

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 08 Volume: 76

Published: 19.08.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Andres S. Gotera

Asian College of Technology
AB, MA, DM

Director, Students Welfare and Services
Philippines

Joel E. Asuncion

Asian College of Technology
AB, MBA-HRMD, PH.D

Director, Standards, Accreditation and Research
Philippines

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SYSTEM OF ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC PERSONNEL OF A COLLEGE

Abstract: Performance evaluation systems are designed to assess the effectiveness of a process or function and the manner in which it is completed. The goals of these systems are to promote optimal performance, identify areas of inefficiency, and monitor progress. The study utilized the descriptive-survey method making use of the researcher-made questionnaire to gather data needed to assess the existing performance evaluation system of the school for its academic and non-academic personnel in terms of process flow, instruments used, the evaluators who conduct the performance evaluation system, the feedback mechanism to inform the result of the evaluation and the utilization of these results for the benefit of the concerned employees. The results revealed that the academic and non-academic personnel consider the performance evaluation system as effective in the aspect of process flow, instruments, evaluators, feedback mechanism and the utilizations of results. Thus, affirming Henderson's theory that organizations must develop a well-designed, tailor-made and systematic performance evaluation system to match employee and organizational characteristics and qualities.

Key words: Performance Evaluation, Appraisal System, Human Resource Management.

Language: English

Citation: Gotera, A. S., & Asuncion, J. E. (2019). Performance evaluation system of academic and non-academic personnel of a college. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 08 (76), 111-126.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-08-76-17> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.08.76.17>

Classifiers: Human Resource Management.

Introduction

Every organization creates a set of desired goals and objectives and the main task ahead is to be able to accomplish these desired goals and objectives. This can only be achieved if individuals involved in the organization know their roles and functions and are producing the expected output i.e. performance.

Many organizations in the world use performance evaluation that appraises the effectiveness of management tools, determines the relevance of performance evaluation in today's work environment and identifies the kind of performance appraisal needed. A performance appraisal is a

process of assessing workers' performance in comparison to certain predetermined organizational standards. Appraisals do not only help employees understand how they are doing but they also help their superiors identify points for improvements to develop the organization as a whole.

Performance appraisal is one way of giving employees feedback about their performance at work. According to ACAS (1997), appraisals regularly record an assessment of an employee's performance, potential and development needs. Performance appraisal is a formal system of measuring, evaluating, and influencing an employee's job-related attributes,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

behaviors and outcomes. In some organization's appraisal, results may be used to determine relative rewards in the firm -- who should get merit in the form of pay increases, bonuses, or promotions. Similarly, appraisal results can be used to identify those who perform poorly who may require some form of counseling, demotion, decreases in pay or even dismissal.

A sound performance appraisal should provide substantial benefits to both the organization and the employees. However, it has been found out that many performance appraisals contain weaknesses, some of which are the resistance of the supervisors to spend sufficient time and attention to it, biases and sometimes favoritism, lack of reliability and validity in giving the ratings and the problems arising between the supervisors and subordinates in discussing and acting upon the results of the appraisal. As a result of these weaknesses, it created an atmosphere of doubts and biases such that the result of the performance appraisal is not anymore communicated to the employee concerned despite the general idea that an employee ought to know the result for whatever purpose it may serve him/her.

Over the years, researchers and practitioners, industrial psychologists and personnel/human resource specialists have tried their best to come up with a well-designed and tailor-made performance evaluation that would provide a higher degree of reliability and validity for the program to bring about competitive advantage to the organization. However, no one can lay claim to the fact of creating an ideal performance evaluation since an appraisal is governed by specific objectives to be achieved by the organizations. As Henderson would say, "Developing an appraisal system that would accurately reflect employee performance is a difficult task. Performance appraisal systems are not generic or easily passed from one company to another; their design and administration must be tailor-made to match employee and organizational characteristics and qualities" (Henderson, 1984).

Asian College of Technology International Educational Foundation (ACTIEF), like any organization, uses its own performance evaluation for both the academic and non-academic personnel. It uses the traditional type of appraisal system wherein subordinates are evaluated by their superiors and likewise, superiors are also evaluated by their subordinates. As had been practiced by the school, peer and self-evaluation had never been conducted. Weighting of evaluation results had also not been considered. Thus, problems may arise when evaluation procedures seem not to be as objectively carried as possible.

It is, therefore, the desire of the researchers to conduct a study to assess the existing performance evaluation of the school to have bases for some recommendations to improve the existing system.

Methodology

This study utilized the descriptive-survey method making use of the researcher-made questionnaire to gather data needed to assess the existing performance evaluation system of Asian College of Technology-International Educational Foundation (ACTIEF) for its academic and non-academic personnel in terms of process flow, instruments used, the evaluators who conduct the performance evaluation system, the feedback mechanism to inform the result of the evaluation and the utilization of these results for the benefit of the concerned employees. Moreover, this study also utilized unstructured and informal interviews as well as focused group discussion in order to ascertain the accuracy of data.

Results and Discussion

Profile of Performance Evaluation System in the Aspect of Process Flow

A successful organization attains its goals or objectives through the optimum level of performance of every personnel involved. Human resource practitioners would always say that the employees are the most important assets of any organization (Davis, 1992). Therefore, these assets have to be properly taken care of and maximally developed. In order to arrive at the optimum performance level, they must be properly guided, monitored and evaluated.

Process Flow

As shown in Table 1, the majority of the respondents said that they were informed as to the aims of the evaluation. This accounts to the total of 70 or 88.61 percent of the respondents as compared to 9 or 11.39 percent who said that they were not informed of the aims of the evaluation. Only 9 or 11.39 per cent of the respondent claimed otherwise.

From these findings, it can be gleaned that the academic and non-academic personnel are fully aware of the aims of the evaluation.

The table further reveals that majority of these respondents were likewise informed of the benefits of evaluation as evidenced by 69 or 87.34 percent of the respondents as against 10 or 12.66 per cent who said that they were not informed.

As to the question on whether the school has a process in the conduct of the evaluation, majority said yes, as manifested by 72 respondents or 91.14 percent of the total. As to the frequency of the evaluation, 53 respondents or 67.09 percent said that they are evaluated every semester while 26 or 32.91 percent said that they are evaluated every year. Those evaluated every semester are the college deans, chairs and faculty members while the non-academic staff are evaluated on a yearly basis.

From these findings, it can be deduced that the school is able to widely inform all employees as to the

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

aims and the benefits that every employee gets from this performance evaluation.

Table 1. Profile of Performance Evaluation System in the Aspect of Process Flow

Items	f	%
1) Does the school inform you of the aims of evaluation?		
Yes	70	88.61
No	9	11.39
2) Does the school inform you of the benefits of evaluation?		
Yes	69	87.34
No	10	12.66
3) Does the school have a process on performance evaluation?		
Yes	72	91.14
No	7	8.86
4) How often does the school evaluate your performance?		
Every year	26	32.91
Every semester	53	67.09

Instrument

Table 2 presents data on the profile of the performance evaluation system in the aspect of the instrument being used.

As shown in Table 2, the respondents believe that the school uses a standard tool for the conduct of the evaluation as manifested by 66 or 83.54 percent. Moreover, they are also aware of the areas wherein

they are being evaluated. However, as to the regular revision of the said instrument, majority of the respondents believe that there is none. Although not manifested, many of the respondents have been in the institution for quite a number of years and they noticed that there had been no revisions made as regards to the instruments used.

Table 2. Profile of Performance Evaluation System in the Aspect of Instrument

Items	f	%
5) Does the school use a standard evaluation tool/instrument?		
Yes	66	83.54
No	13	16.46
6) Are you aware of the areas by which you are evaluated?		
Yes	66	83.54
No	13	16.46
7) Does the school regularly revise/update the evaluation instrument?		
Yes	26	32.91
No	53	67.09

Evaluator

Table 3 presents the profile of Performance Evaluation System in the aspect of the evaluator.

As shown in Table 3, the 79 respondents or 100 per cent said that they are all evaluated by their head of office; the teachers by their Chairs, the Chairs by their deans, the deans by the Vice President for Academics, the directors by the Vice President for Administration and the office and maintenance staff by the Vice President for Administration. Moreover,

the 36 faculty members also mentioned that they are evaluated by the students. Peer and self-evaluation got zero responses and have been consistent with the questions if the respondents are given the chance to evaluate themselves and their colleagues. The results show that Peer and Self-evaluation are not included in the Performance Evaluation System of the academic and non-academic personnel of the school.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Table 3. Profile of Performance Evaluation System in the Aspect of Evaluator

Items	f	%
8) Who evaluates your performance?		
Head of office/Dean	79	100
Peers	0	0
Self	0	0
Students	36	45.57
9) Are you given the chance to evaluate the performance of your colleagues?		
Yes	0	0
No	79	100
10) Are you given the chance to evaluate your own performance?		
Yes	0	0
No	79	100

Feedback Mechanism

Table 4 presents the profile of Performance Evaluation System in the aspect of the feedback mechanism.

As shown in Table 4, 72 or 91.14 percent of the respondents revealed that they are informed of the results of the evaluation. Since they refer to their immediate head as the ones who evaluated them, they also said that their heads are the ones who informed them of the result of their evaluation. As to the

frequency of the conduct of the feedback mechanism, it is consistent with the fact that those who are evaluated every semester also receive their feedback every after the evaluation. Those that are evaluated on a yearly basis also receive their feedback once a year.

The finding reveals that the school has a feedback mechanism wherein employees are given the results of their evaluation.

Table 4. Profile of Performance Evaluation System in the Aspect of Feedback Mechanism

Items	f	%
11) Does the school inform you of the results of your evaluation?		
Yes	72	91.14
No	7	8.86
12) Who informs you of the results of your evaluation?		
Chairman/Department Head	36	45.57
Dean	36	45.57
VP Academics	4	5.06
VP Administration	28	35.44
13) How often does the school give you feedback on your evaluation?		
Every year	28	35.44
Every semester	51	64.56

Utilization of Results

Table 5 presents the profile of Performance Evaluation System in the aspect of utilization of results.

As shown in Table 6, 60 or 75.95 per cent of the respondents did not feel that there were interventions made by the school regarding the outcome of the evaluation of the employees. As to the question

whether the school made some policies based on the result of the evaluation, 64 or 81.01 per cent said that there was none.

Generally, the result shows that evaluation results are not utilized to make interventions for the development of the employees and there were no policies made out of the outcome of the evaluation

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Table 5. Profile of Performance Evaluation System in the Aspect of Utilization of Results

Items	f	%
14) Does the school provide intervention so you can improve your performance?		
Yes	19	24.05
No	60	75.95
15) Does the school make policies based on the results of evaluation?		
Yes	15	18.99
No	64	81.01

Manifestation of Performance Evaluation System Among the Administrators, Faculty, Non-Teaching and Maintenance Staff

Tables 6 to 10 present data on the extent to which the different dimensions have been manifested among the administrators, faculty, non-teaching and maintenance staff of Asian College of Technology-International Educational Foundation.

Process Flow

Table 6 presents data on the extent of the manifestation of the performance evaluation system among the administrators, teaching and non-teaching personnel as well as the maintenance staff in the aspect of the process flow.

As shown in Table 6, the overall item average of 3.04 derived from the group average of 3.28 (Great Extent) from the school administrators, 3.11 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.75 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 2.90 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff revealed that the steps undertaken in the conduct of the performance evaluation of all employees are done to a moderate extent.

In particular, the item average of 3.03 from the group mean of 3.26 (great extent) from the school administrators, 2.91 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.82 (moderate extent) from the non-academic and 3.50 (great extent) from the maintenance staff is indicative of the fact that the dissemination of information on the conduct of the performance evaluation is to a moderate extent.

The item average of 3.35 taken from the group mean of 3.26 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.57 (great extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.83 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel, and 3.70 (great extent) from the maintenance staff reveals that the majority is aware that there is an office or a person that is responsible in the conduct of the performance evaluation.

Moreover, the item average of 3.04 taken from the group mean of 3.20 (moderate extent), 3.08 (moderate extent), 2.78 (moderate extent), and 3.20 (moderate extent) respectively from the school administrators, teaching personnel, non-academic and maintenance staff suggests that they are informed of the goals and objectives of the performance evaluation in a moderately extent manner.

Furthermore, that the school has a clear policy on performance evaluation is manifested in the item average of 2.94 taken from the group mean of 3.20 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 3.08 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.55 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel, and 2.80 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff. The finding reveals that Asian College of Technology-International Educational Foundation has created a clear policy on performance evaluation of all its employees.

As shown by the item average of 3.05, the respondents believe that there is an orderly and systematic conduct of the performance evaluation. This is derived from the weighted mean of 3.26 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 3.16 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.72 from the non-academic and 3.00 from the maintenance staff.

The respondents are assured that there is confidentiality in the conduct of the evaluation as shown by the item average of 3.17 (moderate extent) which is derived from the weighted mean of 3.60 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.19 from the teaching personnel, 2.94 from the non-academic staff and 2.90 from the maintenance staff.

The respondents also believe that the feedback system is used to a moderate extent as evidenced by the item average of 2.98 taken from the group mean of 3.40 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.11 from the teaching personnel, 2.50 from the non-academic personnel and 2.80 from the maintenance staff. The finding reveals that the respondents are able to receive the result of the evaluation or the evaluators are able to give feedback of the results to their subordinates on a regular basis.

The item average of 3.13 (moderate extent) revealed that the conduct of performance evaluation is done in a regular basis. The regularity of the conduct of the evaluation is every semester for the Deans and teaching personnel and once every year for the non-academic and maintenance staff. This item average was derived from the weighted mean of 3.60 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.28 (great extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.83 (moderate extent) from the non-academic and 2.50 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Finally, with the item average of 2.94 (moderate extent), the respondents believe that the school sees to it that the evaluation process is as objective as possible. This is based on the weighted mean of 3.20

(moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.97 (moderate extent) from the faculty, 2.72 (moderate extent) from the non-academic and 2.90 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff.

Table 6. The Extent to which the Performance Evaluation System is Manifested in the Aspect of Process Flow

Items	Administrator (n=15)		Teaching Personnel (n=36)		Non-Academic Personnel (n=18)		Maintenance Personnel (n=10)		Item Average (N=79)	
	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.
1. The school properly disseminates information on performance evaluation	3.26	GE	2.91	ME	2.82	ME	3.50	GE	3.03	ME
2. There is an office/person tasked to conduct evaluation	3.26	GE	3.57	GE	2.83	ME	3.70	GE	3.35	GE
3. The school informs the goals and objectives of performance evaluation	3.20	ME	3.08	ME	2.78	ME	3.20	ME	3.04	ME
4. The school has a clear policy on performance evaluation	3.20	ME	3.08	ME	2.55	ME	2.80	ME	2.94	ME
5. The conduct of evaluation is orderly and systematic	3.26	GE	3.16	ME	2.72	ME	3.00	ME	3.05	ME
6. Confidentiality of results is maintained	3.60	GE	3.19	ME	2.94	ME	2.90	ME	3.17	ME
7. There is a system of feed backing on evaluation results	3.40	GE	3.11	ME	2.50	ME	2.80	ME	2.98	ME
8. Performance evaluation is conducted regularly	3.60	GE	3.28	ME	2.83	ME	2.50	ME	3.13	ME
9. The school gives premium on the results of evaluation	2.85	ME	2.79	ME	2.83	ME	2.50	ME	2.77	ME
10. The school sees to it that the evaluation process is as objective as possible	3.20	ME	2.97	ME	2.72	ME	2.90	ME	2.94	ME
Group Average	3.28	VGE	3.11	ME	2.75	ME	2.90	ME	3.04	ME

Legend:

Mean Range	
3.25 - 4.00	
2.50 - 3.24	
1.75 - 2.49	
1.00 - 1.74	

Scale
Always
Often
Rarely
Never

Interpretation
Great Extent (GE)
Moderate Extent (ME)
Less Extent (LE)
Not Practiced (NP)

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 3.117	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Instruments

Table 7 presents data regarding the extent of the manifestation of the performance evaluation system among the administrators, teaching and non-teaching personnel as well as the maintenance staff in the aspect of the instrument being used.

As shown in Table 7, the overall item average of 3.06 (moderate extent) derived from the group average of 3.33 (great extent) coming from the school administrators, 3.02 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.96 (moderate extent) from the non-academic and 3.06 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff, indicated that the respondents believe that the instruments used in the conduct of the evaluation are effective for the purpose.

Specifically, as revealed by the item average of 3.01 (moderate extent), the respondents believe that the school uses an appropriate evaluation instruments. This is based on the weighted mean of 3.21 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 3.14 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.70 (moderate extent) from the non-academic and 2.80 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff. The findings revealed that the respondents are unanimous in saying that the instruments used in the conduct of the evaluation are effective for what they are meant for.

An item average of 3.34 (great extent), which is derived from the weighted mean of 3.57 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.22 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.27 (great extent) from the non-academic and 3.60 (great extent) from the maintenance staff, manifests that the school has included questions regarding the employees' attendance in the evaluation instrument. Punctuality is also solicited in the instrument as manifested in an item average of 3.33 (great extent) which is derived from the weighted mean of 3.64 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.19 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.27 (great extent) from the non-academic staff and 3.50 from the maintenance personnel. The item on job knowledge reveals that the respondents expressed a strong affirmation to the existence of such item as indicated in the item average of 3.21 (moderate extent) which is derived from the weighted mean of 3.42 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.25 (great extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.11 (moderate extent) from the non-teaching personnel and 3.00 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff.

As shown by the item average of 3.19 (moderate extent) taken from the weighted mean of 3.57 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.13 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.11 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel and 3.00 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff, the respondents stated that the instrument includes quality of work as one of the items evaluated.

On the other hand, with an item average of 3.20 (moderate extent) taken from the weighted mean of 3.50 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.08 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.27 (great extent) from the non-academic personnel and 3.10 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff, all respondents noted that that item regarding attitude towards work is solicited from them.

As shown by the item average of 3.11 (moderate extent) taken from the weighted mean of 3.42 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.00 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.16 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel and 3.00 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff, the respondents claimed that the instrument includes personality as among the items evaluated.

As shown by the item average of 3.02 (moderate extent) taken from the weighted mean of 3.21 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.91 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.00 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel and 3.20 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff, the respondents noted that the instrument includes industry as among the items included in the evaluation system.

Initiative and resourcefulness are also included as an item in the evaluation as manifested by the average item of 3.07 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.50 (great extent) from the school administrators, 2.85 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.11 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 3.00 from the maintenance staff.

Also included in the evaluation tool is the item on loyalty and cooperation. This is confirmed by an item average of 3.11 (moderate extent) which is derived from the weighted mean of 3.35 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.08 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.05 from the non-academic personnel and 3.00 from the maintenance staff.

An item average of 3.11 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.42 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.25 (great extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.00 (moderate extent) from both the non-academic and maintenance staff showed that the respondents were aware of the different areas in which they were evaluated.

An item average of 2.72 (moderate extent) based on the weighted mean of 2.85 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.88 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.55 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 2.30 (less extent) indicated that the respondents did not see any revision or updates with regard to the instrument used in the conduct of the evaluation. The instrument used is the same all throughout that the respondents could not identify some changes being made.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

An item average of 2.13 (less extent) derived from the weighted mean of 2.50 from the school administrators, 2.11 (less extent) from the teaching personnel, 1.77 (less extent) from the non-academic and 2.30 (less extent) from the maintenance staff showed that the respondents are almost unanimous in saying that they have not been given the chance to participate in the crafting/revising of the evaluation instrument.

These findings disclosed that the instrument used in the conduct of the evaluation is to a moderate extent as perceived by the respondents. However, it is very evident that the respondents likewise emphasized that they need to be included in the crafting or revision of the future instrument so that they will feel that they also own the instrument.

Table 7. The Extent to which the Performance Evaluation System is Manifested in the Aspect of Instruments

Items	Administrator (n=15)		Teaching Personnel (n=36)		Non-Academic Personnel (n=18)		Maintenance Personnel (n=10)		Item Average (N=79)	
	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.
11. The school uses appropriate evaluation tools/instruments	3.21	ME	3.14	ME	2.70	ME	2.80	ME	3.01	ME
12. The evaluation tool/instrument solicits questions on employees':										
a) attendance	3.57	GE	3.22	ME	3.27	ME	3.60	ME	3.34	ME
b) punctuality	3.64	GE	3.19	ME	3.27	ME	3.50	ME	3.33	ME
c) job knowledge	3.42	GE	3.25	ME	3.11	ME	3.00	ME	3.21	ME
d) quality of work	3.57	GE	3.13	ME	3.11	ME	3.00	ME	3.19	ME
e) attitude towards work	3.50	GE	3.08	ME	3.27	ME	3.10	ME	3.20	ME
f) human relations	3.42	GE	3.00	ME	3.16	ME	3.00	ME	3.11	ME
g) personality	3.42	GE	3.13	ME	3.11	ME	3.00	ME	3.16	ME
h) industry	3.21	ME	2.91	ME	3.00	ME	3.20	ME	3.02	ME
i) initiative and resourcefulness	3.50	GE	2.85	ME	3.11	ME	3.20	ME	3.07	ME
j) loyalty and cooperation	3.35	GE	3.08	ME	3.05	ME	3.00	ME	3.11	ME
13. I am aware of the different areas by which I am evaluated	3.42	GE	3.25	ME	3.00	ME	3.00	ME	3.19	ME
14. The evaluation instrument is revised/updated regularly	2.85	ME	2.88	ME	2.55	ME	2.30	LE	2.72	ME
15. Employees are given the chance to participate in crafting/revising the evaluation instrument	2.50	ME	2.11	LE	1.77	LE	2.30	LE	2.13	LE
Group Average	3.33	GE	3.02	ME	2.96	ME	3.00	ME	3.06	ME

Legend:

Mean Range	
3.25 - 4.00	
2.50 - 3.24	
1.75 - 2.49	
1.00 - 1.74	

Scale
Always
Often
Rarely
Never

Interpretation
Great Extent (GE)
Moderate Extent (ME)
Less Extent (LE)
Not Practiced (NP)

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHIИ (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Evaluators

Table 8 presents data regarding the extent of the manifestation of the performance evaluation system among the administrators, teaching and non-teaching personnel as well as the maintenance staff in the aspect of the evaluators.

As shown in Table 8, the overall item average of 3.32 (great extent) derived from the group average of 3.40 (great extent) coming from the school administrators, 3.44 (great extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.11 (moderate extent) from the non-academic and 3.16 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff, manifested that the respondents believe in the capability of the evaluators to perform their task.

Specifically, an item average of 3.51 (great extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.64 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.58 (great extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.00 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel and 4.00 (great extent) from the maintenance staff revealed that all the respondents are being evaluated by their heads or immediate superior.

With an item average of 3.30 (great extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.42 (great extent) from the school administrator, 3.38 (great extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.22 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel and 3.00 (effective) from the maintenance staff also revealed that the one who conducted the evaluation observed professionalism in the conduct of the evaluation.

The respondents were also one in saying that the evaluators observed confidentiality as evidenced by an item average of 3.43 (great extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.57 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.50 (great extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.44 (great extent) from the non-academic personnel and 3.00 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff.

With an item average of 3.08 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.07 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 3.30 (great extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.77 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 2.90 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff revealed that at least the conduct of the evaluation is announced by the head ahead of time to prepare the respondents.

Finally, with an item average of 3.26 (great extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.28 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.44 (great extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.11 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel and 2.90 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff the respondents believe that their head was objective in the conduct of the performance evaluation.

From these findings, it can be deduced that the school has entrusted to the right persons as evaluators of the employees who are capable of handling their tasks and are effective in the performance of their duties.

Table 8. The Extent to which the Performance Evaluation System is Manifested in the Aspect of Evaluators

Items	Administrator (n=15)		Teaching Personnel (n=36)		Non-Academic Personnel (n=18)		Maintenance Personnel (n=10)		Item Average (N=79)	
	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.
16. My head conducts my performance evaluation	3.64	GE	3.58	GE	3.00	ME	4.00	GE	3.51	GE
17. My head observes professionalism in conducting my evaluation	3.42	GE	3.38	GE	3.22	ME	3.00	ME	3.30	GE
18. My head observes confidentiality in my evaluation results	3.57	GE	3.50	GE	3.44	GE	3.00	ME	3.43	GE
19. My head announces the conduct of evaluation ahead of time	3.07	ME	3.30	GE	2.77	ME	2.90	ME	3.08	ME
20. My head is objective in										

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

evaluating performance	my	3.28	GE	3.44	GE	3.11	ME	2.90	ME	3.26	GE
Group Average		3.40	GE	3.44	GE	3.11	ME	3.16	ME	3.32	GE

Legend:

Mean Range

3.25 - 4.00
2.50 - 3.24
1.75 - 2.49
1.00 - 1.74

Scale

Always
Often
Rarely
Never

Interpretation

Very Effective (VE)
Effective (E)
Not Effective (NE)
Not Practiced (NP)

Feedback Mechanism

Table 9 presents data regarding the extent of the manifestation of the performance evaluation system among the administrators, teaching and non-teaching personnel as well as the maintenance staff in the aspect of the feedback mechanism.

As shown in Table 9, the overall item average of 2.86 (moderate extent) derived from the group average of 3.00 (moderate extent) coming from the school administrators, 2.99 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.58 (moderate extent) from the non-academic and 2.75 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff, manifested that the feedback mechanism is used to a moderate extent.

In particular, the item average of 2.93 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.20 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 3.00 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.72 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel, and 2.70 from the maintenance staff revealed that the school has a feedback mechanism and that those who evaluated were able to relay to the respondents the results of the evaluation.

Furthermore, the item average of 2.66 (moderate extent) taken from the weighted mean of 3.00 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.80 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.22 (less extent) from the non-academic personnel and 2.50 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff revealed that there is post conference with regard to the results of the evaluation. However, the non-academic personnel believed that the process is not effective.

The item average of 2.80 (moderate extent) taken from the weighted mean of 3.00 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.80 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.44 (less extent), and 2.60 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff indicated that the respondents believed that the feedback mechanism used by the school is objective and proactive.

Moreover, with an average item of 2.89 (moderate extent) taken from the weighted mean of 2.93 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 3.05 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel,

2.61 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 2.80 from the maintenance personnel, it can be deduced that the feedback mechanism had its effect in the improvement of the respondents' performance.

Furthermore, an item average of 2.83 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.06 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.94 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.41 (less extent) from the non-academic staff and 2.90 from the maintenance personnel revealed that the respondents have been informed of their weak points in the evaluation and have been encouraged to improve in the next performance evaluation.

The item average of 2.90 (moderate extent) taken from the weighted mean of 3.06 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.72 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.44 (less extent) from the non-academic personnel, and 2.90 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff also revealed that the respondents have been informed of their strong points in the evaluation and have been advised to continue doing well.

The item average of 3.14 (moderate extent) taken from the weighted mean of 3.40 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.22 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.05 (moderate extent), and 2.70 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff implies that the respondents believe that confidentiality is being observed in the feedback mechanism.

The item average of 2.87 (moderate extent) taken from the weighted mean of 2.87 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 3.00 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.67 (less extent) from the non-academic staff, and 2.80 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff revealed that the respondents believe that the feedback mechanism is able to highlight the areas where they need to improve.

Finally, with an item average of 2.85 (moderate extent) from the weighted mean of 2.73 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 3.14 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.55 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 2.60 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff further

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

revealed that the school regularly conducts monitoring of the performance of the employees.

These findings revealed that the school possesses an effective feedback mechanism where the

respondents are able to receive the result of the evaluation with acknowledgement of the strong points that need to be maintained and the weak points that need to be improved and developed.

Table 9. The Extent to which the Performance Evaluation System is Manifested in the Aspect of Feedback Mechanism

Items	Administrator (n=15)		Teaching Personnel (n=36)		Non-Academic Personnel (n=18)		Maintenance Personnel (n=10)		Item Average (N=79)	
	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.
21. The school has a feedback system on evaluation results	3.20	ME	3.00	ME	2.72	ME	2.70	ME	2.93	ME
22. There is a post conference where my evaluation results are discussed	3.00	ME	2.80	ME	2.22	ME	2.50	ME	2.66	ME
23. The feed backing system is objective and is pro-active	3.00	ME	2.97	ME	2.44	ME	2.60	ME	2.80	ME
24. The feed backing system ensures improvement of my future performance	2.93	ME	3.05	ME	2.61	ME	2.80	ME	2.89	ME
25. The weak points in my evaluation are given emphasis for improvement	3.06	ME	2.94	ME	2.41	ME	2.90	ME	2.83	ME
26. The strong points in my evaluation are considered for future enhancement	3.06	ME	2.94	ME	2.72	ME	2.90	ME	2.90	ME
27. Confidentiality is maintained in every feed backing session	3.40	GE	3.22	ME	3.05	ME	2.70	ME	3.14	ME
28. Points for improvement are highlighted and given immediate resolution	2.87	ME	3.00	ME	2.67	ME	2.80	ME	2.87	ME
29. My head conducts monitoring of my performance after the feed backing session	2.80	ME	2.86	ME	2.38	ME	3.00	ME	2.75	ME
30. Monitoring of performance is regularly conducted	2.73	ME	3.14	ME	2.55	ME	2.60	ME	2.85	ME
Group Average	3.00	ME	2.99	ME	2.58	ME	2.75	ME	2.86	ME

Legend:

Mean Range

3.25 - 4.00

2.50 - 3.24

1.75 - 2.49

1.00 - 1.74

Scale

Always

Often

Rarely

Never

Interpretation

Great Extent (GE)

Moderate Extent (ME)

Less Extent (LE)

Not Practiced (NP)

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 3.117	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHIQ (Russia)	= 0.156	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Utilization of Results

Table 10 presents data regarding the extent of the manifestation of the performance evaluation system among the administrators, teaching and non-teaching personnel as well as the maintenance staff in the aspect of the utilization of the evaluation results.

As shown in Table 10, the overall item average of 2.61 (moderate extent) derived from the group average of 2.69 (moderate extent) coming from the school administrators, 2.56 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.75 (moderate extent) from the non-academic and 2.60 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff, showed that the results of the evaluation are being used by the school in its desire to improve the incentives of the employees.

An item average of 2.98 (moderate extent) based on the weighted mean of 3.20 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 3.08 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.94 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 2.98 (moderate extent) from the maintenance personnel revealed that the evaluation result is utilized for merit increase.

However, the respondents were almost unanimous in affirming that the results of the evaluation have not been effectively used by the school for job counseling as manifested in the item average of 2.46 (less extent) derived from the weighted mean of 2.40 (less extent) from the school administrators, 2.38 (less extent) from the teaching staff, 2.55 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel and 2.40 (less extent) from the maintenance staff.

Furthermore, an item average of 2.56 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 2.80 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.50 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.66 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff, and 2.70 from the maintenance personnel revealed that the school takes into consideration the results of the evaluation in the promotion of its employees.

An item average of 2.68 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 2.85 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.52 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.83 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff revealed that majority of the respondents believe that the results of the evaluations have been made basis for termination or layoff. However, the maintenance staff, with a weighted mean of 2.30 (less extent), believe otherwise.

Whether the results of the evaluation are being utilized for development and evaluation of training program, or not, the answer can be manifested by the following presentation. With an item average of 2.55 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 2.66 (moderate extent) from both the school administrators and the teaching personnel, 2.50

(moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 2.80 (moderate extent) from the maintenance personnel, the respondents said that the results of the evaluation have been utilized for the development of the personnel and the evaluation of the training programs of the institution.

An item average of 2.54 (moderate extent) from the weighted mean of 2.50 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel and 2.72 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff revealed that the respondent perceive that the results of the evaluation have been considered in the transfer of employees. However, the school administrators with a weighted mean of 2.35 (less extent) and 2.10 (less extent) from the maintenance personnel said otherwise.

An item average of 2.56 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 2.71 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.55 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.61 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 2.70 from the maintenance staff shows that the school uses the results as a basis for its human resource planning.

Furthermore, the respondents were divided in terms of their perception whether the results have been used for giving incentives and bonuses to the employees. The school administrators netted a weighted mean of 2.73 (moderate extent) while the non-academic personnel had a weighted mean of 3.11 (moderate extent) believe so. However, the teaching personnel, with a weighted mean of 2.34 (less extent) and the maintenance staff with a weighted mean of 2.30 (less extent) indicated otherwise. Overall, the item average of 2.58 (moderate extent) manifested that the respondents still believe that the results are used for this purpose.

An item average of 2.61 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 2.66 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.57 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.77 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff, and 2.30 (less extent) from the maintenance personnel revealed that the school uses the results of the evaluation for internal communication.

And finally, with an item average of 2.59 (moderate extent) deduced from the weighted mean of 2.57 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.52 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.77 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 2.40 (less extent) from the maintenance personnel suggested that the results are utilized for policy formulation.

From this finding, it can be deduced that generally, the school utilizes the results of the evaluations from merit increase to policy formulation but there are some areas where other respondents did not perceive like job counseling, giving of incentives and bonuses and transferring of employees.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHIJ (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Table 10. The Extent to which the Performance Evaluation System is Manifested in the Aspect of Utilization of Results

Items	Administrator (n=15)		Teaching Personnel (n=36)		Non-Academic Personnel (n=18)		Maintenance Personnel (n=10)		Item Average (N=79)	
	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.
31.Evaluation results are used for:										
a) merit increase	3.20	ME	3.08	ME	2.94	ME	2.75	ME	2.98	ME
b) job counseling	2.40	ME	2.38	ME	2.55	ME	2.40	LE	2.46	LE
c) promotion	2.80	ME	2.50	ME	2.66	ME	2.70	ME	2.56	ME
d) termination/layoff	2.85	ME	2.52	ME	2.83	ME	2.30	LE	2.68	ME
e) development and evaluation of training program	2.66	ME	2.66	ME	2.50	ME	2.80	ME	2.55	ME
f) transfer	2.35	ME	2.50	ME	2.72	ME	2.10	LE	2.54	ME
g) human resource planning	2.71	ME	2.55	ME	2.61	ME	2.70	ME	2.56	ME
h) giving of incentives and bonuses	2.73	ME	2.34	LE	3.11	ME	2.30	LE	2.58	ME
i) internal communication	2.66	ME	2.57	ME	2.77	ME	2.30	LE	2.61	ME
j) policy formulation	2.57	ME	2.52	ME	2.77	ME	2.40	LE	2.59	ME
Group Average	2.69	ME	2.56	ME	2.75	ME	2.60	ME	2.61	ME

Legend:

Mean Range

3.25	-	4.00
2.50	-	3.24
1.75	-	2.49
1.00	-	1.74

Scale

Always
Often
Rarely
Never

Interpretation

Great Extent (GE)
Moderate Extent (ME)
Less Extent (LE)
Not Practiced (NP)

Summary of Data on the Extent to which Performance Evaluation System is Manifested

Table 11 contains a summary of the data pertaining to the extent to which the performance evaluation system is manifested as perceived by the school administrators, teaching personnel, non-academic staff and the maintenance personnel.

As shown in Table 11, the overall item average of 2.97 (moderate extent) derived from the group mean of 3.14 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 3.02 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.83 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel and 2.87 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff showed that the school's performance evaluation system is effective as perceived by the respondents.

Specifically, the item average of 3.04 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.28 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.11 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.75 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 2.98

(moderate extent) from the maintenance personnel showed that the process flow of the evaluation system is effective.

The item average of 3.06 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.33 (great extent) from the school administrators, 3.02 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.96 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff and 3.00 (moderate extent) from the maintenance staff revealed that the instrument used in the conduct of the evaluation is still useful and effective.

Furthermore, the item average of 3.32 (great extent) taken from the weighted mean of 3.40 (great extent) from the administrators, 3.44 (great extent) from the teaching personnel, 3.11 (moderate extent) from the non-academic personnel and 3.16 (moderate extent) from the maintenance personnel showed that those who are tasked to evaluate are very much capable and acceptable to those who were evaluated. This is the only aspect where the respondents gave a very high rating.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

The respondents also believe that the feedback mechanism is effective as manifested in the item average of 2.86 (moderate extent) derived from the weighted mean of 3.00 (moderate extent) from the administrators, 2.99 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.58 (moderate extent) from the non-academic staff, and 2.75 (moderate extent) from the maintenance personnel.

Finally, the item average of 2.61 (moderate extent) taken from the weighted mean of 2.69 (moderate extent) from the school administrators, 2.56 (moderate extent) from the teaching personnel, 2.75

(moderate extent) from the non-academic staff showed that for the majority of the respondents, the results of the evaluations are used to improve the employees' welfare while the maintenance personnel, with a weighted mean of 2.46 (less extent) perceive otherwise.

These findings imply that, generally, the school's performance evaluation is still effective and serves its purpose. From the standpoint of the respondents, there are some areas which need to be reviewed and given attention.

Table 11. Summary on the Extent to which the Performance Evaluation System Is Manifested as Perceived by the Administrators, Teaching Personnel, Non-Academic Personnel and Maintenance Personnel

Aspects of Performance Evaluation System	Administrator (n=15)		Teaching Personnel (n=36)		Non-Academic Personnel (n=18)		Maintenance Personnel (n=10)		Item Average (N=79)	
	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.	Mean	Int.
1. Process Flow	3.28	GE	3.11	ME	2.75	ME	2.98	ME	3.04	ME
2. Instruments	3.33	GE	3.02	ME	2.96	ME	3.00	ME	3.06	ME
3. Evaluators	3.40	GE	3.44	GE	3.11	ME	3.16	ME	3.32	GE
4. Feedback Mechanism	3.00	ME	2.99	ME	2.58	ME	2.75	ME	2.86	ME
5. Utilization of Results	2.69	ME	2.56	ME	2.75	ME	2.46	LE	2.61	ME
Group Average	3.14	ME	3.02	ME	2.83	ME	2.87	ME	2.97	ME

Legend:

Mean Range	
3.25 - 4.00	
2.50 - 3.24	
1.75 - 2.49	
1.00 - 1.74	

Scale
Always
Often
Rarely
Never

Interpretation
Great Extent (GE)
Moderate Extent (ME)
Less Extent (LE)
Not Practiced (NP)

Test of Hypothesis

The data are presented in Table 12 showing the degree of freedom, the computed F-value, the critical F-value, the p-value, the decision and the conclusion to the hypothesis.

The null hypothesis of the study was stated as: there is no significant difference on the extent to which the performance evaluation system is manifested by the school administrators, teaching personnel, non-academic staff and maintenance personnel in the aspect of process flow, instruments, evaluators, feedback mechanism and the utilization of results.

As presented in Table 12, there is a significant difference between the perceptions of the respondents in the aspect of the process flow as shown by the p-value of 0.0054 which is less than the 0.05 level of

significance. This finding could be traced back to Table 6 which revealed that although the item average is considered effective, however there are some items under this aspect where the administrators and teachers, non-academic staff and maintenance personnel differed in their perceptions. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected.

On the other hand, the perceptions of the different groups of respondents on the aspects of instruments, evaluators, feedback mechanism and utilizations of results showed no significant difference. Specifically, the p-value of 0.2564 for instruments, 0.1178 for the evaluators, 0.2227 for feedback mechanism and 0.6461 for the utilizations of results all are higher than the 0.05 level of significance, thus accepting the null hypothesis.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Table 13. Results of the Test of Hypothesis at $\alpha = 0.05$ Level of Significance

Null Hypothesis	Degrees of Freedom (df)	Computed F-value	Critical F-value	p-value	Decision	Conclusion
Ho: There is no significant difference on the extent to which the performance evaluation system is manifested by the respondents in the aspects of:						
a) Process Flow	78	4.5641	2.72	0.0054	Reject Ho	Significant Difference
b) Instruments	78	1.3765	2.72	0.2564	Accept Ho	No Significant Difference
c) Evaluators	78	2.0238	2.72	0.1178	Accept Ho	No Significant Difference
d) Feedback Mechanism	78	1.4952	2.72	0.2227	Accept Ho	No Significant Difference
e) Utilization of Results	78	0.5553	2.72	0.6461	Accept Ho	No Significant Difference

Conclusion

Based on the results of the study, it is concluded that the academic and non-academic personnel consider the performance evaluation system as effective in the aspect of process flow, instruments, evaluators, feedback mechanism and the utilizations of results.

The study supports the theory of Henderson that in order for an organization to be able to survive,

prosper and achieve competitive advantage with the rest of similar organizations, it must develop a well-designed, tailor-made and systematic performance evaluation system to match employee and organizational characteristics and qualities (Henderson, 1984).

References:

- DeNisi, A. S. (1996). *A cognitive approach to performance appraisal: A program of research*. London: Routledge.
- Grote, R. C. (2002). *The performance appraisal question and answer book: A survival guide for managers*. New York: American Management Association.
- Kreitner, R. (1998). *Management* (7th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Landy, F. J., & Farr, J. L. (1983). *The measurement of work performance: Methods, theory, and applications*. New York: Academic Press.
- Longenecker, C. O., & Fink, L. S. (1999). Creating effective performance appraisals. *Industrial Management*, 41(5), 18.
- Baker, H. B. (1984). 'Two Goals in Every Performance Appraisal', *Personnel Journal Vol. 63, No. 9*, pp. 74-78.
- Cole, G.A. (1988). *Personnel Management: Theory and Practice*. London: DP Publications.
- Swan, W.S. (1991). *How to do Superior Performance Appraisal*. In Swan, W.S. (Eds.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Henderson, R.I. (1984). *Practical Guide to Performance Appraisal*. Reston Publishing, Virginia.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.156	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

10. Kennedy, M. M. (1999). *Performance Appraisal Across the Board*, 36(1), pp. 51-52.
11. Tziner, A., Joanis, C., & Murphy, K. (2000). A comparison of three methods of performance appraisal with regard to goal properties, goal perceptions, and rate satisfaction. *Group and Organization Management*, 25: 175-190.
12. Davis, K. (1985). *Human Behavior at Work: Organization Behavior*, McGraw Hill Book Company New York.
13. Brown, R. D. (1988). *Performance appraisal as a tool for staff development*. In M. J. Barr & M. L. Upcraft (Eds.), *New directions for student services* (pp. 3-105). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
14. Burkhalter, B. B., & Buford, J. A. Jr. (1989). *Performance appraisal: Concepts and techniques for postsecondary education*. Alexandria, VA: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Publications.
15. Clausen, T. S., Jones, K. T., & Rich, J. S. (2008). *Appraising Employee Performance Evaluation System*, *The CPA Journal*, February 2008 Issue, New York.
16. Davis, J.S. (2001). Approaches to performance appraisal in student affairs. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 21(1), 92.
17. Katz, R. (2001). *Six Steps to Successful Performance Appraisal*, Workforce; October 26, 2001.
18. Pettijohn, L. S., Parker, R. S., Pettijohn, C. E., & Kent, J. L. (2001). Performance appraisals: Usage, criteria and observations. *Journal of Management Development*, 20(9), 754.
19. Rasch, L. (2004). Employee performance appraisal and the 95/5 rule. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 28(5), 407-414.
20. Starcher, R. (1996). Individual performance appraisal systems. *Production & Inventory Management Journal*, 37(4), 58-62.