IJAMS
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
Volume IV, Issue 5 May 2024, eISSN: 2799-0664

Teaching Practices of Public Elementary School Teachers Relative to Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST)

GEMMA G. TACULOG
Cabaruan Elementary School
Urdaneta City, Pangasinan
gayap001@deped.gov.ph

RUSSEL V. SANTOS
Urdaneta City University
Urdaneta City, Pangasinan
russelsantos @ucu.edu.ph

Abstract — Teaching quality education is widely recognized as a factor in the learning process and affecting student learning outcome. Hence, the attributes of highly effective teaching practices must aim to produce an effective practice of learning and teaching.
Under quantitative design, the researcher utilized the descriptive-survey-correlation design. "In quantitative research, researchers collect numerical data from individuals or group and usually subject these data to statistical analyses to determine whether there are relationships among them, while in the descriptive-correlational survey, the information gathered can be used for comparison and contrast designed to estimate the extent to which the variables are related to each other in the population of interest.
The output of the study is a development program to enhance the teaching practices of the Public Elementary School Teachers relative to the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST); that reflecting back on their past actions and events, emotions, experience, possible actions and responses will help them gain in depth understanding what practices are needed to continue or are needed to improve or develop and even what characters to enhance and possess to cater quality education. Thus, it is indeed the commitment and dedication of the teachers that gives or makes purposeful, meaningful experiences to learners towards quality education.

Keywords — Quality Education, Teaching Practices, Development Program, Commitment

I. Introduction

Education is an important pillar towards achieving national development and global competence. It creates a bridge towards the achievement of success in line of foundations of learning. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) stated that education is for All (EFA) and that access must be matched by quality, which shared a common goal with the Department of Education, wherein its mission is to promote the right of every Filipinos, to quality, equitable, culture-based and complete basic education, accessible for all.

Teaching quality is widely recognized as a factor in the learning process and affecting student learning outcome (CEPPE, 2013). Hence, the attributes of highly effective teaching must be aimed to produce an effective practice of learning and teaching (Rasool, et al.,2017)

The article from the United States (US) Department of Education (2019) entitled "President's Budget Expands Education Freedom, Supports Teachers, Protects Vulnerable Students" says that for the first time, teacher voucher program has been included in the President's 2020 Budget Request to provide teachers the freedom and flexibility to chart their own course for professional development. In elevating the teaching profession, $300 million investment fund goes to customized teacher professional development and $200 million investment for Teachers and School Leaders (TSL) Incentive Grants so that their teachers can benefit from high quality mentoring programs.

The problem of teacher development in South Africa is aggravated by the 40 percent unqualified and underqualified practicing teachers who lack content knowledge and some teachers holding outdated qualifications (Gumbo, M. 2020). A teacher group SADTU (2014) conducted research to its teacher-members in poor towns and rural communities about their perception on professional development challenges and their need for training interventions. The study averred that South Africa has changed its education policies many times, including the curriculum but teachers were not even trained to implement these policies. They recommended that any education policy (curriculum change) that the government introduces should be accompanied by a proper teacher professional development derived from training needs of concerned teachers taking into consideration where their schools operate.

Myanmar government has prioritized educational reform efforts to uplift national education, cognizant that improvement of their teacher quality is important to quality education and positive learning outcomes. The Myanmar Teacher Competency Standards Framework (TCSF) had been developed to establish set of standards for the improvement in the quality of teachers and teaching in the country (Myint & Win, 2016).

In Singapore, teachers are entitled to 100 hours of professional development every year, establish teacher networks, and collaborate with professional learning communities for consistent peer-to-peer learning to improve in their practice (TALIS, 2018). Moreover, teachers' professional development is encouraged through the Enhanced

Performance Management System that forms part of the career and recognition system. This structure has three components: a career path, recognition through monetary rewards and an evaluation system. The plan recognizes that teachers have different ambitions and provides three career tracks: the Teaching Track for a career focused on excellence in teaching where they can advance to the level of Master Teacher; the Leadership Track, which provides opportunities for them to assume school leadership positions; and the Senior Specialist Track, where teachers join

the ministry's headquarters to become part of the education specialists with deep knowledge and skills in specific areas primarily to keep Singapore at the leading edge in education.

Change is continuous including the process of teaching which lead to the creation of the standards of teaching practice to ensure the quality of teaching (Roberto & Madrigal 2019). Teaching in 21st century focuses on teaching standards or standards of teaching practice which define what teachers and school leaders should be able to do. Therefore, teachers are placed under the teaching standards or otherwise known as Philippine Professional Standards for teachers (PPST) (Madrigal 2019).

Increasing access to quality and relevant education requires effective teachers to achieve the basic goals of these UN's sponsored programs. Teachers and the national policies that shape the teaching profession are critical for the provision of quality education. Teachers are the key facilitators of learning. They are the so-called nation-builders and as such their services are significant to every nation's progress.

Literature Review

Presently, there are 90 million teachers worldwide, but they receive an average of only one in-service training yearly (Cilliers et al., 2020). UNESCO Institute for Statistics

(UIS) data in 2018 estimated that the world needs almost 69 million more new teachers to achieve the targets of SDG 4 by 2030 to provide every child basic education. However, not all

the teachers around the globe are trained, only 85% of primary teachers and 86% of secondary teachers (UIS, 2019). In sub-Saharan Africa, only 64% of primary and 50% of secondary school teachers were trained in 2018 compared to 71% and 79% respectively in 2005. In Southern Asia, 72% of primary teachers were trained in 2018 compared to 78% in 2013.

Improving education quality requires far more than just having enough teachers in the education system. Teachers need to be trained, supported through professional development, motivated and willing to continually improve their teaching practices. Teachers' continuing professional development has become imperative concerns in many educational studies in many countries over the years (Bayar, 2014). Moreover, professional teaching standards have the potential to raise teacher quality (Call, 2018).

As for the Philippines, Filipinos are known to value education. It is perceived as the key to escaping poverty. The Constitution explicitly states that "the state shall protect and promote the rights of all citizens to quality education and shall take appropriate steps to make such education accessible to all" (Article 14, Section 1 of the Philippine Constitution). The Department of Education (DepEd) is the government agency tasked to formulate, implement, and coordinate policies, plans, programs and projects in the areas of formal and non-formal basic education.

In response to the Constitutional mandate to provide quality education and to enhance the country's global competitiveness, DepEd initiated educational reforms through Republic Act No. 10157 or the Kindergarten Education Act and Republic Act No. 10533, known as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013. Kindergarten to Grade 12 now follows the K-12 Basic Education Curriculum (K-12) patterned after the 12-year primary and secondary schooling system of all countries in the ASEAN region and the world (Jocson, J. & Mc Phan, G., 2015). This overhaul in the basic education system adds two more years to the 10 years of basic education will allow learners to master the skills needed for continuing into tertiary education or entrance into the labor force. Furthermore, it establishes a system of equivalency of courses taken by students so that Filipino graduates and professionals will be on par with other countries.

Likewise, Section 5 paragraph 5 of Article 14 of the 1987 Constitution promulgates that the education sector gets budgetary priority. Over the years, it has the highest fraction of the national budget. Recently, President Eduardo Roa Duterte signed into law the 2021 budget with the Department of Education (DepEd) getting the largest proportion with Php 751.7 billion, or 16.7 percent of the total FY 2021 budget (DBM, 2021). Because of the Corona Virus (COVID-19) pandemic, Php 17.02 billion has been allocated to adopt flexible distance learning through the implementation Basic Education Learning Continuity Program (BE-LCP).

When K-12 was launched in 2012, a major change has consistently pursued teaching quality reforms (D.O. No.31, 2012). The Philippine Professional Standard for Teachers (PPST) formerly known as National Competency–Based Teacher Standards (NCBTS) (D.O.32,2009) was established to be the framework of teaching quality (D.O.

No.42, 2017). Because of this study, the question of the practicability of the 21st century as a response to the 21st century of learning shall be used as a basis for the standards of teaching in public and private schools.

Despite the concerted efforts placed into our educational sector and significant reform initiatives, dissatisfaction persists over the years about the quality of Philippine education the students are getting and the quality of graduates the educational institutions are producing as implied by national and international assessments.

In addition, a teacher's qualities, character, qualifications, and professional competences are the cornerstone on which successful national education ultimately depends. The development and improvement of teacher's competence can transform not only the learners but the society at large (Gepila,2019).

The 2021 results of Quarreli Symonds (QS) Asia University Rankings released a report which indicated that the country's top university, the University of the Philippines ranked 69th from the 650 participating institutions in the region. UP was 72nd last 2020. The other country's top universities (Ateneo De Manila University, University of Santo Tomas, and De La Salle

University) fell from their previous rankings while other institutions in the country were way far behind in rankings compared to our Asian neighboring higher education institutions.

Surveys and evaluations had conducted to measure the outcomes of learning, Philippines is one of the six Southeast Asian countries that has participated in Southeast Asia Primary Learning Metrics 2019, or SEA-PLM 2019. It was developed to better measure and understand learning outcomes in Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Global Citizenship of Grade 5 learners (DepEd, 2020). Based on the SEA-PLM Report by UNICEF & SEAMEO (2020), only 10 percent of Filipino Grade 5 children belonged to Band 6 of reading proficiency. This means only very few can "understand texts with familiar structures and manage competing information". In writing proficiency, 45% are under the lowest Band 1, which tells that majority of them have very "limited ability to present ideas in writing". In Mathematics literacy, Philippines have modest percentages of Grade 5 children who achieved the mathematical literacy skills expected at the end of primary school, as indicated with a mathematical proficiency of Band 6 and above. This implies that the majority of Grade 5 children are still working towards mastering fundamental mathematical skills.

In a speech of DepEd Secretary Leonor M. Briones (2019), she said that in terms of access, our education system has produced major gains and major development but there is a need to respond to the biggest enduring challenge of basic education and that is, attaining quality. As a result of the dismal performance of the country in the various large-scale national and international assessments, the S*ulong EduKalidad* program was launched as a rallying call for a national effort for quality basic education with four key reform areas, namely, (1) K to 12 curriculum review and update, (2) improving the learning environment, (3) teachers' upskilling and reskilling, and (4) engagement.

Of those mentioned, teachers have a crucial role in improving the quality of education. According to Pyne (2014), quality education begins with the best teachers arguing that the quality of teachers and their teaching quality is seen as one of the important, if not most important, determinants affecting education performance. The quality of teachers shows a stronger relationship to pupil achievement (Goldhaber, 2016). Other factors such as the school facilities, the curriculum, and parental involvement also contribute, but how and what our students are taught probably matters most. As a result of McKinsey's survey of education systems across 50 countries, Andreas Schleicher of the OECD (2019) stressed that the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers. This implies that if we want to improve the quality of education, focus more on improving the teachers. Reviewing all factors that affect teaching performance and teacher quality is a great need because teachers are considered as the most vital part in the delivery of the K to 12 curriculum (Diaz, 2015).

In 2015, DepEd issued Order No. 2, s. 2015 – "Guidelines on the Implementation of the Results-based Performance Management System (RPMS) to ensure quality performance among its personnel following Civil Service Commission Memorandum Circular No. 6, s. 2012 or the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS). As a result, DepEd institutionalized the

Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) for common language of teacher quality through DepEd Order No. 42, S. 2017 describing the expectations of teachers' knowledge, practice, and professional engagement. The PPST is a set of standards that articulates teacher quality and explicitly identifies what teachers should know, value and be able to do in their practice in 7 domains. 37 strands, 37 indicators and 4 career stages. Teachers are categorized into Career Stages 1-4 namely, beginning teachers, proficient teachers, highly proficient teachers, and distinguished teachers. At each career stage, teachers' works are categorically defined in terms of the elements of high-quality teaching for the 21st century skills.

Through PPST implementation, the quality of teaching and learning is highly achievable. It also contributes to supporting the Department of Education's vision of producing "Filipinos who passionately love their country and whose values and competencies enable them to realize their full potential and contribute meaningfully to building the nation."

II. Methodology

Research Design and Strategy

The researcher used the quantitative data surveys, and questionnaires in one.

Under quantitative design, the researcher utilized the descriptive-survey-correlation design.

Quantitative design is a method that aims to determine the relationship between one thing an independent and dependent variable in a population. (Hopkins, W.G., 2000). "In quantitative research, researchers collect numerical data from individuals or group and usually subject these data to statistical analyses to determine whether there are relationships among them.

Literally, descriptive method was used to determine the characteristics of a population or phenomenon being studied without the researchers attempt to manipulate the variables. In the descriptive-correlational survey, the information gathered can be used for comparison and contrast designed to estimate the extent to which the variables are related to each other in the population of interest.

From the nature of the aforementioned research method, this study described the

(I) Elementary Teachers' professional profile – (1) age, (2) sex, (3) civil status, (4) highest educational attainment (5) position (Teacher I-III, Master Teacher I-IV) (6) number of years in teaching, and (7) teaching performance; and (II) assessment on the level of teaching practices along the professional variables in the seven domains of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) along (a) Content, Knowledge, and Pedagogy, (b) Learning Environment (c) Diversity of Learners, (d) Curriculum and Planning (e) Assessment and Reporting, (f) Community Linkages and Professional Engagement, and (g) Personal Growth and Professional Development.

It also determined significant relationships between the teaching practices across Elementary Teachers' professional profiles.

The output of the study is Teachers' Professional Development Program to address their priority areas for development related to their professional work and the standards of teacher quality as prescribed by the PPST. A development program proposal was made to start the innovation.

Population and Locale of the Study

The respondents of this study were the Public Elementary School Teachers teaching for the School Year 2022-2023. Complete enumeration was used.

This study was based on the Self-Assessment Tools-Results-Based Performance Management System (SAT-RPMS) for Teachers prepared by DepEd for the School Year 2021-2022 in the time of COVID-19.

It is a self-assessment tool that has the following parts: the cover page which introduces the tool, its purposes, and parts; the demographic profile which collects the teachers'' demographic information such as age, sex, civil status, rank or position, highest degree obtained, among others; and the objectives which are composed of 11 priority indicators from the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) under the different domains. Using a four-point Likert Scale, the teachers rated themselves in terms of how capable they were in performing each objective and what level of development of priority they gave to each objective.

As for the teaching practices, the evaluated and validated Individual Performance and Commitment Review Form (IPCRF) of the RPMS tool was used for Teachers in the time of COVID-19 for the School Year 2021-2022. IPCRF is an assessment form, aligned with the same PPST indicators as that of the SAT-RPMS that rates the teacher's performance and practices within the school year.

The instrument was subjected to evaluation, modification, and enhancement by experts in the field of education using the instrument of Meimban (2020) to establish the content validity of the questionnaire. The survey form was validated in terms of accuracy of contents and alignment of contents with the research objectives. Furthermore, the survey forms were subjected to a pilot test or dry run by administering it to the Public Elementary School Teachers.

The researcher reproduced the duly approved questionnaire and used it to collect data and information from the respondents

Data Gathering Procedure

A letter of permission was forwarded to the Dean of the Graduate School to approve the present study. Upon the approval of the Dean of the Graduate School, the researcher sought the

approval of the School's Division Superintendent to allow the researcher to conduct the study in the division. The respondents were given considerable time to answer the self-assessment tool before the retrieval. For the Public Elementary School Teachers' teaching performance, their approved and validated IPCRF ratings were obtained from the Division Office. The information was gathered and entered into a spreadsheet and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Treatment of Data

The Public Schools Elementary Teachers' responses were quantified, analyzed, and interpreted using the appropriate statistical treatment according to the sub-problems of the study. The data obtained from the questionnaires was encoded in SPSS.

For sub-problem number 1, frequency counts and percentages were used to describe the profile of the Public Elementary School Teachers as age, sex, civil status, highest degree obtained, total number of years in teaching, teaching position, and teaching performance.

For the teaching performance, the presentation on the next page shows the key to descriptive IPCRF ratings.

Scale	Statistical Limit	Descriptive Equivalent
5	4.50-5.00	Outstanding
4	3.50-4.49	Very Satisfactory
3	2.50-3.49	Satisfactory
2	1.50-2.49	Unsatisfactory
1	1.00-1.49	Poor

For sub-problem number 2, the level of teaching practices of the Public Elementary Teachers, the five-point Likert Scale had the following statistical limit and descriptive equivalent for the interpretation of results.

Scale	Statistical Limit	Descriptive Equivalent	Transmuted Rating
5	4.50- 5.00	Always	Highly Practiced
4	3.50- 4.49	Often	Practiced
3	2.50- 3.49	Sometimes	Moderately Practiced
2	1.50- 2.49	Seldom	Fairly Practiced
1	1.00- 1.49	Least	Least Practiced

For sub-problem numbers 3-4 which are concerned with significant relationships and significant differences between the Public Elementary School Teachers' professional profiles and their teaching practices, the Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation was used.

Sub-problem number 5 was concerned with the development program for Public Elementary School Teachers, the researcher provided a proposal for a training matrix for the enhancement of teaching practices.

III. Results and Discussion

Profile of the Respondents

Table 2 below presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondent-teacher profile variables.

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents

n=671

Variable	Variable Categories	Frequency	Percent
Age	21 to 30 years old	112	17
	31 to 40 years old	191	28
	41 to 50 years old	240	36
	51 to 60 years old	128	19
Sex	Male	80	12
	Female	591	88
Civil Status	Single	140	21
	Married	520	77
	Widow	7	1
	Separated	4	1
Highest Educational Attainment	EdD/PhD Graduate	32	5
	EdD/PhD Units	8	1
	MA/MAED Graduate	352	52
	MA/MAED Units	72	11
	BSE/BEED Graduate	207	31
Teaching Position	Master Teacher II	8	1
	Master Teacher I	24	4
	Teacher III	460	69
	Teacher II	108	16
	Teacher I	71	11
Number of Years in Teaching	1-5 years	120	18
	6-10 years	148	22
	11-15 years	164	24
	16 -20 years	87	13
	21 years and above	152	23
Teaching Performance Rating	Outstanding	492	73
	Very Satisfactory	179	27
	Satisfactory	-	-
	Good	-	-
	Poor	-	-

Age. Most of the Respondents, i.e., Two hundred forty (240) of them or 36 percent belong to the 41-50 years old bracket. One hundred ninety-one (191) of them or 28 percent belong to the 31-40 years old bracket, one hundred twenty-eight (128) or 19 percent of them belong to the 51-60 years old bracket while 21-30 years old had a total of one hundred twelve (112) or 17 percent.

Sex. Five hundred eighty- four (591) or 88 percent of the respondent-teachers are female. Eighty (80) of them or 12 percent are male.

Civil Status. Most of the respondents are married with a total of five hundred twenty (520) which is 77 percent. Single has 21 percent or one hundred forty (140) in number. Seven (7) or 1 percent are widows and four (4) or 1 percent of the total respondents are separated.

Highest Educational Attainment: Most of the respondents are MA/MAED graduates with a total of three hundred fifty-two (3520 or 52 percent. Two hundred seven (207) or 31 percent are BSE/BEED Graduates and seventy-two (72) or 11 percent have MA/MAED units. Thirty-two (32) or 5 percent are EdD/PhD Graduates, while EdD/PhD unit earners are only eight (8) or 1 percent.

Teaching Position. Most of the respondents are Teacher III with a total of four hundred sixty (460) or 69 percent. One hundred eight (108) of the respondents are in Teacher II position or 16 percent followed by a total seventy-one (71) Teacher I or 11 percent of the respondents. Master Teacher I are twenty-four (24) or 4 percent in total and a total of eight (8) or 1 percent for Master Teacher II respondents.

Number of years in Teaching. One hundred sixty-four (164) or 24 percent of the respondent teachers are in 11-15 years of service. One hundred fifty-two (152) or 23 percent belong to 21 years and above in service. One hundred forty-eight (148) or 22 percent of them are 6-10 years in the position. One hundred twenty (120) or 18 percent is in the bracket of 1-5 years in service and eighty-seven (87) or 13 percent is in the bracket of 16-20 years in service.

Teaching Performance. Most of the respondent's performance rating is under Outstanding with a total number of four hundred ninety-two (492) or 73 percent and a total of one hundred seventy-nine (179) or 27 percent has a performance rating of Very Satisfactory.

Teaching Practices Relative to Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) Under Domain 1 (Knowledge, Content and Pedagogy).

Table 3 shows the level of teaching practices relative to PPST under Domain 1 which involves the knowledge, content, and strategies used by teachers.

Table 3
Level of Teaching Practices Relative to PPST Under Domain

Domain 1 (Knowledge, Content, and Pedagogy) As a Teacher, I….	Weighted Mean	Transmuted Rating
1. master the content, knowledge, and its application within and across the curriculum.	4.46	Practiced
2. apply research-based knowledge and principles of learning	3.15	Practiced
3. have a positive use of ICT	4.58	Highly Practiced
4. use strategies for promoting literacy and numeracy	4.27	Practiced
5. develop strategies for critical and creative	4.68	Highly Practiced
6. thinking		
7. utilize Mother Tongue, Filipino, English and in teaching and learning	4.48	Highly Practiced
8. use classroom communication and strategies	4.43	Practiced
Over-all Weighted Mean	4.29	Practiced

The respondent-teachers obtained an overall weighted mean (OWM) of 4.29, equivalent to Practiced (P). They scored WM=4.68 in indicator 5, “Develop strategies for critical and creative thinking,” which also indicated that teachers highly practiced this indicator to severe performance, WM=4.58 in indicator 3, “Have a positive use of ICT,” also highly practiced and always used in teaching practice. These above-mentioned WMs are the highest among the indicators in Domain 1. In contrast, the lowest WM=3.15 was obtained by the Teachers in indicator 2, “Apply research-based knowledge and Principles of Learning” in which it is moderately practiced.

The above result is similar to the study conducted by Almeida (2017), the result had an excellent value in terms of the utilization and development of strategies, resources, and themes which believed to promote learning and better delivery.

The values presented in Table 3 indicate that the teaching practices of the respondents about Domain 1 are Practiced (P). Furthermore, it is perceived the teachers utilized and carried out the teaching practice often for the benefit of learners. Manages teaching activities effectively and properly can systematically stimulate interest and promote the self-confidence of students.

Teaching Practices Relative to Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) Under Domain 2 (Learning Environment)

Table 4 shows the level of teaching practices relative to PPST under Domain 2 which concerns the learning environment of learners.

Table 4

Level of Teaching Practices Relative to PPST Under Domain 2

Domain 2 (Learning Environment) As a Teacher I…	Weighted Mean	Transmuted Rating
1. maintain learner safety and security	4.19	Practiced
2. maintain a fair Learning Environment	4.46	Practiced
3. manage classroom structures and activities well	4.59	Highly Practiced
4. support Learners' Activity	4.53	Highly Practiced
5. promote purposive Learning	4.39	Practiced
Over-All Weighted Mean	4.43	Practiced

The respondent-teachers obtained an overall weighted mean (OWM) of 4.43, equivalent to Practiced (P) teachers who had often under their teaching practices. They scored WM=4.59 in indicator statement No.3, “Manage Classrooms and activities well,” which also indicated that teachers highly practiced this indicator which carrying it out always, WM=4.53 in indicator statement No. 4, “Support learners Activity” also highly practiced and always used in teaching practice. These above-mentioned WMs are the highest among the indicator statements in Domain 2 for Learning Environment. In contrast, the lowest WM=4.19 was obtained by the Teachers in indicator statement No. 2, “Maintain learner Safety and Security” in which it is moderately practiced.

Learning environment as a variable that contributes either positively or negatively to the academic achievements of students has attracted only a little attention in the struggle to find a lasting solution to the persistent lackluster results by students from the education system in the country. The learning environment has recently come to the limelight as an essential area that should be considered and well-managed to enhance students’ academic performance. (Dangara, 2019)

Teaching Practices Relative to Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) Under Domain 3 (Diversity of Learners).

Table 5 presents the level of teaching practices relative to PPST under Domain 3 which involves diverse learners.

Table 5
Level of Teaching Practices *Relative to PPST Under Domain 3*

Domain 3 (Diversity of Learners) As a Teacher, I…	Weighted Mean	Transmuted Rating
1. determine learners' gender, needs, strengths, interests, and experiences	3.39	Moderately Practiced
2. determine learners' linguistic, cultural, Socio-economic, and Cultural Background	3.15	Moderately Practiced
3. determine learners with disabilities, giftedness, and talents.	4	Practiced
4. determine learners in difficult circumstances	4.58	Highly Practiced
5. determine learners from Indigenous People	3.51	Practiced
Over-All Weighted Mean	3.73	Practiced

The respondent teachers obtained an overall weighted mean (OWM) of 3.73, equivalent to Practiced (P) teachers who had it often under their teaching practices. They scored WM=4.58 in indicator statement No.4, "Determine learners in difficult

circumstances," which also indicated that teachers highly practiced this indicator carrying it out always, WM=4 in indicator statement No. 3, "Determine learners with disabilities, giftedness and talents" also practiced and often used in learners' classification. These above-mentioned WMs are the highest among the indicator statements in Domain 3 for Diversity of learners. In contrast, the lowest WM=3.15 was obtained by the Teachers in indicator statement No. 2, "determine linguistic, cultural, socio-economic, and cultural background in which it is moderately practice.

Learner diversity is an issue worth addressing in education practices across countries if inclusive societies are to be developed, promoted, and sustained. On the contrary, the area of diversity of learners got the lowest rating in the study conducted by Madrigal (2018). This result indicated that there is a need to focus on the area of diversity of learners. At the diocesan school, there are facilities intended for diverse learners but programs for learner diversity are not well-articulated in the curriculum. Hall, MacDonald, and Smolen (1995) mentioned that as early as the 1990s when teacher education prepared teachers to work in schools responsive to social and economic shifts.

In addition, Teachers should consider background differences in language among learners as an issue that needs to be appreciated to accommodate all learners in their classrooms especially when they start teaching new students who join secondary education (Possi, 2017).

Teaching Practices Relative to Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) Under Domain 4 (Curriculum and Planning)

Table 6 presents the level of teaching practices relative to PPST under Domain 4 which concerns the participation of teachers to the curriculum and planning.

Table 6
Level of Teaching Pctices Relative to PPST Under Domain 4

The respondent-teachers obtained an overall weighted mean (OWM) of 4.46, equivalent to Practiced (P) teachers who had often under their teaching practices. They scored WM=4.60 in indicator statement No.3, "Check on the relevance and responsiveness of learning programs," which also indicated that teachers highly practiced this indicator as to carrying it out always, WM=4.58 in indicators statement No. 1 & 2, "Involve myself in planning and management of Teaching Learning Process and Aligned Learning outcomes with competencies" also highly practiced and always used in curriculum and planning. These above-mentioned WMs are the highest among the indicator statements in Domain 4 for Curriculum and planning. In contrast, the lowest WM=3.15 was obtained by the Teachers in indicator statement No. 4, "Practice professional collaboration for teaching development" in which it is just practiced.

Teaching Practices Relative to Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) Under Domain 5 (Assessment and Reporting).

Table 7 presents the level of teaching practices relative to PPST under Domain 5 which concerns the assessing and reporting of learners' achievement.

Table 7
Level of Teaching Practices Relative to PPST Under Domain 5

Domain 5 (Assessment and Planning) As a Teacher I…	**Weighted Mean**	**Transmuted Rating**
1. design, select, organize, and utilize assessment strategies	4.53	Highly Practiced
2. monitor and evaluate progress reports and learners' achievement	4.53	Highly Practiced
3. do feedback for the learner's improvement	4.45	Practiced
4. communicate with Learners' needs, progress, and achievement to learners' records.	3.38	Practiced
5. use assessment data to enhance teaching and learning practice programs	4.38	Practiced
Over-All Weighted Mean	4.25	Practiced

The respondent-teachers obtained an overall weighted mean (OWM) of 4.25, equivalent to Practiced (P) teachers who had it often under their teaching practices. They scored WM=4.53 in indicator statements No.1 and 2, "Monitor and evaluate of progress reports and learners' achievement and Design select, organize and utilize of assessment strategies," which also indicated that teachers highly practiced this indicator as to which carrying it out always, WM=4.45 in indicators statement No.3. "Do feedbacking for learners' improvement" also practiced and often used in Assessment and Reporting. These above-mentioned WMs are the highest among the indicator statements in Domain 5 for Assessment and Reporting. In contrast, the lowest WM=3.38 was obtained by the Teachers in indicator statement No. 4, "Communicate with Learners needs, progress and achievement to learners' records." in which it is just moderately practiced.

Indicators nos. 1 & 2 are obtained to be highly practiced and always done inside the classroom. This result is supported by Aada (2020) in which the study has found out that the first essential thing to do in this case is to plan the quizzes carefully. Designing and selecting proper assessment tools are highly practiced for the benefit of learners.

Indicator no. 4 with the statement "Communicate with Learners needs, progress and achievement to learners' records." is moderately practiced based on the result of the research. It is also observed in the study of Diloyan, "The importance of communication in the classroom, it was found out that the teachers mainly interacted only with those students who showed interest in the subject and participated. Those who were not interested were left behind." According to the results, student-teacher communication had an impact on those students who were interested in the class as it enthused them to participate more. On the contrary, nothing motivated the students who did not care for the class. The students did not feel free and express themselves in the classroom and only answered yes or no questions. Teachers must provide feedback to all for better outcomes.

Teaching Practices Relative to Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) Under Domain 6 (Community Linkages and Professional Engagement).

Table 8 presents the level of teaching practices relative to PPST under Domain 6 which involves the teacher's professional engagement to the community.

Table 8

Level of Teaching Practices Relative to PPST Under Domain 6

Domain 6 (Community Linkages and Professional Engagement) As a Teacher I…	Weighted Mean	Transmuted Rating
1. establish learning environments that are responsive to community contexts	4.53	Highly Practiced
2. establish engagement of parents and the wider school community in the educative process.	4.53	Highly Practiced
3. maintain professional ethics	4.77	Highly Practiced
4. adhere to school policies and Procedures	4.84	Highly Practiced
5. tapped the stakeholders for school improvement	4.15	Practiced
Over-All Weighted Mean	4.56	Highly Practiced

The respondent-teachers obtained an overall weighted mean (OWM) of 4.56, equivalent to Highly Practiced (HP) teachers had it always under their teaching practices. For the highest mean of 4.84 indicator 4 "Adhere to School Policies and Procedure" also indicated that teacher-respondents do highly practice this regularly. They also scored WM=4.77 in indicator statement No.3, "Maintain Professional Ethics" which also indicated that teachers highly practiced this indicator as to carrying it out always, WM=4.53 in indicator statement No. 1&2, "Establish learning environments that are responsive to community and establish engagement of parents and the wider school community in the educative process." also highly practiced and always used in Professional Engagement. These above-mentioned WMs are the highest among the indicator statements in Domain 4 for Professional Engagement. In contrast, the lowest WM=4.15 was obtained by the Teachers in indicator statement No. 5, "Tap the stakeholders for school improvement" which is just often practiced.

Teaching Practices Relative to Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) Under the Seven Domain 7 (Personal Growth and Professional Development

Table 9 shows the level of teaching practices relative to PPST under Domain 7 which concerns teachers' personal growth and their professional development.

Table 9
Level of Teaching Practices Relative to PPST under Domain 7

Domain 7 (Personal Growth and Professional Development) As a Teacher, I…	Weighted Mean	Transmuted Rating
1. apply a personal philosophy of teaching that is learner-centered.	3.48	Practiced
2. adopt/Utilize practices that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession	3.00	Moderately Practiced
3. participate/Contribute in professional networks to share knowledge and to enhance practice.	2.50	Moderately Practiced
4. develop a personal professional improvement plan based on reflection of one's practice and ongoing professional learning.	2.40	Fairly Practiced
5. set professional development goals based on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers	2.00	Fairly Practiced
Over-All Weighted Mean	2.75	Moderately Practiced

The respondent teachers obtained an overall weighted mean (OWM) of 2.75, equivalent to Moderately Practiced. For the highest standard of 3.48, indicator 1, "apply a personal philosophy of teaching that is learner-centered," indicates that teacher-respondents practice this regularly. They also scored WM=3.00 in Indicator 3, "adopt/utilize practices that uphold the dignity of teaching as a profession," and WM=2.50 in Indicator 4, "develop a personal professional improvement plan based on reflection of one's practice and ongoing professional learning,' which indicate that the teachers moderately practice these indicators and carrying it out constantly. WM=2.40 in indicator 4, "participate/contribute in professional networks to share knowledge and to enhance practice," and the lowest WM=2 obtained from the Teachers in indicator 5, "set professional development goals based on the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers," indicating that these are somewhat practiced.

We might better understand the potential outcomes of LCP implementation if we consider the possible reasons that LCP has been introduced. Schweinfurth suggests that there are three 'justificatory narratives' for LCP implementation. The first is the 'economic' perspective, which assumes that LCP will better prepare students for the demands of a changing world. National governments are understandably interested in becoming as economically competitive as possible, and the argument is that young people will need certain key skills such as critical thinking and creativity to achieve such competitiveness, skills that are more likely to be fostered through LCP (Sahlberg and Oldroyd, 2010).

Relationship Between the Domains and the Profile Variables

Table 11 presents the Pearson r coefficient of correlations between the levels of teaching practices of the respondents and their profile variables.

The R-value of 0.387 sig. at 0.020 and r= 0.444 indicate that there are significant relationships between the teaching practices relative to PPST under Domain 4, Curriculum and Planning, across the variable of teaching position.

Therefore, the null hypothesis stating, "there are no significant relationships between the teaching practices relative to PPST under Domain 4, Curriculum and Planning across the variable of teaching position" is rejected.

However, all the other R-values are not significant between the teaching practices in the seven domains namely: (1) Knowledge, Content and Pedagogy, (2) Learning Environment, (3) Diversity of Learners, (4) Curriculum and Planning, (5) Assessment and Reporting, (6) Community Linkages and Professional Engagement, and (7) Personal Growth and Professional Development across the different areas of need and the profile variables, namely: age, sex, civil status, highest education attainment, teaching position, number of years in teaching and teaching performance. Therefore, the hypothesis of no significant relationships between the teaching practices relative to PPST in the seven domains across these profile variables in this study, is accepted.

Table 11

Significant Relationship across the variables, Pearson r

PPST Domains	Pearson Coefficient Correlation	rAge of	Sex	Status	Educational Attainment	Teaching Position	Teaching Performance
Domain 1 Knowledge Content and Pedagogy	R-value	.140	.603	-.015	.207	.089	.181
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.414	.793	.929	.227	.604	.290
Domain 2 Learning Environment	R-value	.186	.448	-.146	.130	.113	-.154
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.278	.895	.397	.450	.512	.369
Domain 3 Diversity of Learners	R-value	.033	.85	-.228	.032	-.001	-.337
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.849	.369	.182	.852	.996	.044
Domain 4 Curriculum and Planning	r-Valu	.065	.302	-.245	.069	.387	-.241
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.707	.595	.150	.689	.020	.156
Domain 5 Assessment and Reporting	R-value	.035	.127	-.245	.066	-.044	-.341
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.717	.070	.150	.585	.799	.256
Domain 6 Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	R-value	.058	.305	-.245	.067	-.034	-.141
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.539	.070	.150	.689	.809	.256
Domain 7 Personal Growth and Professional Development	R-value	.186	.446	-.243	.031	-.001	-.336
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.278	.894	.148	.850	.995	.043

Mean Differences in the Seven Domains Across the Variable, Age

Table 12 below shows the ANOVA results on the mean differences in the levels of teaching practices of the respondents in all domains.

Table 12

Across the Variable, Age

PPST Domains	Sources of Variation	Sum Squares	ofDF	Mean Square	F-value	Sig.
Domain 1 Knowledge, Content and Pedagogy	Between Groups	0.04600	1	0.04600	0.1380	0.7108
	Within Groups	55.39000	670	0.33780		
	Total	55.44000				
Domain 2 Learning Environment	Between Groups	0.82840	1	0.82840	0.3583	0.6870
	Within Groups	40.45400	670	0.24660		
	Total	41.28300				
Domain 3 Diversity of Learners	Between Groups	1.42000	1	1.42000	0.4829	0.4881
	Within Groups	88.43000	670	0.53000		
	Total	89.85000				
Domain 4 Curriculum and Planning	Between Groups	0.12180	1	0.12180	0.4829	0.4881
	Within Groups	41.37200	670	0.25220		
	Total	41.49000				
Domain 5 Assessment and Reporting	Between Groups	0.00030	1	0.00039	0.0011	0.9741
	Within Groups	61.95740	670	0.37780		
	Total	61.95780				
Domain 6 Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	Between Groups	0.93186	1	0.93186	0.3355	0.5632
	Within Groups	455.50100	670	2.77745		
	Total	456.43300				
Domain 7 Personal Growth and Professional Development	Between Groups	0.93186	1	0.93186	0.3355	0.5632
	Within Groups	455.50100	670	2.77745		
	Total	456.43300				

The F-value= 0.687 sig. at 0.3583 for Domain 2, F=0.4881 sig. at 0.4829 for Domain 3 and 4, F=0.3355 at sig. 0.5632 for Domain 6 and 7, statistically attest to the fact that the variable is not significant across the variable, age.

Mean Differences in the Seven Domains Across the Variable, Sex

Table 13 below shows the ANOVA results on the mean differences in the levels of teaching practices of the respondents in all domains.

Table 13

Across the Variable Sex

PPST Domains	Variable categories	N	Mean	Mean Diff	DF	T-value	Sig.
Domain 1 Knowledge, Content and Pedagogy	Male	84	4.55000	0.04370	1	0.6031	0.7931
	Female	587	4.51370				
Domain 2 Learning Environment	Male	84	4.46575	0.01575	1	0.0448	0.8954
	Female	587	4.45000				
Domain 3 Diversity of Learners	Male	84	4.60000	-0.16027	1	0.85	0.3639
	Female	587	4.76027				
Domain 4 Curriculum and Planning	Male	84	4.45000	-0.637	1	0.3023	0.5957
	Female	587	4.51370				
Domain 5 Assessment and Reporting	Male	84	4.45000	-0.1664	1	0.1279	0.2559
	Female	587	4.61644				
Domain 6 Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	Male	84	4.69178	0.014178	1	0.3609	0.7219
	Female	587	4.55000				
Domain 7 Personal Growth and Professional Development	Male	84	4.45000	-0.637	1	0.3023	0.5957
	Female	587	4.51370				

As shown on the table most of the respondents are females. The statistics indicate that there are no significant mean differences between the teaching practices of the Public Elementary School Teachers across the variable, sex. Hence, the null hypothesis stating that “there are no significant differences between the teaching practices, across the variable, sex, in all domains” is accepted. This means that the respondents are comparable to each other in across the variable, sex.

Both male and female respondents highly practiced the seven domains in their teaching practices.

Mean Differences in the Seven Domains Across the Variable, Civil Status

Table 14 below shows the ANOVA results on the mean differences in the levels of teaching practices of the respondents in all domains.

Table 14

Across the variable Civil Status

PPST Domains	Variable categories	N	Mean	SD	DF	Sig.
Domain 1 Knowledge, Content and Pedagogy	Married	520	4.51969	0.575290	3	0.9727
	Single	140	4.50000	0.614540		
	Widow	7	4.66700	0.577300		
	Separated	4	4.50000	0.707160		
Domain 2 Learning Environment	Married	520	4.45669	0.500000	3	0.4941
	Single	140	4.66000	0.507519		
	Widow	7	4.50000	0.574503		
	Separated	4	4.00000	0		
Domain 3 Diversity of Learners	Married	520	4.74800	0.745000	3	0.8820
	Single	140	4.50000	0.707100		
	Widow	7	4.70580	0.759900		
	Separated	4	4.00000	0		
Domain 4 Curriculum and Planning	Married	520	4.50390	0.501960	3	0.1429
	Single	140	4.00000	0.503994		
	Widow	7	4.58000	0		
	Separated	4	4.33300	0		
Domain 5 Assessment and Reporting	Married	520	4.57400	0.597800	3	0.1462
	Single	140	4.58000	0.656780		
	Widow	7	4.00000	0		
	Separated	4	4.33000	0.577300		
Domain 6 Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	Married	520	4.70000	1.880000	3	0.9243
	Single	140	4.50000	0.506600		
	Widow	7	4.00000	0		
	Separated	4	4.00000	0		
Domain 7 Personal Growth and Professional Development	Married	520	4.70000	1.880000	3	0.9243
	Single	140	4.50000	0.506600		
	Widow	7	4.00000	0		
	Separated	4	4.00000	0		

Married respondents are more numerous based on the statistical view. Its over-all weighted mean is < 4.50 which fall under Highly Practiced (HP) while Single respondents' over-all weighted mean is > 4.50 which fall under Practiced (P).

Mean Differences in the Seven Domains Across the Variable, Educational Attainment

Table 15 below shows the ANOVA results on the mean differences in the levels of teaching practices of the respondents in all domains.

Table 15

Educational Attainment

PPST Domains	Variable categories	N	Mean	DF	f-value	Sig.
Domain 1 Knowledge, Content and Pedagogy	PhD graduate	8	4.00			
	PhD Units	32	4.62			
	MA Graduate	72	4.33			
	MA Units	352	4.54			
	BSED/BEED	207	4.64	4	0.9912	0.4141
Domain 2 Learning Environment	PhD graduate	8	4.00			
	PhD Units	32	4.50			
	MA Graduate	72	4.55			
	MA Units	352	4.47			
	BSED/BEED	207	4.40	4	0.8462	0.4979
Domain 3 Diversity of Learners	PhD graduate	8	4.00			
	PhD Units	32	4.62			
	MA Graduate	72	4.83			
	MA Units	352	4.77			
	BSED/BEED	207	4.70	4	0.6981	0.5944
Domain 4 Curriculum and Planning	PhD graduate	8	4.50			
	PhD Units	32	4.25			
	MA Graduate	72	4.38			
	MA Units	352	4.52			
	BSED/BEED	207	4.56	4	0.9346	0.4454
Domain 5 Assessment and Reporting	PhD graduate	8	4.50			
	PhD Units	32	4.25			
	MA Graduate	72	4.61			
	MA Units	352	4.63			
	BSED/BEED	207	4.58	4	0.7521	0.5580
Domain 6 Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	PhD graduate	8	4.50			
	PhD Units	32	4.37			
	MA Graduate	72	4.50			
	MA Units	352	4.78			
	BSED/BEED	207	4.60	4	0.2360	0.9137
Domain 7 Personal Growth and Professional Development	PhD Graduate	8	4.51			
	PhD Units	32	4.36			
	MA Graduate	72	4.49			
	MA Units	352	4.78			
	BSED/BEED	207	4.61	4	0.2360	0.9137

Most of the respondents are MA unit earners under the OWM <4.50 with the transmuted rating of Highly Practiced (HP).

The F-value of Domain 1 is .9912, sig 0.4141 which indicates a statical point of view of no significant difference across the variable, educational attainment. F-value 0.8462, sig. 4979 Domain 2 has no level of significance based on prob <t 0.05 together with the other 4 domains on the table. This means that the respondents are comparable to one another.

Mean Differences in the Seven Domains across Variable, Teaching Position

Table 16 on the next page shows the ANOVA results on the mean differences in the levels of teaching practices of the respondents in all areas.

Most of the respondents are Teacher III in position with OWM <4.50 in which they highly practiced all the domains.

The F-value =2.9957 sig. at 0.023 for Domain 4, is significant at the alpha level 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis states, "there are no significant mean differences in the respondent performance standards and its correlates to teaching performance". This means that the respondents are comparable to each other when grouped across the variable, teaching position.

Table 16

Teaching Position

PPST Domains	Variable categories	N	Mean	DF	f-value	Sig.
Domain 1 Knowledge, Content, and Pedagogy	Master Teacher II	8	4.52			
	Master Teacher I	24	4.65			
	Teacher III	460	4.54			
	Teacher II	108	4			
	Teacher I	71	4	4	1.96	0.1025
Domain 2 Learning Environment	Master Teacher II	8	4			
	Master Teacher I	24	4.75			
	Teacher III	460	4.44			
	Teacher II	108	4.69			
	Teacher I	71	4.45	4	1.7543	0.1407
Domain 3 Diversity of Learners	Master Teacher II	8	4.25			
	Master Teacher I	24	4.25			
	Teacher III	460	4.72			
	Teacher II	108	4.95			
	Teacher I	71	4.77	4	1.4121	0.2323
Domain 4 Curriculum and Planning	Master Teacher II	8	4			
	Master Teacher I	24	4			
	Teacher III	460	4.68			
	Teacher II	108	4.43			
	Teacher I	71	4.68	4	2.9957	0.0203
Domain 5 Assessment and Reporting	Master Teacher II	8	4.50			
	Master Teacher I	24	4			
	Teacher III	460	4.60			
	Teacher II	108	4.56			
	Teacher I	71	4.72	4	1.2474	0.2931
Domain 6 Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	Master Teacher II	8	4			
	Master Teacher I	24	4.5			
	Teacher III	460	4.72			
	Teacher II	108	4.52			
	Teacher I	71	4.72	4	0.02516	0.9084
Domain 7 Personal Growth and Professional Development	Master Teacher II	8	4			
	Master Teacher I	24	4.5			
	Teacher III	460	4.71			
	Teacher II	108	4.53			
	Teacher I	71	4.72	4	0.02516	0.9084

Mean Differences in the Seven Domains Across the Variable, Years of Teaching

Table 17 below shows the ANOVA results on the mean differences in the levels of teaching practices of the respondents in Years of Teaching.

Table 17

Across the variable Years of Teaching

PPST Domains	Variable categories	N	Mean	SD	DF	Sig.
Domain 1 Knowledge, Content, and Pedagogy	1-5 years	120	4.51	0.57	5	0.9
	6-10 years	148	4.5	0.61		
	11-15 years	164	4.6	0.57		
	16 -20 years	87	4	0.70		
	21 years and above	152	4.7	0.67		
Domain 2 Learning Environment	1-5 years	120	4.45	0.50	5	0.49
	6-10 years	148	4.7	0.50		
	11-15 years	164	4.5	0.57		
	16 -20 years	87	4	0		
	21 years and above	152	4.3	0.58		
Domain 3 Diversity of Learners	1-5 years	120	.4.7	0.74	5	0.88
	6-10 years	148	4.5	0.70		
	11-15 years	164	4.4	0.7		
	16 -20 years	87	4	0		
	21 years and above	152	4.6	0.62		
Domain 4 Curriculum and Planning	1-5 years	120	4.5	0.50	5	0.14
	6-10 years	148	4.1	0.50		
	11-15 years	164	4.6	0.44		
	16 -20 years	87	4.3	0.56		
	21 years and above	152	4.71	0.60		
Domain 5 Assessment and Reporting	1-5 years	120	4.5	0.59	5	0.14
	6-10 years	148	4.5	0.65		
	11-15 years	164	4	0.52		
	16 -20 years	87	4.3	0.57		
	21 years and above	152		0.57		
Domain 6 Community Linkages and Professional Engagement	1-5 years	120	4.7	1.88	5	0.92
	6-10 years	148	4.5	0.50		
	11-15 years	164	4	0		
	16 -20 years	87	4	0		
	21 years and above	152	4.6			
Domain 7 Personal Growth and Professional Development	1-5 years	120	4.70	1.88	5	0.94
	6-10 years	148	4.5	0.50		
	11-15 years	164	4	0		
	16 -20 years	87	4	0		
	21 years and above	152	4.4	0.61		

Most of the respondents have 11-15 years in Service. Followed by 21 years above with a total of 152 respondents considering the length of teaching, they have been in the industry long enough the improvement of their standards in teaching.

The significant difference values for Domain 1. Sig. 0.9, Domain 2. Sig..49. Domain 3.0.88, Domain 4 sig.014, Domain 5 sig. 0.14, domain 6 0.92, and domain 7 sig. 94, which do not show any significant difference at the set alpha level 0.05.he

IV. Conclusion

The following are the conclusions drawn from the salient findings: The public elementary school teachers are female dominated, relatively old in the service and majority of them are Teacher III. The public elementary school teachers should maintain their level of teaching practices except in personal growth and professional development which they need to improve. The proposed development program can enhance the teaching practices of the public elementary school teachers.

REFERENCES

[1] Aada K. (2020) "Insight on Planning and Assessing the Teaching-Learning Process" International Journal on Social and Education Sciences, Volume 2, Issue 2
[2] Almeida, F., Faria, D., & Queirós, A. (2017). Strengths and Limitations of Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods. European Journal of Education Studies, 32501-1111.
[3] Bada, S. O. & Olusegun, S. (2015). Constructivism learning theory: A paradigm for teaching and learning. Journal of Research & Method in Education, 5(6), 66-70. https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-05616670
[4] Bayar, A (2014). "The Components of Effective Professional Development Activities in terms of Teachers' Perspective", International Journal of Education, vol.10, p.319-327,
[5] Basilio, M.B. & Bueno, D.C. (2019). "Research Skills and Attitudes of Master Teachers in A Division Towards Capability Buildings".
[6] Beck, C., Hart, D., & Konsik C. (2002) "The Teaching Standards Movement and Current Teaching Practices" Canadian Journal of Education, vol 27,2/3, p.175
[7] Bual, Joel & Jorilla C.(2021). "Assessing the Teachers' Competence in Diocesan Catholic Schools Relative to the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers" Philippine Social Science Journal, vol. 4 no.2,2021
[8] Bual, J. & Madrigal, D. (2018). The quality of Catholic education in a diocesan school relative to the Philippine Catholic school standards. Philippine Social Science Journal, 1(1), 41-53. https://doi.org/10.52006/main.v1i1.11
[9] Call, L. (2018), "Teacher Leadership: Influences of Chinese Context on the Capacity of Professional Learning Communities to Empower the Classroom teacher," Journal of Education Change vol.1
[10] Castleberry, Gwen Troxell; Evers, Rebecca B. Intervention in School, and Clinic, v45 n3 p201-205 2010
[11] Caver-T & Darling H.(2017), "Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it" American Journal of Education Research,Vol.10 No. 2,99-102
[12] Cilliers, J.(2019), "How to Improve Teaching Practice? An Experimental Comparison of Centralize Training and In- Classroom Coaching", The Journal of Human Resources, vol.4
[13] Dangara, Y, Usnan; Madudili, Chinyere G. (2019), Evaluation of the Effect of Learning Environment on Student's Academic Performance in Nigeria, Non-Journal
[14] Department of Education (2019). Secretary Briones' speech on the launch of Sulong Edukalidad. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2019/12/04/sulong-edukalidad/.
[15] Diaz, M, (2015) "Phenomenology in Educational Qualitative Research: Philosophy as Science or Philosophical Science?" International Journal of Education, vol.1 no.2, p.101-110

[16] Gamal, Sarah -El, (2019). "Effect of Educational Program on Knowledge and Uses of Social Network Sites of Faculty of Nursing Students at Tanta University" Tanta Scientific Journal, vol 22, no. 3, p185-210
[17] Garcia, E, (2020). "COVID-19 and student performance, equity, and U.S. education policy: Lessons from pre-pandemic research to inform relief, recovery, and rebuilding" Economic Policy Institute
[18] George, C (2015) "Employee Relations Article information: Retaining professional workers: what makes them stay?" Employee Relations, Employee Relations Vol. 0033, p. 102
[19] Gepila, E, (2020) "Assessing Teachers Using Philippine Standards for Teachers" Universal Journal of Educational Research, vol 8.
[20] Gilavand A. (2016), Investigating the Impact of Environmental Factors on Learning and Academic Achievement of Elementary Students: Review International Journal of Medical Research & Health Sciences 5(7S):360-36,
[21] Goldhaber, D, (2017). "Building a More Complete Understanding of Teacher Evaluation Using Classroom Observations" SAGE Publications, vol.45 no.6, p.378-387,
[22] Gumbo, M, (2020) "Professional Development of technology Teachers: Does their Training meets their Needs?" Journal in Perspective in Education, vol.38, no.1 p.58-71,
[23] Hall S., MacDonald S. and Smolen L. 20 "Preparing Preservice Teachers for Diversity in Learners" Sage Journal Vol. 46 Issue 4
[24] Hopkins, W. G. (2000). Quantitative Research Design. Sport Science, 4, 1-8
[25] Laude, T. & Ralar, T. (2018), "Master Teachers as Instructional Leaders: An Exploration of School Leadership Capacity in the Division of Biliran" International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research, 2018
[26] Madrigal, D.V & Roberto, J. (2018). Teacher quality in the light of the Philippine professionalization standards for teachers. Philippine Social Science Journal
[27] Maksinovic, J and Osmonovic, J (2018) "Reflective Practice as a Changing Factor of Teaching Quality", Research in Pedagogy, v8 n2 p172-189 2018
[28] Meimban J. (2020) "Everyone is relative", Philippine Star Opinion
[29] Morallo, M & Abay, J,(2019). "Teachers' Needs towards the Creation of A Framework for an Extension Program on Teachers' Professional Development" International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, vol.1 no.3, p. 28-36
[30] .Mukadi, M. (2021), "Factors Enhancing Positive Performance of Students from Single Parent at Alfagems Secondary School" Open Journal of Social Sciences, 9, 185- 192
[31] Myint, A. A., & Win, M. (2016). The implementation of the Myanmar teacher competency standards framework. AsTEN Journal of Teacher Education, 1(2).
[32] OECD (2019) "Assessment Framework of the OECD Study on Social and Emotional Skills", OECD Education Working Paper No. 207
[33] Paje, Y.M. (2021), The Teachers' Utilization of Computer-Based Technology in Science Instruction, International Journal of Technology in Education and Science, Vol 5, No 3 (2021)
[34] Petalla, M. B. & Madrigal, D. V.(2017). "Teaching standards competence and efficiency. Performance of the Basic education teachers. University of Negros Occidental-
[35] Recoletos, Bacolod City, Philippines", Journal of Institutional Research in South East Asia – Vol. 15 No.3
[36] Perera, S, (2003) "Teacher education and teacher competencies: a study of how a model of teacher competencies could inform pre-service primary teacher education in Sri Lanka", Doctor of Education thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Wollongong

[37] Possi M. and Milinga J. (2017) "Learner Diversity in Inclusive Classrooms: The Interplay of Language of Instruction, Gender and Disability" Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences
[38] Pyrie, (2015). "Action Research in Education", European Scientific Journal vol.10,no.13.
[39] Quarreli Symonds (QS) Asia University Rankings (2021). Discover the top universities in Asia with the QS Asia University Rankings 2021. www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/asian-university-rankings/2021
[40] Rasool, G., Mahboob, U., Sajid, M., & Ahmad, S.(2017) "Characteristics of effective teaching: a survey on teacher's perceptions", Pakistan Oral & Dental Journal, vol. 37(1)
[41] Roberto, J. and Madrigal Dennis,(2019) "Teacher Quality in the Light of the Philippine Standards for Teachers" Philippine Social Science Journal, vol.1
[42] Saha, L & Dworkin, A (2009), 'Teachers and Teaching in an Era of Heightened School Accountability: A Forward Look', in Laurence J. Saha; A. Gary Dworkin (ed.), International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching. Part One, Springer, New York, pp. 1177-1185.
[43] Sahlberg, P. and Oldroyd D. "Pedagogy for economic competitiveness and sustainable development" Eur. J. Educ., 45 (2) (2010), pp. 280-299
[44] Schweisfurth M. (2013) "Learner-Centred Education in International Perspective: Whose Pedagogy For Whose Development?" Routledge,
[45] Tabulawa, R. (2013). Teaching and learning in context. Why pedagogical reforms fail in sub-Saharan Africa. Dakar: CODESRIA
[46] Tarhan, H,(2019) "Understanding Teacher Evaluation in Finland: A Professional Development Framework", Australian Journal of Education, vol.44 no.4, p.33-50
[47] Talis, (2018) "Teachers and School Leaders as Lifelong Learners" OECD Education,
[48] UNESCO (n.d.). Education transforms lives. https://en.unesco.org/themes/education.
[49] UNESCO (n.d.). Ensure quality and relevance of education and learning. https://www.ibe.unesco.org//en/what-we-do/ensure-quality-and-relevance-education-and-learning.
[50] Vavrus, F. and Bartlett L. (eds). 2013a. Teaching in Tension: International Pedagogies, National Policies, and Teachers' Practices in Tanzania. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers
[51] Villocino, A,(2019) "Increasing Research Capability among Masters Teachers in the Countryside Area of the Philippines - Bases for Proposed Program Intervention" The Countryside Development Research Journal, vol 7, no.1.
[52] Yenen, E. T., & Yöntem, M. K. (2020). Teachers' professional development needs: AQ method analysis. Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education, 11(2), 159-176.
[53] DepEd Order no. 31 s. 2012; DepEd Order no. 32 s. 2009; and DepEd Order no. 42

AUTHOR'S PROFILE

GEMMA G. TACULOG

Gemma G. Taculog is a graduate with a Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Mathematics, at the Urdaneta City University and taking up her Master of Arts in Education majoring in Educational Management in the same institution. Currently, she is Teacher III, designated as the school Coordinator of Brigada Eskwela, Information and Communication Technology, and Araling Panlipunan; and as an Adviser of the Supreme Elementary Learner Government at Cabaruan Elementary School, Urdaneta City. She has been in the DepEd for 10 years now, attended numerous training courses on pedagogies, curriculum development and others for her professional development. She served as a proponent of two In-service Trainings regarding ICT Literacy for Teachers in 2018 and 2022.

Gemma G. Taculog graduated in Elementary as Valedictorian and received With Honors in Secondary Education.

AUTHOR'S PROFILE

DR. RUSSEL V. SANTOS

Dr. Russel V. Santos is a Licensed Professional Teacher. She is a graduate of Bachelor of Secondary Education, major in General Science, graduated With Honors at University of Luzon and took her Master of Arts in Education major in Educational Management and Doctor of Philosophy major in Development Education in the same institution and graduated with Meritus Award. Currently, she is an Assistant Professor III and designated as Program Head in the College of Teacher Education at Urdaneta City University and Part Time Professor in the Institute of Graduate School and Advance Studies and served as a Head Teacher III for 7 years and a classroom

teacher for 13 years in the Department of Education. She is also the author of the articles New-Normal-Secondary-School-Management-And-ItsCorrelates-The-Public-Educational-Institutions found @ https://www.ijstr.org/finalprint/oct2021 and Stakeholders' Participation of the Implementation of Senior High School Program found in https://www.ijams-bbp.net/archive/vol-2-issue-9-september/ .