widely accessible, higher-level exposure remains restricted to a few educators.

These findings align with Cabradilla (2025), who also reported that teachers predominantly attend school- and division-based trainings, with fewer progressing to higher-level professional fora. Overall, the results highlight the need for expanded and more equitable access to advanced training opportunities to further strengthen teacher competence and instructional effectiveness.

2. How do the respondents perform based on their Individual Performance Commitment and Review ratings aligned with the Performance Management and Evaluation System (PMES)?

a. Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

Table 9
Mean Distribution and Qualitative Description on the Performance of Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers Along Content Knowledge and Pedagogy Based on their Individual Performance Commitment Rating

No.	KRA 1. Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	Mean	Qualitative Description
Proficient Teachers			
1	Applied knowledge of content within and across curriculum teaching areas.	4.93	Outstanding
2	Used research-based knowledge and principles of teaching and learning to enhance professional practice.	4.83	Outstanding
3	Ensured the positive use of ICT to facilitate the teaching and learning process.	4.90	Outstanding
4	Used a range of teaching strategies that enhance learner achievement in literacy and numeracy skills.	4.91	Outstanding
5	Used effective verbal and non-verbal classroom communication strategies to support learner understanding, participation, engagement and achievement	4.91	Outstanding
Overall Mean		4.89	Outstanding
Highly Proficient Teachers			
1	Modeled effective applications of content knowledge within and across curriculum teaching areas.	5.00	Outstanding

2	Promoted effective strategies in the positive use of ICT to facilitate the teaching and learning process.	5.00	Outstanding
3	Evaluated with colleagues the effectiveness of teaching strategies that promote learner achievement in literacy and numeracy.	5.00	Outstanding
4	Collaborated with colleagues in the conduct and application of research to enrich knowledge of content and pedagogy.	5.00	Outstanding
5	Overall Mean	5.00	Outstanding

Table 9 presents the performance ratings of proficient and highly proficient teachers in Content Knowledge and Pedagogy. Results show that all indicators for both groups were rated Outstanding, indicating strong competence aligned with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers–Results-Based Performance Management System (PPST-RPMS), particularly Key Result Area 1. For proficient teachers, weighted means ranged from 4.83 to 4.93, with an overall mean of 4.89 (Outstanding). The highest rating (4.93) was observed in applying content knowledge across curriculum areas, while the lowest (4.83) involved the use of research-based knowledge, suggesting a need to further strengthen evidence-based instructional practices. Indicators on varied strategies and communication both scored 4.91, reflecting effective learner-centered instruction. Highly proficient teachers obtained a perfect mean of 5.00 across all indicators, demonstrating exemplary mastery in content integration, ICT use, collaborative evaluation, and research application. Overall, both groups performed at an Outstanding level, with highly proficient teachers showing consistently superior performance, reflecting PPST expectations for progressive career stages.

These findings align with Siri et al. (2020), Haron et al. (2021), Sahana (2018), Dahan (2022), Cadacio & Albite (2025), Ismail et al. (2020), and Bellibas et al. (2022), emphasizing the central role of pedagogical competence in instructional effectiveness and learner achievement.

b. Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners

Table 10
Mean Distribution and Qualitative Description on the Performance of Proficient Teachers along with Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners based on their Individual Performance Commitment Rating

No.	KRA 2. Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	Mean	Qualitative Description
Proficient Teachers			
1	Maintained supportive learning environments that nurture and inspire learners to participate, cooperate and collaborate in continued learning.	4.92	Outstanding
2	Applied a range of successful strategies that maintain learning environments that motivate learners to work productively by assuming responsibility for their own learning.	4.9	Outstanding
3	Designed, adapted and implemented teaching strategies that are responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents.	4.83	Outstanding
4	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	4.73	Outstanding

	to armed conflict, urban resettlement or disasters; child abuse and child labor practices.		
5	Overall Mean	4.85	Outstanding
Highly Proficient Teachers			
1	Displayed a wide range of effective verbal and non-verbal classroom communication strategies to support learner understanding, participation, engagement and achievement.	5.00	Outstanding
2	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.	5.00	Outstanding
3	Modeled successful strategies and supported colleagues in promoting learning environments that effectively motivate learners to work productively by assuming responsibility for their own learning.	5.00	Outstanding
Overall Mean		5.00	Outstanding

Table 10 presents the performance ratings of proficient and highly proficient teachers in the domains of Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners. Results show that all indicators across both career stages were rated Outstanding, indicating strong competence in fostering inclusive, supportive, and learner-centered classrooms in the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan.

For proficient teachers, weighted means ranged from 4.73 to 4.92, with an overall mean of 4.85 (Outstanding). The highest rating (4.92) was on maintaining supportive and collaborative learning environments, while responsive strategies for learners with disabilities (4.90) and gifted learners (4.83) were also rated Outstanding. The lowest mean (4.73) involved learners in difficult circumstances, though still within the Outstanding range. Highly proficient teachers obtained a perfect mean of 5.00 across all indicators, reflecting exemplary and consistent competence in communication strategies, collaboration, and learner empowerment. Overall, both groups performed at an Outstanding level, with highly proficient teachers showing uniformly perfect performance, reflecting PPST-RPMS KRA 2 expectations and progressive career-stage standards.

These findings align with Bartz and Bartz (2018), Leshem (2019), Vertucio (2019), Cadacio & Albite (2025), and Bell and Thompson (2021), emphasizing differentiated instruction and strong classroom management as key drivers of inclusive and effective learning environments.

c. Curriculum Planning and Assessment and Reporting

Table 11
Mean Distribution and Qualitative Description on the Performance of Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers along the Curriculum and Planning and Assessment and Reporting based on Their Individual Performance Commitment Rating

No.	KRA 3. Curriculum and Planning and Assessment and Reporting	Mean	Qualitative Description
Proficient Teachers			
1	Adapted and implemented learning programs that ensure relevance and responsiveness to the needs of all learners.	4.68	Outstanding
Overall Mean		4.68	Outstanding

Highly Proficient Teachers			
1	Assisted colleagues to design, adapt and implement teaching strategies that are responsive to learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents.	4.63	Outstanding
2	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.	5.00	Outstanding
3	Worked collaboratively with colleagues to evaluate the design of learning programs that develop the knowledge and skills of learners at different ability levels.	4.50	Outstanding
Overall Mean		4.71	Outstanding

Table 11 presents the performance ratings of proficient and highly proficient teachers in Curriculum and Planning, Assessment, and Reporting under the PPST and PMES frameworks. Findings show that all indicators across both career stages were consistently rated Outstanding, indicating strong competence in curriculum implementation, instructional planning, and assessment practices among Senior High School teachers in the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan.

For proficient teachers, a single indicator on adapting and implementing learning programs for diverse learners obtained a mean of 4.68 (Outstanding), reflecting solid competence in responsive curriculum delivery aligned with KRA 3. This outcome is consistent with the expectations of the PMES framework and is further supported by Quisquino (2022), who emphasized teachers' responsibility in ensuring effective instructional implementation. For highly proficient teachers, weighted means ranged from 4.50 to 5.00, with an overall mean of 4.71 (Outstanding). The highest score (5.00) was on collaboratively evaluating strategies for learners in difficult circumstances, while the lowest (4.50) involved program design evaluation across ability levels, though still rated Outstanding. These results align with Quisquino (2022), highlighting master teachers' supervisory and collaborative roles in improving instructional practices.

Overall, both groups demonstrated Outstanding performance, with highly proficient teachers exhibiting broader collaborative and leadership competencies in curriculum, assessment, and reporting, consistent with PPST expectations and KRA 3 standards.

d. Community Linkages and Professional Engagement

Table 12
Mean Distribution and Qualitative Description on the Performance of Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers along Community Linkages and Professional Engagement based on their Individual Performance Commitment Rating

No.	KRA 4. Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	Mean	Qualitative Description
Proficient Teachers			
1	Maintained learning environments that are responsive to community contexts.	4.62	Outstanding

2	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.	4.76	Outstanding
3	Complied with and implemented school policies and procedures consistently to foster harmonious relationships with learners, parents, and other stakeholders.	4.83	Outstanding
4	Overall Mean	4.73	Outstanding
Highly Proficient Teachers			
1	Reflected on and evaluated learning environments that are responsive to community contexts.	4.88	Outstanding
2	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.	4.88	Outstanding
3	Exhibited commitment to and supported teachers in the implementation of school policies and procedures to foster harmonious relationships with learners, parents and other stakeholders.	4.63	Outstanding
Over-all Mean		4.79	Outstanding

Table 12 presents the performance ratings of proficient and highly proficient teachers in Community Linkages and Professional Engagement under PPST, aligned with KRA 4 of the PMES framework. Results show that all indicators across both groups were rated Outstanding, indicating strong competence in building community partnerships and sustaining professional engagement among Senior High School teachers in the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan.

For proficient teachers, weighted means ranged from 4.62 to 4.83, with an overall mean of 4.73 (Outstanding). The highest score (4.83) was on compliance with school policies and procedures, while the lowest (4.62) involved responsiveness to community contexts, though still rated Outstanding. These findings reflect strong adherence to professional standards and reflective practice, consistent with Siri et al. (2020), Aslan and Eröz (2025), and Macayanan and Abalos (2025), who emphasized the importance of teacher commitment, collaboration, and stakeholder engagement in improving instructional effectiveness. For highly proficient teachers, weighted means ranged from 4.63 to 4.88, with an overall mean of 4.79 (Outstanding). The highest mean (4.88) was observed in reflecting on community-responsive learning environments and engaging colleagues in professional discussions grounded in laws and the Code of Ethics, while the lowest (4.63) related to supporting school policy implementation. These findings align with Conales et al. (2023), highlighting master teachers' advanced mentoring and technical assistance roles across PPST domains.

Overall, both groups demonstrated Outstanding performance, with highly proficient teachers showing slightly higher competence and stronger leadership in professional engagement, consistent with PPST expectations and KRA 4 standards.

e. Personal Growth and Professional Development

Table 13
Mean Distribution and Qualitative Description on the Performance of Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers along Personal Growth and Professional Development based on their Individual Performance Commitment Rating

No.	KRA 5. Personal Growth and Professional Development	Mean	Qualitative Description
Proficient Teacher			
1	Adopted practices that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession by exhibiting qualities such as a caring attitude, respect, and integrity.	4.82	Outstanding
Overall Mean		4.82	Outstanding
Highly Proficient Teachers			
1	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.	5.00	Outstanding
Overall Mean		5.00	Outstanding

Table 13 presents the performance ratings of proficient and highly proficient teachers in Personal Growth and Professional Development under PPST, aligned with KRA 5 of the PMES framework. Findings show that all indicators across both groups were rated Outstanding, indicating strong professional competence and sustained commitment to continuous development among Senior High School teachers in the Schools Division of Ilagan.

For proficient teachers, the overall mean was 4.82 (Outstanding), reflecting consistent engagement in reflective practice, ethical behavior, and professional accountability. This aligns with PPST expectations on lifelong learning and is supported by Lefebvre et al. (2022), Almazroa and Alotaibi (2023), and Frianeza et al. (2024), emphasizing reflective practice, upskilling, and structured professional development. For highly proficient teachers, the overall mean was 5.00 (Outstanding), indicating exemplary competence and sustained professional growth, with strong embodiment of integrity and leadership. Overall, highly proficient teachers demonstrate superior performance in KRA 5. These findings align with Quisquino (2022), Cai et al. (2022), and Badmus and Olorisade (2013), highlighting the role of leadership, stakeholder engagement, and continuous development in enhancing teaching quality.

Table 14
Summary of the Performance of Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers Based on their Individual Performance Rating

No.	Key Result Area on the Performance of Teachers	Mean		Qualitative Description
		Proficient Teachers	Highly Proficient Teachers	
1	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	4.89	5.00	Outstanding
2	Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	4.85	5.00	Outstanding
3	Curriculum and Planning and Assessment and Reporting	4.68	4.71	Outstanding
4	Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	4.73	4.79	Outstanding

5	Personal Growth and Professional Development	4.82	5.00	Outstanding
Overall Mean		4.79	4.90	Outstanding

Table 14 presents the consolidated performance ratings of proficient and highly proficient teachers across the five KRAs under the PPST–RPMS framework. Results show that both groups consistently achieved Outstanding ratings, with overall means of 4.79 for proficient teachers and 4.90 for highly proficient teachers, indicating a high level of professional competence among Senior High School teachers in the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan. Across domains, highly proficient teachers consistently obtained higher ratings, including perfect scores of 5.00 in Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners, and Personal Growth and Professional Development, surpassing proficient teachers in all areas. Both groups remained Outstanding in Community Linkages and Professional Engagement, while Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting recorded the lowest but still Outstanding means. Overall, findings confirm that career progression is associated with higher performance levels, supporting PPST expectations and aligning with Cabradilla (2025), Gestupa (2023), and Cadacio and Albite (2025).

3. Is there a significant difference in the individual performance rating of the respondents when grouped according to profile?

a. Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

Table 15
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Individual Performance Ratings for Content Knowledge and Pedagogy When Grouped According to Profile

Profile	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Age	0.432	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Position	0.008	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Years of Service	0.457	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Bachelor's degree	0.04	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Year level assignment	0.038	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Subject taught	0.843	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Training attended for the past 3 years	< 0.001	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 15 presents the ANOVA results on respondents' performance in Content Knowledge and Pedagogy across selected profile variables at the 0.05 level of significance. Findings show that age, years of service, and subject taught obtained p-values greater than 0.05; thus, their null hypotheses are accepted, indicating no significant differences in performance across these variables. This result aligns with Cabañero (2024), who found no age-based differences in teacher competencies, but contrasts with González-Fernández et al. (2024), who reported age-related variations.

In contrast, teaching position, bachelor's degree, year level assignment, and training attended in the past three years yielded p-values below 0.05; thus, the null hypotheses are rejected, indicating significant differences in performance. These differences suggest that professional roles, academic preparation, teaching assignments, and exposure to training influence pedagogical competence.

These findings support Pañares et al. (2021) and Salvador (2025), who emphasized that teacher performance varies significantly based on position, experience, training, and related professional factors affecting instructional effectiveness.

b. Learning Environment & Diversity of Learners

Table 16
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Individual Performance Ratings for Learning Environment & Diversity of Learners When Grouped According to Profile

Profile	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Age	0.002	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Position	0.004	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Years of Service	0.505	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Bachelor's degree	0.009	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Year level assignment	0.966	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Subject taught	0.207	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Training attended for the past 3 years	0.029	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 16 shows that respondents' performance in Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners does not significantly differ when grouped according to years of service, year-level assignment, and subject taught, as all p-values exceeded 0.05. This indicates that teachers demonstrate comparable competencies in managing classroom environments and addressing learner diversity regardless of experience, assignment, or specialization. The result suggests that standardized implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), institutional policies, and continuous professional development programs may contribute to a consistent level of teacher competence.

However, this finding contrasts with Salvador (2025), who reported that years of service significantly influence teacher performance, emphasizing experience as a key factor in instructional competence. The difference may be explained by strong mentoring systems, structured training, and uniform competency standards that minimize variation among teachers.

In addition, the result aligns with Bart and Bartz (1996) and Leshem (2009), who highlighted that structured training and collaborative professional development can equalize teacher performance. Overall, findings suggest that sustained professional development and PPST-aligned practices may play a stronger role than experience alone in ensuring consistent teacher competence in inclusive learning environments.

c. Curriculum and Planning & Assessment and Reporting

Table 17
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Individual Performance Ratings for Curriculum and Planning & Assessment and Reporting When Grouped According to Profile

Profile	p value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Age	0.857	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Position	0.42	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Years of Service	0.72	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Bachelor's degree	0.8	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Year level assignment	0.429	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Subject taught	0.137	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Training attended for the past 3 years	0.015	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 17 presents the ANOVA results on differences in respondents' performance in Curriculum and Planning, and Assessment and Reporting at the 0.05 level of significance. Findings show that only training attended within the past three years yielded a p-value below 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis is rejected for this variable. This indicates a significant difference in performance based on training exposure, suggesting that recent professional development plays a key role in strengthening teachers' competencies in curriculum design, instructional planning, assessment, and reporting. Such training enhances pedagogical knowledge, improves instructional strategies, and supports more effective evaluation practices.

In contrast, age, position, years of service, bachelor's degree, year level assignment, and subject taught all obtained p-values above 0.05; hence, their null hypotheses are accepted. This suggests no significant differences in performance across these profile variables, indicating relatively consistent competencies among teachers in these domains regardless of demographic or professional characteristics. These findings align with Manigbas and De Luna (2004) and Tabliago (2025), who reported no significant differences in assessment and reporting competencies based on selected profile variables. However, they contradict González-Fernández et al. (2024) and Salvador (2025), who found significant differences influenced by age, service length, and training, highlighting the critical impact of professional development on teacher performance.

d. Community Linkages and Professional Engagement

Table 18
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Individual Performance Ratings for Community Linkages and Professional Engagement When Grouped According to Profile

Profile	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Age	0.015	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Position	0.381	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Years of Service	0.662	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Bachelor's degree	0.999	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Year level assignment	0.331	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Subject taught	0.152	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Training attended for the past 3 years	0.341	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant

Table 18 presents the ANOVA results on differences in respondents' performance in Community Linkages and Professional Engagement at the 0.05 level of significance. Findings show that only age yielded a p-value below 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis for this variable is rejected, indicating a significant difference in performance when grouped according to age. This suggests that teachers' community engagement and professional involvement vary across age groups.

The result implies that age may influence levels of experience, maturity, and established relationships within the community, which in turn affect participation in school and stakeholder-related activities. Older teachers may demonstrate stronger engagement due to accumulated experience and wider professional networks, while younger teachers may still be developing exposure and involvement in community-based initiatives.

This finding is consistent with Salvador (2025), who emphasized that age significantly affects teachers' community engagement and professional collaboration. Overall, the result highlights age as a key factor in shaping performance in Community Linkages and Professional Engagement, suggesting the need for differentiated support across career stages.

e. Personal Growth and Professional Development

Table 19
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Individual Performance Ratings in Personal Growth and Professional Development When Grouped According to Profile

Profile	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Age	0.247	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Position	< 0.001	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Years of Service	< 0.002	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Bachelor's degree	0.637	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Year level assignment	0.816	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Subject taught	0.936	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Training attended for the past 3 years	< 0.001	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 19 presents ANOVA results on Personal Growth and Professional Development at the 0.05 level of significance. Findings reveal that position, years of service, and training attended in the past three years have p-values below 0.05; thus, the null hypotheses are rejected, indicating significant differences in performance. Higher positions, longer service, and recent training are associated with stronger engagement in professional growth, likely due to increased responsibilities, experience, and access to development opportunities. This supports Salvador (2024), who emphasized their influence on teacher competence. In contrast, age, bachelor's degree, year level assignment, and subject taught showed no significant differences, indicating consistent performance across these factors and aligning with Cabañero (2024).

4. What is the extent of the challenges encountered by the respondents?

a. Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

Table 20
Mean Distribution and Qualitative Description on the Challenges Encountered by the Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers as to Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

No.	KRA 1. Content and Pedagogy	Proficient Teachers		Highly Proficient Teachers	
		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
1	I have limited understanding of effective teaching strategies and methods.	1.99	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All
2	I struggle to employ diverse teaching methods to cater to the different learning styles and interests, leading to disengagement among the students.	2.07	Slightly Challenging	1.75	Slightly Challenging
3	I rely heavily on traditional lecture-based instruction, failing to engage students through interactive and participatory learning experiences.	1.92	Slightly Challenging	1.13	Not Challenging at All
4	I struggle in making a meaningful connection between classroom content and real-world applications, diminishing students' interest and relevance in the material.	1.84	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All
5	I have difficulty in differentiating instructions to meet the needs of diverse learners within the same classroom, including students with special needs.	2.03	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All
6	I insufficiently differentiate in meeting the needs of diverse learners, resulting in disengagement among my students who require additional support or enrichment.	1.94	Slightly Challenging	1.13	Not Challenging at All
7	I struggle to cater to the diverse needs and learning styles of the students.	2.03	Slightly Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All
8	I experience difficulty in updating my subject matter knowledge to keep	1.96	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All

	pace with recent developments and innovations in my field of specialization.				
9	I have limited confidence in integrating higher-order thinking skills (e.g., critical thinking, problem-solving, and creativity) into my daily lesson delivery	1.87	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All
10	I struggle to effectively integrate appropriate instructional technologies and digital resources to enhance content delivery and student engagement.	1.96	Slightly Challenging	1.13	Not Challenging at All
Overall Mean		1.94	Slightly Challenging	1.28	Not Challenging at All

Table 20 presents challenges in Content Knowledge and Pedagogy. Results show slightly challenging perceptions, with highly proficient teachers reporting lower difficulty than proficient teachers, indicating that experience reduces instructional challenges. Proficient teachers obtained a mean of 1.94, with the highest difficulty in using diverse teaching methods (2.07) and differentiating instruction (2.03), while real-life contextualization was least challenging (1.84). Highly proficient teachers recorded a mean of 1.28, showing minimal challenges, though diverse methods remained highest (1.75), while ICT integration and differentiation were lowest (1.13). Overall, highly proficient teachers experienced fewer challenges. These align with Tanjung (2022), Nurfadillah (2015), Hidayatullah et al. (2024), Limen & Arante (2025), Ningtiyas and Jailani (2018), Boquirin (2025), and Cadacio et al. (2025).

b. Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners

Table 21
Mean Distribution and Qualitative Description on the Challenges Encountered by the Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers as to Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners

No.	KRA 2. Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	Proficient Teachers		Highly Proficient Teachers	
		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
1	I struggle to establish an authority figure in the classroom, leading to disruptions and a lack of respect from the students.	1.79	Slightly Challenging	1.00	Not Challenging at All
2	I have difficulty in managing disruptive behavior, including addressing conflicts and maintaining a positive learning environment.	1.85	Slightly Challenging	1.00	Not Challenging at All
3	I have limited knowledge in arranging	1.82	Slightly Challenging	1.00	Not Challenging at All

	the physical space and resources inside the classroom in a way to promotes learning and minimizes distractions.				
4	I have difficulty keeping all students actively engaged in learning activities, leading to disinterest and off-task behavior.	1.98	Slightly Challenging	1.00	Not Challenging at All
5	I have difficulty in establishing a positive classroom environment characterized by enthusiasm, rapport, and mutual respect, which can impact students' motivation and engagement levels.	1.87	Slightly Challenging	1.00	Not Challenging at All
6	I struggle with communication, expectations, directions, and feedback, leading to confusion and disengagement among students.	1.76	Not Challenging at All	1.00	Not Challenging at All
7	I have limited use of technology in my lessons, which may lead to missing opportunities to enhance students' engagement through interactive tools and resources.	1.84	Slightly Challenging	1.13	Not Challenging at All
8	I struggle to understand the diverse needs of students and tailor teaching methods accordingly.	1.98	Slightly Challenging	1.00	Not Challenging at All
9	I encountered difficulty in planning, engaging and effective lessons that cater to the diverse needs of learners.	2.03	Slightly Challenging	1.00	Not Challenging at All
10	I am challenged by cultural differences among my students regarding their background that can lead to misunderstanding their personal norms.	2.14	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All
11	I hardly understand the languages or dialects	1.89	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All

	of the students, leading to confusion.				
12	I am affected by the socio-economic disparities among my students that would lead to fewer educational opportunities.	2.11	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All
13	I encountered different learning styles due to different cultural backgrounds and experiences, requiring teachers to adapt their teaching methods.	2.65	Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All
14	I am challenged with inclusive education, such as disabilities or special needs, requiring teachers to provide inclusive education and support services.	2.51	Slightly Challenging	1.5	Not Challenging at All
15	I experience difficulty in implementing consistent classroom routines and behavioral expectations that promote a safe, inclusive, and learner-centered environment.	2.07	Slightly Challenging	1.13	Not Challenging at All
Overall Mean		1.99	Slightly Challenging	1.13	Not Challenging at All

Table 21 shows that proficient and highly proficient teachers generally encountered minimal challenges in managing the learning environment and addressing learner diversity. Proficient teachers rated most indicators as Slightly Challenging, with the highest difficulty in addressing culturally diverse learning styles, followed by socio-economic and cultural differences, suggesting the need to strengthen differentiation and culturally responsive practices. Their least challenging area was communicating expectations, directions, and feedback, indicating effective classroom communication. Highly proficient teachers reported lower difficulty, with an overall mean of 1.13, showing stronger mastery of classroom environment practices, although inclusive education for learners with disabilities remained a continuing area for improvement. Overall, the findings indicate that experience and professional development reduce challenges, supporting Uddin (2025), Al-Naimi et al. (2020), Aguirre & Faller (2017), Mustamin (2024), Caseros & Tan (2020), and Vertucio (2019).

c. Curriculum and Planning & Assessment and Reporting

Table 22
Mean Distribution and Qualitative Description on the Challenges Encountered by the Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers as to Curriculum and Planning and Assessment and Reporting

No.	KRA 3. Curriculum and Planning & Assessment and Reporting	Proficient Teachers		Highly Proficient Teachers	
		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
1	I find it difficult to align lesson plans with curriculum standards and learning objectives.	1.87	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All
2	I have limited time to develop detailed lesson plans due to other responsibilities such as grading, meetings, and extra-curricular activities in the school.	2.23	Slightly Challenging	1.63	Not Challenging at All
3	I am inefficient in allocating time to various lesson components.	1.9	Slightly Challenging	1.13	Not Challenging at All
4	I struggle in organizing instructional materials, resources, and classroom activities, resulting in much wasted time.	1.9	Slightly Challenging	1.13	Not Challenging at All
5	I may underestimate the time needed to cover certain topics or activities, resulting in rushed lessons and incomplete learning objectives.	2.08	Slightly Challenging	1.5	Not Challenging at All
6	I am inefficient in lesson preparation due to spending excessive time planning lessons, which may lead to struggles in prioritizing tasks and allocating time effectively.	2.02	Slightly Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All
7	I have limited access to teaching materials and technology in the portals of reference.	2.29	Slightly Challenging	1.63	Not Challenging at All
8	I encountered difficulty in incorporating assessments effectively into lesson plans to gauge students' understanding.	1.98	Slightly Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All
9	I have a limited use of formative assessment	1.96	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All

	strategies to gauge student understanding and adjust instruction, accordingly, resulting in missed opportunities for engagement and progress monitoring.				
10	I struggle to design, select, and implement diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies consistent with curriculum requirements.	1.94	Slightly Challenging	1.5	Not Challenging at All
11	I have difficulty monitoring and evaluating learner progress and achievement using learner attainment data.	1.9	Slightly Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All
12	I have difficulty providing timely, accurate, and constructive feedback to improve learner performance.	1.99	Slightly Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All
13	I struggle to communicate promptly and clearly the learners' needs, progress, and achievement to key stakeholders, including parents/guardians.	1.99	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All
14	I find it challenging to utilize assessment data to inform the modification of teaching and learning practices and programs.	2.13	Slightly Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All
15	I experience difficulty in contextualizing curriculum content and assessment tasks to make them responsive to learners' local context and real-life situations.	2.22	Slightly Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All
Overall Mean		2.00	Slightly Challenging	1.37	Not Challenging at All

Table 22 shows that proficient and highly proficient teachers encountered minimal challenges in Curriculum and Planning, Assessment, and Reporting, with highly proficient teachers reporting lower difficulty levels. Proficient teachers obtained an overall mean of 2.00, indicating slightly challenging experiences, particularly in limited access to teaching materials and technology, limited time for lesson planning,

and difficulty contextualizing curriculum content. These suggest minor concerns in resources, time management, and instructional contextualization despite generally strong competence. Highly proficient teachers recorded an overall mean of 1.37, indicating that the indicators were not challenging at all, although time constraints, resource access, assessment design, and topic coverage remained areas for attention. Overall, experience and professional development helped reduce challenges, supporting Badmus & Olorisade (2013), Manigbas & De Luna (2024), Gestupa (2023), Adjei (2025), Caseros and Tan (2020), and Salvador (2025).

d. Community Linkages and Professional Engagement

Table 23
Mean Distribution and Qualitative Description on the Challenges Encountered by the Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers as to Community Linkages and Professional Engagement

No.	KRA 4. Community and Professional Engagement	Proficient Teachers		Highly Proficient Teachers	
		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
1	I have difficulty seeking guidance and mentorship from experienced colleagues and find it very challenging to collaborate with them while maintaining individual productivity	1.92	Slightly Challenging	1.63	Not Challenging at All
2	I often face time constraints due to teaching responsibilities, making it challenging to engage in frequent and meaningful communication with parents.	2.09	Slightly Challenging	1.63	Not Challenging at All
3	I have limited communication preferences, such as email, phone calls, or in-person meetings, requiring teachers to accommodate diverse communication styles due to the signal in the school where I am assigned.	1.90	Slightly Challenging	1.75	Slightly Challenging
4	I have less contact with parents in discussing student issues while maintaining privacy or confidentiality and	2.02	Slightly Challenging	2.00	Slightly Challenging

	adhering to school policies.				
5	I have less engagement and collaboration with parents, particularly in meetings and project-initiated activities, and encounter difficulty contacting them for consultation due to work conflicts	2.06	Slightly Challenging	1.75	Slightly Challenging
6	I struggle in discussing student behavior or academic issues that require sensitivity and effective communication skills from teachers.	2.00	Slightly Challenging	1.75	Slightly Challenging
7	I struggle in building relationships with students' families and the local community with unfamiliar cultural dynamics and community norms.	2.05	Slightly Challenging	1.88	Slightly Challenging
8	I have limited opportunities to engage in school–community partnerships that support student learning and development.	2.05	Slightly Challenging	1.88	Slightly Challenging
9	I encounter challenges in documenting and sustaining collaborative initiatives with parents, colleagues, and community stakeholders.	2.10	Slightly Challenging	1.88	Slightly Challenging
10	I find it challenging to balance professional collaboration with administrative tasks and teaching responsibilities.	2.29	Slightly Challenging	2.25	Slightly Challenging
Overall Mean		2.03	Slightly Challenging	1.84	Slightly Challenging

Table 23 presents the challenges encountered by proficient and highly proficient teachers in Community Linkages and Professional Engagement. Results show that both groups perceived the indicators as slightly challenging, with highly proficient teachers reporting lower difficulty levels, indicating stronger competence in stakeholder collaboration and community engagement.

For proficient teachers, the overall mean was 2.03, with challenges mainly in balancing collaborative activities with teaching and administrative tasks (2.29), documenting collaborations (2.10), and communication with parents (2.09), while signal limitations (1.90) were least challenging. For highly proficient teachers, the overall mean was 1.84, with workload balance also as the highest concern (2.25), while mentorship and parent communication management were least challenging (1.63). Overall, highly proficient teachers experienced fewer challenges, reflecting experience and professional growth. These findings align with Pamon and Oco (2024) and Rowston et al. (2021), while contrasting Villacorta and Arnado (2023).

e. Personal Growth and Professional Development

Table 24
Mean Distribution and Qualitative Description on the Challenges Encountered by the Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers as to Personal Growth and Professional Development

No.	KRA 5. Personal Growth and Professional Development	Proficient Teachers		Highly Proficient Teachers	
		Mean	Descriptive Interpretation	Mean	Descriptive Interpretation
1	I have been less engaged in regular self-reflection to assess the effectiveness of classroom management strategies.	1.99	Slightly Challenging	1.63	Not Challenging at All
2	I have inadequate reflection on the effectiveness of lesson plans and adjustments for my improvement.	2.18	Slightly Challenging	1.63	Not Challenging at All
3	I have difficulty in prioritizing tasks and allocating time accordingly, focusing on high-impact activities.	2.04	Slightly Challenging	1.50	Not Challenging at All
4	I have less time for regular self-reflection on time management practices and identifying areas for improvement.	2.04	Slightly Challenging	1.63	Not Challenging at All
5	I have difficulty allocating time for professional development to enhance teaching skills and efficiency over time.	2.08	Slightly Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All
6	I have difficulty in setting boundaries with my students between work and personal time, leading to burnout and inefficiency in time management.	1.98	Slightly Challenging	1.25	Not Challenging at All
7	I have difficulty in finding the right balance between teaching and responsibilities,	2.21	Slightly Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All

	personal time, due to the demands of the profession.				
8	I experience difficulty in identifying appropriate professional development activities that align with my individual teaching needs and performance goals.	2.13	Slightly Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All
9	I have limited opportunities to apply newly acquired knowledge and skills from professional development activities to actual classroom practice.	2.10	Slightly Challenging	1.38	Not Challenging at All
10	I encounter challenges in sustaining motivation and commitment to continuous professional growth amid increasing workload demands.	2.30	Slightly Challenging	1.50	Not Challenging at All
Overall Mean		2.09	Slightly Challenging	1.46	Not Challenging at All

Table 24 shows that proficient and highly proficient teachers encountered only slight challenges in Personal Growth and Professional Development, with highly proficient teachers reporting lower difficulty levels. Proficient teachers had an overall mean of 2.09, indicating concerns in sustaining motivation amid workload demands, balancing teaching and personal time, and reflecting on instructional effectiveness. These findings suggest continuing needs in workload management, reflective practice, and well-being support. Highly proficient teachers obtained an overall mean of 1.46, showing stronger professional maturity, motivation, and work–life balance, although systematic reflection on practice remained a minor concern. Overall, highly proficient teachers experienced fewer challenges, highlighting the value of experience and professional development. These findings support Macayanan and Abalos (2025), Monares and Dasig (2024), Demapendan (2024), Wasnawa and Christiawan (2020), Frianeza et al. (2024), and Conales et al. (2023).

Table 25
Summary on the Mean Distribution and Qualitative Description on the Challenges Encountered by Proficient and Highly Proficient Teachers

N o.	Challenges Encountered by the Teachers	Proficient Teachers	Qualitative Description	Highly Proficient Teachers	Qualitative Description
		(Mean)		(Mean)	
1	Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	1.94	Slightly Challenging	1.28	Not Challenging at All
2	Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners	1.99	Slightly Challenging	1.13	Not Challenging at All
3	Curriculum and Planning and Assessment and Reporting	2.00	Slightly Challenging	1.37	Not Challenging at All
4	Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	2.03	Slightly Challenging	1.84	Slightly Challenging

5	Personal Growth and Professional Development	2.09	Slightly Challenging	1.46	Not Challenging at All
Overall Mean		2.01	Slightly Challenging	1.41	Not Challenging at All

Table 25 presents the consolidated challenges of proficient and highly proficient teachers across the five KRAs. Results show that proficient teachers obtained an overall mean of 2.01 (Slightly Challenging), while highly proficient teachers recorded a lower mean of 1.41 (Not Challenging at All), indicating that both groups experience minimal challenges, with fewer difficulties among highly proficient teachers.

Across KRAs, Content Knowledge and Pedagogy showed means of 1.94 and 1.28, while Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners recorded 1.99 and 1.13, indicating stronger competence at higher proficiency levels. Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting yielded 2.00 (proficient) and 1.37 (highly proficient), reflecting greater efficiency among highly proficient teachers. Community Linkages and Professional Engagement remained slightly challenging (2.03 and 1.84), while Personal Growth and Professional Development showed 2.09 and 1.46.

Overall, challenges decrease with proficiency, reflecting improved competence and efficiency. These findings align with Badmus and Olorisade (2013), Conales et al. (2023), and Gestupa (2023).

5. Is there a significant difference in the challenges encountered by the respondents when grouped according to their profile?

a. Content Knowledge and Pedagogy

Table 26
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in Terms of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy When Grouped According to Their Profile

Profile	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Age	0.488	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Position	0.056	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Years of Service	0.824	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Bachelor's degree	0.725	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Year level assignment	0.921	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Subject taught	0.886	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Training attended for the past 3 years	0.75	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant

Table 26 presents the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to determine the significant differences in the challenges encountered by the respondents in terms of content knowledge and pedagogy when grouped according to their profile variables, at the 0.05 level of significance. As reflected in the table, all computed p-values for the profile variables exceeded the 0.05 threshold. Consequently, the null hypotheses for all variables are accepted. This finding indicates that there are no statistically significant differences in the challenges encountered by

the respondents in relation to content knowledge and pedagogy when classified according to their profile. It further suggests that the respondents experience comparable challenges in these domains regardless of variations in age, position, years of service, academic degree, year level assignment, subject taught, or training attended within the past three years.

b. Learning Environment & Diversity of Learners

Table 27
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in Terms of Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners When Grouped According to Their Profile

Profile	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Age	0.573	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Position	< 0.001	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Years of Service	0.231	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Bachelor's degree	0.74	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Year level assignment	0.369	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Subject taught	0.054	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Training attended for the past 3 years	0.158	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant

Table 27 presents the ANOVA results on the differences in challenges encountered in Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners across profile variables at the 0.05 level of significance. Findings show that only position yielded a p-value below 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating a significant difference in challenges based on teachers' position.

This suggests that proficient and highly proficient teachers experience and perceive challenges in managing learning environments and addressing learner diversity differently. The variation may be attributed to differences in job responsibilities, instructional expectations, and levels of professional competence associated with each position. Highly proficient teachers, due to their advanced role, are expected to demonstrate stronger capability in handling diverse learners and creating inclusive classroom environments.

Overall, the results highlight that professional position significantly influences how teachers manage classroom diversity and learning environment challenges.

c. Curriculum and Planning & Assessment and Reporting

Table 28
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in Terms of Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting When Grouped According to Their Profile

Profile	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Age	0.426	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Position	0.003	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant

Years of Service	0.132	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Bachelor's degree	0.893	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Year level assignment	0.44	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Subject taught	0.125	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Training attended for the past 3 years	0.232	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant

Table 28 presents the ANOVA results on the differences in challenges encountered in Curriculum and Planning, Assessment, and Reporting across profile variables at the 0.05 level of significance. Findings show that only position yielded a p-value below 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating a significant difference in challenges based on position.

This suggests that teachers' challenges in these domains vary depending on their professional role. The difference may be explained by the varying levels of responsibility and involvement in instructional planning, assessment, and reporting tasks. Highly proficient teachers are more engaged in curriculum development, mentoring, assessment supervision, and instructional leadership, which may reduce perceived challenges in these areas. In contrast, proficient teachers may experience more difficulties in time management, lesson contextualization, use of assessment data, and access to resources, often due to heavier teaching loads and fewer leadership responsibilities.

Overall, position plays a significant role in shaping teachers' challenges in curriculum-related domains.

d. Community Linkages and Professional Engagement

Table 29
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in Terms of Community Linkages and Professional Engagement When Grouped According to Their Profile

Profile	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Age	0.479	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Position	0.187	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Years of Service	0.578	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Bachelor's degree	0.806	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Year level assignment	0.591	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Subject taught	0.105	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Training attended for the past 3 years	0.563	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant

Table 29 presents the ANOVA results on differences in challenges encountered in Community Linkages and Professional Engagement across profile variables at the 0.05 level of significance. Findings show that all computed p-values exceed 0.05; thus, the null hypotheses are accepted, indicating no significant differences in challenges when respondents are grouped according to their profile characteristics.

This implies that teachers experience similar levels of difficulty in Community Linkages and Professional Engagement regardless of age, position, years of service, academic qualification, year level assignment, subject taught, or training attended. The consistency of results suggests that challenges in this domain are generally uniform across different teacher groups and are not influenced by demographic or professional differences.

Overall, the findings highlight that difficulties in community engagement and professional collaboration are shared across all respondents, reflecting common constraints in this domain.

e. Personal Growth and Professional Development

Table 30
Results of the Test of Significant Difference in the Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in Terms of Personal Growth and Professional Development When Grouped According to Their Profile

Profile	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Age	0.232	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Position	0.006	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant
Years of Service	0.172	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Bachelor's degree	0.78	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Year level assignment	0.299	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Subject taught	0.077	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Training attended for the past 3 years	0.376	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant

Table 30 presents the ANOVA results on differences in challenges encountered in Personal Growth and Professional Development across profile variables at the 0.05 level of significance. Findings show that only position yielded a p-value below 0.05; thus, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating significant differences in challenges based on teaching position.

This suggests that teachers' experiences of challenges in professional growth vary depending on their rank and responsibilities. Highly proficient teachers, due to their leadership roles, mentoring functions, and active participation in professional development activities, are more engaged in structured growth opportunities that enhance reflection, time management, and continuous learning. In contrast, proficient teachers may still experience slight difficulties in balancing teaching responsibilities, professional development activities, and personal commitments, which can affect their capacity for sustained professional growth.

Overall, the results highlight that position plays a significant role in shaping teachers' challenges in personal and professional development, emphasizing the need for differentiated support and development programs aligned with career stages.

6. Is there a significant relationship between the competence and challenges encountered by the respondents?

Table 31
Results of the Significant Relationship Between Competence and Challenges Encountered by the Respondents

Variables	Pearson's r - value	p - value	Analysis	Decision	Remarks
Competence and Challenges in terms of Content Knowledge and Pedagogy	-0.09	0.211	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Competence and Challenges in terms of Learning Environment & Diversity of Learners	-0.095	0.185	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Competence and Challenges in terms of Curriculum and Planning & Assessment and Reporting	0.03	0.672	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Competence and Challenges in terms of Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	-0.121	0.093	$p > 0.05$	Accept H_0	Not Significant
Competence and Challenges in terms of Personal Growth and Professional Development	0.164	0.022	$p < 0.05$	Reject H_0	Significant

Table 31 shows the Pearson r results on the relationship between respondents' competence and challenges across the five KRAs. Most correlations were weak, indicating limited association between competence and encountered challenges. Negative correlations in Content Knowledge and Pedagogy, Learning Environment and Diversity of Learners, and Community Linkages and Professional Engagement suggest that higher competence was linked to fewer challenges in these areas. Meanwhile, positive correlations in Curriculum and Planning, Assessment and Reporting, and Personal Growth and Professional Development imply that more competent teachers may engage more actively with related challenges. However, only Personal Growth and Professional Development showed a significant positive relationship at the 0.05 level, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This suggests that competence in this domain significantly relates to teachers' ability to address professional growth challenges.

Conclusions

The findings present a coherent view of teacher professional development across the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Both proficient and highly proficient teachers demonstrate strong competence across all Key Result Areas; however, differences emerge in their experience of challenges. Proficient teachers still encounter slight difficulties in several aspects of their work, while highly

proficient teachers consistently report minimal to no challenges. This pattern indicates that as teachers advance in proficiency and accumulate experience, they develop greater confidence, efficiency, and adaptability in managing instructional and professional demands.

Overall, the results highlight that professional growth not only enhances teaching competence but also reduces the perceived difficulty of everyday teaching tasks. The slight challenges experienced by proficient teachers represent areas for targeted professional development, whereas the performance of highly proficient teachers reflects the standards of excellence envisioned by the PPST. These findings emphasize the importance of continuous training, reflective practice, and collaborative professional engagement in strengthening teacher effectiveness.

Furthermore, significant differences across profile variables such as age, position, years of service, training attended, and subject specialization highlight the influence of professional maturity and experience on teacher performance. Highly proficient teachers demonstrate greater ease in managing both instructional and professional responsibilities, while proficient teachers face more challenges in areas such as community engagement and personal development. These results affirm the PPST framework and underscore the need for sustained capacity-building and support systems to further enhance teacher competence and resilience.

Recommendations

From the above findings and conclusion, the following are hereby recommended:

1. Education Program Supervisors and School Heads should undertake a comprehensive personnel audit of current teaching assignments within their respective institutions. Such an audit should systematically identify and document instances of subject-specialization mismatch, thereby providing an empirical basis for the design and implementation of targeted bridging programs and subject-specific training interventions.
2. School administrators and the Department of Education (DepEd) must strengthen teacher deployment policies by aligning teaching assignments with teachers' academic specializations to ensure instructional quality and curricular fidelity. This alignment should be reinforced through strategic hiring practices, retooling initiatives, and targeted upskilling or reskilling programs aimed at addressing competency gaps and enhancing instructional effectiveness.
3. Schools should institutionalize continuous capacity-building programs that emphasize differentiated instruction, the integration of diverse and innovative teaching strategies, the promotion of higher-order thinking skills (HOTS), and the effective utilization of educational technologies. Professional development modalities such as training workshops, Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, and peer coaching should be further strengthened to cultivate teachers' pedagogical adaptability and responsiveness to the demands of 21st-century education.
4. Schools should intensify professional development initiatives focusing on inclusive education and culturally responsive pedagogy. Such training will better equip teachers to address the diverse needs of learners. Furthermore,

the development and utilization of differentiated instructional materials and strategies should be systematically encouraged to foster equitable learning opportunities.

5. Schools should provide adequate instructional resources and contextualized learning materials and improve access to contextualized and localized learning materials. These materials must reflect the cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic contexts of learners, particularly those in underserved and geographically remote school communities, thereby promoting relevance and inclusivity in instruction.
6. Schools should introduce structured time management strategies and workload balancing mechanisms. School heads should rationalize non-teaching tasks, ensure equitable distribution of ancillary functions, and adopt digital tools to enhance administrative efficiency. These measures will enable Senior High School teachers to devote adequate time and energy to instructional preparation, delivery, and sustained professional growth.
7. Schools should establish structured and sustainable parent engagement programs to strengthen communication and collaboration between home and school. The integration of digital platforms and the institutionalization of regular consultation schedules are encouraged to enhance parent-teacher interaction, thereby fostering shared responsibility in supporting student learning outcomes.
8. Schools continue to nurture and sustain teachers' professionalism by formally recognizing exemplary practices and providing structured opportunities for career advancement. The institutionalization of incentive systems, leadership training initiatives, and professional recognition programs may further motivate educators to uphold high standards of ethical and professional conduct.
9. School leaders are encouraged to implement comprehensive supportive mechanisms, including workload management strategies, wellness programs, and mentoring systems, to assist teachers in coping with the increasing demands of the profession. Such initiatives are essential in promoting resilience, efficiency, and sustained professional engagement.
10. Proficient and highly proficient teachers should reinforce mentor-mentee relationships by formalizing and sustaining structured mentoring programs. These programs must foster collaborative professional growth, reflective practice, and the systematic sharing of pedagogical expertise, thereby serving as pathways toward career advancement and the attainment of sustained instructional excellence.
11. The Department of Education, through the Schools Division Office, should strongly implement the Expanded Career Progression (ECP) for Senior High School teachers with fidelity and urgency, particularly with respect to the creation of plantilla positions for higher teacher designations.
12. School heads should disseminate the requirements for Expanded Career Progression so that teachers are aware of the career progression and may avail of it. They should conduct regular orientations, advisory sessions, and information drives on the Expanded Career Progression pathways, ensuring that all eligible senior high school teachers are informed of the qualifications, documentation requirements, and timelines necessary to advance to the next career stage in accordance with existing DepEd policies and guidelines
13. The Professional Development Plan formulated as an output of this study should be formally adopted and utilized division-wide through structured In-

Service Training programs, Cluster-Based Training sessions, and School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) Sessions

Compliance with Ethical Standards

This study was conducted in accordance with established ethical research principles, ensuring voluntary participation, informed consent, confidentiality, and anonymity of all respondents. Prior to data collection, permissions were secured from the Schools Division Office and concerned school authorities, and respondents were fully informed about the purpose, procedures, and significance of the study. Participation was voluntary, and teachers were assured that their responses would be used solely for academic purposes and reported in aggregate form to prevent identification of individuals or schools. No form of coercion or undue influence was applied, and participants were given the right to withdraw at any stage without penalty. Data gathered were securely stored and handled with strict confidentiality to protect the privacy and integrity of respondents. Throughout the research process, ethical considerations guided all procedures to ensure respect for persons, beneficence, and justice, thereby upholding the highest standards of academic integrity and responsible conduct of research.

Acknowledgements

The successful completion of this dissertation has been made possible through the invaluable support, guidance, and encouragement of numerous individuals. The researcher hereby conveys his deepest and most sincere gratitude to the following, whose contributions and unwavering assistance have been instrumental in the realization of this academic endeavor.

To Dr. Vilma C. Cabrera, the researcher's dissertation adviser, whose unwavering patience, scholarly guidance, and thoughtful mentorship profoundly shaped this work from its inception to its completion. The researcher extends sincere gratitude for her steadfast belief in this study and for generously sharing her time, expertise, and wisdom throughout the academic journey;

To the members of the dissertation committee—Dr. Salome S. Cariño, Chairman, and panel members Dr. Mai Rani Kristine A. Zipagan, Dr. Marites P. Talosig, Dr. Marie Rose P. Ramos, and Dr. Maria Elisa T. Alvaro for their critical insights, constructive feedback, and scholarly recommendations;

To Dr. Eduardo C. Escorpiso Jr., Schools Division Superintendent of the Schools Division of the City of Ilagan, the School Heads, and the Senior High School teachers who willingly participated as respondents. Their cooperation, honesty, and generosity of time were invaluable to the successful completion of this study;

To Dr. Marie Rose P. Ramos, School Principal IV; Dr. Emelinda C. Abu, Assistant School Principal II for Curriculum; and Mrs. Romela Prisca C. Buenaventura, Assistant School Principal II for Governance of Isabela National High School, for their administrative support, encouragement, and for fostering a professional environment that enabled the researcher to pursue this academic endeavor with focus and dedication;

To Dr. Maricel A. Pascua-Ramos, Officer-in-Charge Dean, and the faculty and staff of the Graduate School, for broadening the researcher's knowledge and nurturing in him the discipline and passion for scholarly inquiry;

To his beloved parents and siblings, whose unconditional love, unwavering support, and endless encouragement served as a steadfast foundation throughout this journey. To his friends and relatives, the researcher is deeply indebted for their moral and spiritual support, which sustained him during moments of challenge;

Above all, to the Almighty God, for His boundless blessings, grace, and protection. Truly, with Him, all things are possible.

REFERENCES

- Adjei, D. (2025). Gender perspectives on curriculum reforms for national development in Ghana's senior high schools. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 51(8), 484–497. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2025/v51i82255>
- Aguirre, E. B., & Faller, S. D. (2017). Experiences of LNU neophyte teachers: Cues for a viable mentoring program. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(13). <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss13/2/>
- Al-Naimi, S. R., Romanowski, M. H., & Du, X. (2020). Novice teachers' challenges and coping strategies in Qatari government schools. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 19(9), 118–142. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.9.7>
- Almazroa, H., & Alotaibi, W. (2023). Teaching 21st century skills: Understanding the depth and width of the challenges. *Sustainability*, 15(9), 7365. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15097365>
- Aslan, R., & Eröz, B. (2025). Transferring skills, transforming careers: Examining second-career teachers. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-XXXX>
- Badmus, A. A., & Olorisade, O. D. (2013). Influence of school facilities on teachers' effectiveness in secondary schools in Ilorin metropolis. *ResearchGate*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382328937>
- Bart, J., & Bartz, T. (1996). Contemporary perspectives on education: Instructional strategies and classroom effectiveness.
- Bartz, D. E., & Bartz, B. L. (2018). Recognizing and acknowledging worldview diversity in the inclusive classroom. *Education Sciences*, 8(4), 196. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci8040196>
- Bell, H., & Thompson, C. (2021). Master teachers as instructional leaders: Modeling best practices for educational excellence. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 58(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jel.2021.07.004>
- Bellibaş, M. Ş., Polatcan, M., & Kılınç, A. Ç. (2022). Linking instructional leadership to teacher practices: The mediating effect of shared practice and agency in learning effectiveness. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(5), 812–831. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220945706>
- Boquirin, N. D. (2025). Teaching competencies of provisional senior high school teachers in Zone 2, Division of Zambales. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(8), 4145–4157. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.08.31>
- Cabañero, F. (2024). Training needs analysis on the competencies of senior high school teachers in Surigao del Norte National High School. <https://doi.org/10.69481/VRTLTNAC10192024>
- Cabradilla, M. T. (2025). Teachers' competency based on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers I–III: Basis for a training program. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 8(4), 2083–2099. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v8-i04-64>
- Cadacio, J. C. M., & Albite, C. J. (2025). Master teachers' instructional leadership, teaching competencies and teacher development in public secondary schools. *International*

- Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science.
<https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRIS.2025.91100012>
- Cai, Y., Wang, L., Bi, Y., & Tang, R. (2022). How can the professional community influence teachers' work engagement? *Sustainability*, 14(16), 10029.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su141610029>
- Caseros, E., & Tan, D. A. (2020). The plight of non-education major graduate senior high school teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Central Mindanao University).
<https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.26612.56963>
- Castro, F. L. T., Ventura, B. L. O., Estajal, R. S., Timpangco-Macario, J., Limen, M. V., Garil, B. A., & Chavez, J. V. (2024). Teachers handling multiple subject areas: Difficulties and adaptive attributes in the delivery of instructions. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9). <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2520>
- Conales, R., Dacanay, R. T., & Perez, D. R. (2023). Mentoring and technical assistance of master teachers in the Division of Palawan. *Philippine E-Journals*.
<https://www.ejournals.ph/article.php?id=21139>
- Cortes, C. B. (2026). Palit Basura initiative report (Municipal Environment and Natural Resources Office, Milagros, Masbate).
- Cruz, E. D. et al. (2024). Challenges in the Philippine educational system and its impact on teachers' instructional strategies. *Journal of Pedagogy and Education Science*, 3(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.56741/jpes.v3i01.414>
- Dahan, R. D. (2022). Pedagogical competence of senior high school teachers. *Journal of Namibian Studies*, 31. <https://doi.org/10.59670/jns.v31i.3198>
- Demapendan, J. P. C. (2024). Education mismatch among TLE teachers. *International Journal of Open Educational Research*, 5(6). <https://doi.org/10.37251/ijoer.v5i6.1189>
- Department of Education. (2007). DepEd Order No. 66, s. 2007: Revised guidelines on appointment and promotion.
- Department of Education. (2016). DepEd Order No. 3, s. 2016: Hiring guidelines for senior high school teachers.
- Department of Education. (2017). DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017: Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers.
- Department of Education. (2025). DepEd Order No. 3, s. 2025: Expanded career progression system for teachers.
- Department of Education. (2026). Strengthened Senior High School Program.
<https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- Frianeza, E. D., et al. (2024). Challenges in the Philippine educational system. *Journal of Pedagogy and Education Science*, 3(1), 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.56741/jpes.v3i01.414>
- Gestupa, G. M. (2023). Instructional supervision and technical assistance of master teachers. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2023.49146>
- González-Fernández, R., et al. (2024). Teachers' teaching and professional competences assessment. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 103, 102396.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2023.102396>
- Haron, M. Z., Md Zalli, M. M., Othman, M. K., & Awang, M. I. (2021). Examining the teachers' pedagogical knowledge and learning facilities towards teaching quality. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(1), 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i1.20780>
- Hidayatullah, H., Qomariyah, S. S., & Krisnahadi, T. (2024). Non-educational background teachers' knowledge of pedagogical competencies. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 13(4), 2670–2677.
<https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i4.28565>
- Ismail, S. N., Muhammad, S., Omar, M. N., & Raman, A. (2020). The great challenge of Malaysian school leaders' instructional leadership: Can it affect teachers' functional

- competency across 21st century education? *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(6), 2436–2443. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080627>
- Lefebvre, J., Lefebvre, H., & Lefebvre, B. (2022). Reflection of novice teachers. *Reflective Practice*, 23(4), 452–466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2022.2056883>
- Leshem, S. (2019). Envisioning the future: Second career teachers' hopes and concerns. *International Journal of Teaching & Education*, 7(1), 56–72.
- Limen, J. M., & Arante, R. B. (2025). Exploring non-education faculty's lived teaching experiences in a Philippine higher education institution. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 14(5), 3935–3945. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v14i5.33744>
- Loreto, A. M., & Suazo, J. M. (2018). Pedagogical practices of non-education graduate senior high school teachers. Department of Education.
- Macayan, M. M., & Abalos, A. P. (2025). Instructional skills and teaching performance of secondary teachers. *Wesleyan Social Review*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.54788/wsr.v2i2.27>
- Manigbas, J. P., & De Luna, Y. V. (2024). Competency of senior high school teachers in assessment and reporting. *International Journal of Business Law and Education*, 5(2), 1494–1505.
- Monares, H. T., & Dasig, J. P. (2024). RPMS implementation and teacher performance. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(8).
- Mufidah, N., Arafat, Y., & Puspita, Y. (2021). The effect of training and teaching experience on teacher's performance. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Education Universitas PGRI Palembang (INCoEPP 2021)* (pp. 160–166). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210716.030>
- Mustamin. (2024). Description of competencies and training needs for high school teachers in Maros Regency, South Sulawesi Province. *Proceeding of Research and Civil Society Dissemination (Management & Business Challenges in Digital Era)*, 2(1), 362–368. <https://doi.org/10.37476/presed.v2i1.60>
- Nguyễn, T. L., Ngô, V. T. H., & Nguyễn, T. H. (2025). Vietnamese teachers' career adaptability in implementing the 2018 competency-oriented curriculum: A case within a Confucian heritage culture. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), Article 2554951. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2554951>
- Ningtiyas, F. A., & Jailani, J. (2018). Teacher training and pedagogical competence. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1097(1), 012106. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1097/1/012106>
- Nurfadillah, R. (2015). Pedagogical competence of English teachers with non-English background. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflij.v1i2.627>
- Pamon, E. Q., & Oco, R. M. (2024). Teachers' competence and learners' academic performance. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(3).
- Pañares, N. C., Mahinay, R. B., & Magnaong, M. E. (2021). 21st century skills in K to 12 implementation. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7831671>
- Quisquino, J. M. F. (2022). Master teachers as instructional leaders. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology*, 10(12), 891. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2022.47974>
- Republic Act No. 4670: The Magna Carta for Public School Teachers. (1966).
- Rowston, K., Bower, M., & Woodcock, S. (2021). Career-change teachers and technology integration. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 30(2), 323–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2021.1879925>
- Sahana, C. K. (2018). Pedagogical competence: Quality education for future. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 8(9).
- Salvador, A. D. (2025). Profession by heart: Commitment of noneducation graduate teachers. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research and Innovation*, 3(1).

- Siri, A., et al. (2020). Teacher competence and professionalism. Cogent Education. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1781993>
- Tabliago, L. A. (2025). Assessment of pedagogical competence of non-education graduate teachers. AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 11(1), 128–138. <https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v11i1.173>
- Tanjung, S. (2022). Teacher pedagogical competence in English teaching. Vision Journal.
- Uddin, M. S. (2024). Alternative certification programs in K-12 schools. Journal of Education and Training, 11(1), 92–114. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jet.v11i1.21391>
- Vertucio, M. L. (2019). Challenges of senior high school teachers. Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Administration.
- Villacorta, F. C., & Arnado, A. A. (2023). Competencies and challenges of TVL teachers. International Journal of Membrane Science and Technology, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.15379/ijmst.v10i2.1304>
- Wasnawa, G. A., & Christiawan, P. I. (2020). Professional competencies profile of senior high school teachers. Proceedings of AES 2020.

APA Citation:

Ramos, G. C., & Cabrera, V. C. (2026). THE COMPETENCE AND CHALLENGES OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE SCHOOLS DIVISION OF THE CITY OF ILAGAN AS INPUTS FOR A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN. Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 4(7), 310–350. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21212764>

Corresponding author: gerald.amos@deped.gov.ph