

# Elementary Teachers' and School Heads' Perspectives of Upward Evaluation: Inputs to Procedural Guidelines Development

Riolando B. Lobina<sup>1</sup>, Virgilio P. Rapada Jr.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Graduate School Student, Eastern Samar State University-Main Campus, Borongan City, Eastern Samar, Philippines, 6800

<sup>2</sup>Professor I, Graduate School, Eastern Samar State University-Main Campus, Borongan City, Eastern Samar, Philippines, 6800

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1014MG0085>

Received: 02 April 2026; Accepted: 08 April 2026; Published: 25 April 2026

## ABSTRACT

Upward evaluation is a procedure or process where subordinates rate the performance of their supervisors. This process is unheard of in the elementary schools, hence, this study explored teachers' and school heads' perspectives of such evaluation regarding their attitudes, how it should be designed, and the performance areas to be included in the evaluation. Participants included 140 teachers and 21 heads assigned at Oras East School District during the school year 2018-2019 and data used in evolving procedural guidelines on upward evaluation were obtained using self-structured questionnaire. The study revealed that both the school heads and teachers have favorable attitude towards upward evaluation. They were agreed that upward evaluation should involve subordinates and immediate superior of school heads as raters without anonymity, using the behavior approach and both the rating and critical incidents techniques in rating, to be conducted once before every school year ends where evaluators shall be asked to rate the school head on station with the school district supervisor visiting each school to facilitate the conduct of the evaluation using a devised performance appraisal form, and the results be communicated a week after the evaluation for discussion between school head and immediate superior. Five performance areas identified that were included in upward evaluation are on instructional leadership, learning environment, human resource management and development, parents' involvement and community partnership, and school leadership, management and operation. The procedural guidelines evolved describe how upward evaluation may be undertaken to produce results fair enough to provide feedback of school heads' performance.

**Keywords:** Upward Evaluation, Attitude, Performance Areas of School Heads

## INTRODUCTION

### Background of the Study

For any human activity to be successful, actors should be prepared for it. By being prepared means that actors should possess of the needed expertise to perform the activity. Such should be the case in the educational system.

The performance of any educational institution lies largely in the role, of the school heads in instructional leadership and administrative management. They can help to elevate or lower the performance of the school (Hoque & Kamalludin, 2014). Thus, there are those schools which are labeled as high performing and low performing because the success of a school involves huge responsibility of the school heads. As such teacher feedback provides valuable insights into instructional leadership, decision-making, communication and school climate (Jonas et al., 2024).

Because of the crucial role the school heads have to play in bringing about improved or poor performance, their performance evaluation should be well conducted. In the present set up of the Department of Education, performance evaluations are mostly conducted among teachers and pupils with the results used to project performance of school heads. It is high time that a separate performance evaluation for school heads be

conducted by those who know best how they perform their daily tasks such that valuable insight on their school management style can be obtained and rooms for improvement can be made clearer.

In school institution, teachers know best how their school heads perform because they receive directly the flow of implementation, command and request from these heads. The untold and unseen problems within the school are felt of by the teachers; some issues are coming out regarding miscommunication and mismanagement in a school institution which contributes to misunderstanding and chaos within the organization. Such problem is clearly attributed to the management style of the school head, and, with this issue, there is a need for teachers to help their school heads through performance appraisal. School heads' performance can be assessed by teachers as to what areas they perform well and less with the thought of improving the performance of the school. Such kind of evaluation is called upward evaluation (Koltin, 2008). At present, before the publication of this research findings, studies have shown that incorporating teachers' feedback into principal evaluation system can improve both leadership effectiveness and student outcomes. For instance, Jang and Alexander (2025) found that principal evaluation policies that include stakeholder feedback, such as teacher surveys, are associated with improved academic performance, particularly in reading achievement. This finding highlights the practical value of upward evaluation as a mechanism for enhancing accountability and promoting school improvement, specially on the performance of the learners specifically in literacy and reading in which these are affecting factors for the learners to learn best in other learning areas.

Upward evaluation is a process that involves the evaluation of supervisors by those they supervise (Howe, Auflick, & Freiburger, 2011). In the elementary school setting, upward evaluation can be done for school heads labeled as principals, head teachers, and teachers in-charge by their subordinates or teachers. Such a process is unheard of in the public elementary schools. Therefore, this study was undertaken to explore teachers' perspectives of upward evaluation and those of their school heads as regards their opinions and procedures on how the process should be conducted.

### **Objectives of the Study**

This study explored teachers' and school heads' perspectives of upward evaluation for elementary school heads. Specifically, this study was aimed to attain the following objectives:

1. To determine teachers' and school heads' attitude towards upward evaluation;
2. To find out teachers' and school heads' ideas or opinions of how upward evaluation should be designed;
3. To identify performance areas to be included in upward evaluation from the point of view of teachers and school heads;
4. To compare teachers' and school heads' attitude towards upward evaluation, on how upward evaluation should be designed, and the performance areas to be included in upward evaluation; and
5. To evolve procedural guidelines to be used for upward evaluation based on the results of the study.

### **Significance of the Study**

The results of this study may find significance in the following ways.

The results will contribute to the prevailing theories on performance evaluation in the elementary schools since performance evaluation is only practiced or conducted among teachers. From the respondents' attitude towards upward evaluation, it can be determined if upward evaluation is welcomed both by teachers and school heads themselves. If and when upward evaluation would be embraced in the future, the results of the present study on how the evaluation should be designed and on the performance areas identified for inclusion in the evaluation procedures may help policy makers to adopt more realistic policies concerning performance appraisal of school heads.

The author also hopes that the results of this study would be useful to future researchers who will be interested in undertaking a study in a related area.

The study is also hoped to be a source of great experience for the researcher and a contribution to his academic profession as well as a possible significant help to the researcher who is aiming to head a school someday.

### **Scope and Limitation of the Study**

This study concentrated its investigation on how upward evaluation should be conducted from the point of view or perspective of the teachers and school heads. Data needed in the study were obtained using self-developed questionnaire. These data were limited only to attitude (degree of agreement or disagreement) towards upward evaluation, the preferred design or method for upward evaluation limited to those who will make the upward evaluation, the procedures to use or follow in upward evaluation, and how the results of upward evaluation should be communicated as well as performance areas to be included in upward evaluation.

The elementary teachers assigned at Oras East School District during the school year 2018-2019 were the respondents of this study and so with their school heads who were either be a teacher-in-charge, head teacher or principal. For the teachers, these included only those with 2 years working experience and above.

### **Definition of Terms**

The following terms are operationally defined for a better understanding of the study.

**Attitude towards Upward Evaluation.** This refers to the respondents' feelings and thoughts about the importance or usefulness of performance appraisal for those who manage the elementary schools that could either be positive (favorable) or negative (not favorable).

**Human Resource Management and Development.** This performance area is concerned on how the school head helps the teachers enhance their classroom management skills and instructional competence as well as to develop their personal and organizational skills, knowledge, and abilities.

**Ideas or Opinions about the Design of Upward Evaluation.** This refers to the respondents' insights on just how upward evaluation should be conducted revolving around such items as by whom, by what means/methods, and how the results of evaluation be communicated.

**Instructional Leadership.** This performance area refers to how the school heads are involved in setting clear goals, monitoring lesson plans, instruction inside and outside the classroom, managing the curriculum, allocating resources and evaluating teachers regularly to promote student learning and growth.

**Learning Environment.** As a performance area, this refers to how the school head provides or creates a conducive environment for maximum student learning.

**Parents' Involvement and Community Partnership.** This performance area concerns how the school head connect with stakeholders in terms of obtaining resources and support for the realization of school programs and projects.

**Performance Areas.** These are the areas where elementary school heads are most likely to do and accomplish that are limited to instructional leadership, learning environment, human resource management and development, parents; involvement and community partnership, and school leadership, management and operation.

**Procedural Guidelines for Upward Evaluation.** These are the guiding principles or course of actions that are recommended to be followed for the conduct of upward evaluation as an output of this study.

**School Heads.** This pertains to the school head doing the task of administrative management and instructional leadership in elementary schools that come by the name or label as school principal, head teacher, or teacher in-charge.

**School Leadership, Management and Operation.** This comprises planning, leading, and coordinating with all stakeholders of the school towards the purpose of accomplishing set goals and priorities.

**Upward Evaluation.** This pertains to the performance appraisal of school heads by their teachers.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

The study followed the descriptive method of research to explore the attitudes and ideas or opinions of public elementary school heads and their teachers towards upward evaluation or the performance appraisal of school heads as well as their suggestions on how such evaluation shall be designed and conducted. The needed data to answer the research problems of the study were obtained by asking questions from the respondents through the use of self-structured questionnaire.

### Locale of the Study

The study was conducted in the elementary schools of Oras East School District during the school year 2018-2019. This School District is composed of elementary schools which are managed by a school district supervisor, 13 school principals, 6 head teachers, and 2 teachers in-charge. These school managers are supervising a total of 159 elementary school teachers. Most of these schools are located in carline barangays of the municipality of Oras, Eastern Samar.

### Respondents of the Study

The study involved the participation of elementary grades teachers of Oras East School District and their school heads as respondents of the study. All teachers working/assigned in said school district during school year 2018-2019 and who have at least two years of work experience were asked to participate in the study. These teachers were selected because the researcher feels that their experience can give them a thorough knowledge on how their school managers perform and so they can give a good feedback on how upward evaluation should be conducted. On the other hand, the school heads are greatly aware of their duties and responsibilities, hence, through their involvement in this study, they can significantly identify the areas for inclusion in the evaluation of their job performance. Both teachers' and heads' attitudes and ideas/opinions that were obtained from them shall be good inputs in developing procedural guidelines for upward evaluation.

Since the involvement of all the teachers and school heads described above as respondents were sought, there was no sampling procedure followed in this study. The distribution of these school heads and teachers by school in said school district is found in Appendix Table 1 for reference.

### Research Instrument

The researcher used a self-developed or structured research instrument in obtaining the pertinent data for the study. This is a questionnaire that contains items/questions that are both of the fixed alternative type and the open-ended form. This is a product of in-depth reading of related literature and studies and underwent validation and reliability testing to ensure its appropriateness and consistency in measuring the variables under investigation.

The questionnaire as shown in Appendix A is composed of three (3) parts. Part I asks respondents' attitude towards upward evaluation. It contains seven (7) statements about the importance of upward evaluation and the respondents were made to indicate their degree of agreement/disagreement using the following scales: 1 for strongly disagree, 2 for disagree, 3 for neither agree nor disagree, 4 for agree, and 5 for strongly agree. Part II finds out respondents' ideas or opinions of how upward evaluation should be designed along three (3) issues or

concerns which are who should be involved in the upward evaluation, what procedures to utilize in conducting upward evaluation, and how should the results of upward evaluation be communicated. In Part III, the respondents were asked to identify the performance areas to be included in conducting an upward evaluation.

Prior to the administration, the questionnaire was subjected to content validation by Eastern Samar State University, Graduate School-Main Campus experts in the field of educational research and management to ascertain the relevance, clarity, adequacy and readability of each item. Suggestions from the validators were incorporated to improve the instrument's quality and alignment with the objectives of the study then another validation of the contents/items of the research instrument was made by the thesis advisory panel as experts. Then, dry-run of the questionnaire was administered to five elementary school teachers and five school heads of Oras West School District that are not included in the actual study. Before the dry-run, the researcher sought permission from the school district supervisor of Oras West School District. Upon approval, the researcher distributed the questionnaire to identified teachers and their school heads and retrieved the same questionnaire right after these are accomplished. The dry-run has resulted to all items being answered properly, the reliability analysis using Cronbach's Alpha yielded a coefficient of 0.80, indicating good internal consistency of the instrument. According to accepted research standards, a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.80 signifies that the questionnaire is reliable and acceptable for data collection, thus, the research instrument was deemed valid and reliable for use in the conduct of the study. Thus, the researcher did not make any more revisions and improvement on the instrument.

### Data Collection Procedure

For the administration of the research instrument through the survey, an approval was sought first from the school district supervisor of Oras East School District. With the approval granted, the researcher next sought permission from the head of each elementary school for their participation and that of their school teachers. Then, the researcher formally asked the consent of the teachers for their participation in the study before they were asked to answer the questionnaire. The answered questionnaires were retrieved on the same day and the researcher saw to it that a 100% retrieval rate was attained. Likewise, the researcher looked into the completeness of the accomplished questionnaire in order to ensure no missing or lacking data.

### Measurement of Variables

The variables considered in this study are measured as follows.

The attitude of the respondents towards upward evaluation was determined using their responses to the seven attitudinal statements indicating the importance of upward evaluation as contained in the second part of the questionnaire. Five scales were used to indicate such responses, which are 1 for strongly disagree, 2 for disagree, 3 for neither agree nor disagree, 4 for agree, and 5 for strongly agree. Considering the responses as numeric (interval), the weighted mean was computed and the result was described using the following guide.

Mean Value	Scale	Description
4.21 – 5.00	5	Strongly Agree
3.41 – 4.20	4	Agree
2.61 – 3.40	3	Neither Agree nor Disagree
1.81 – 2.60	2	Disagree
1.00 – 1.80	1	Strongly Disagree

The ideas or opinions of the responses on how upward evaluation should be designed are the teachers' and school managers' insights on the process of conducting upward evaluation revolving around such items as by whom, by what means/methods, and how the results of evaluation be communicated that were obtained in Part II of the research instrument. The responses were counted and grouped by theme or subject area.

The performance areas in upward evaluation are the specific aspects of school manager's work which the respondents believed elementary school managers are most likely to do and accomplish as included in the Office Performance Commitment and Review (OPCR) Form for school heads. These are limited to instructional leadership, learning environment, human resource management and development, parents' involvement and community partnership, and school leadership, management and operation. Responses were indicated by the summary of frequency of mention.

### **Analysis of Data**

After the data have been collected, the data were tabulated, analyzed and interpreted.

To determine the respondents' attitudes towards upward evaluation, the weighted mean of the responses was computed and the results interpreted as described in the Measurement of Variables. Moreover, the results in the group of agree and strongly agree were interpreted as positive or favorable attitude towards upward evaluation; otherwise the attitude was regarded as negative or unfavorable.

To find out teachers' and school heads' ideas or opinions of how upward evaluation should be designed, responses were counted and grouped by theme or subject areas. The response with the highest frequency was taken as the most preferred method that was considered for inclusion in the preparation of procedural guidelines in the conduct of upward evaluation.

To identify the performance areas to be included in upward evaluation, the responses for each of the included dimension were counted and summarized as well as those that were additionally identified by any respondent. Those that were identified by more than half of the respondents were included in evolving the procedural guidelines for upward evaluation.

The test of the null hypothesis of this study on the no-difference in the responses between the teachers and their school heads was set at  $\alpha = .05$ . For the test of difference on the attitude towards upward evaluation between the teachers and the school heads, the t test for independent samples was used. To test the difference on the responses between the teachers and school heads as regards their ideas or opinions of how upward evaluation should be designed and as to the performance areas to be included in upward evaluation that were all summarized in frequencies, the chi square test of homogeneity was used and the test was performed in such a way that there are at least 5 cases in each cell in order to estimate values reliably so as to satisfy data requirement for the test.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

### **Teachers' and School Heads' Attitude**

#### **towards Upward Evaluation**

The weighted mean was computed for the responses to the seven statement indicators by the two groups of respondents to indicate their attitude towards upward evaluation (Table 1). Generally, the teachers strongly agreed to six of the seven statements, while the school heads were found to agree to six statements also. These findings suggest that both teachers and school heads have a positive or favorable attitude towards upward evaluation.

However, when the weighted mean values for the responses to the seven statements between the teachers and school heads were tested for significance of difference using t test for independent groups, results revealed significant differences in four of the seven statements (Table 1). These significance of differences in the responses between the teachers and school heads are for the following statements (S2) upward evaluation can be used to measure school managers' performance fairly and objectively against job requirements; (S3) upward evaluation is a way of ensuring adequate performance for school managers and their teachers; (S4) upward evaluation or appraisal will give the teachers the opportunity to evaluate their school managers' performance in terms of their job knowledge as well as the quality and quantity of work; and (S7) appraising a school manager through upward evaluation should be part of teacher's job so that the manager can adjust his/her performance relevant to the work productivity of the teachers under his/her supervision.

Table 1. Weighted mean of teachers’ and school heads’ responses on their attitude towards upward evaluation and the statistics of the test of difference

Statements	Weighted Mean Response by Group of Respondent		t Values	
	Teachers	School Heads	Computed	Tabular $\alpha = .05$
Upward evaluation is an important technique that can be used by any management or organization such as an elementary school if it really wants to achieve its set objectives.	4.34(SA)	4.10(A)	1.176 <sup>ns</sup>	1.960
Upward evaluation can be used to measure school managers’ performance fairly and objectively against job requirements.	4.21(SA)	3.00(NAD)	8.206*	
Upward evaluation is a way of ensuring adequate performance for school managers and their teachers.	4.35(SA)	3.86(A)	3.121*	
Upward evaluation or appraisal will give the teachers the opportunity to evaluate their school managers’ performance in terms of their job knowledge as well as the quality and quantity of work.	4.35(SA)	3.95(A)	2.621*	
Upward evaluation will help the school managers to recognize their strengths and weaknesses and will enlighten them as to what performance is expected of them by their subordinates or teachers.	4.37(SA)	4.10(A)	1.702 <sup>ns</sup>	
Upward evaluation can be used as a basis for promotion, transfer or training and development of school managers.	4.19(A)	3.86(A)	1.869 <sup>ns</sup>	
Appraising a school manager through upward evaluation should be part of a teacher’s job so that the manager can adjust his/her performance relevant to the work productivity of the teachers under his/her supervision.	4.22(SA)	3.76(A)	2.640*	

<sup>ns</sup>Not significant at  $\alpha = .05$

\*Significant at  $\alpha = .05$

For statement 2 (S2), while teachers strongly agree that upward evaluation can be used to measure school managers’ performance fairly and objectively against job requirements, the school heads themselves neither agree nor disagree. For this finding, this probably means the school heads are not sure whether upward evaluation can give a fair and objective appraisal of their job performance on the contention that there are raters or their subordinates who will consider the process as a chance for them to air out their bad feelings to their managers or heads by giving biased and unreasonable rating thus they should understand the findings of the study of Derrington et al. (2024) in which introduced the concept of the teacher-principal working alliance, which refers to the level of trust, collaboration, and shared understanding between teachers and school heads. Their study found that strong working relationships enhance the effectiveness of evaluation systems and contribute to improve instructional practices. This suggest that upward evaluation should not only be used for accountability but also as a tool for professional growth and collaborative leadership

As for the other three statements, the teachers generally gave “strongly agree” response but the school heads gave “agree” response. It could be implied from the latter finding and from the general response of the respondents to the first, fifth, and sixth statements that both teachers and heads approve of upward evaluation in the elementary schools, probably because they are aware of one of the benefits of upward evaluation as mentioned by Caruso (2014) which is that it “offers employees an opportunity to help leaders improve

performance as well as recognize a leader's skills and strengths". Moreover, this finding supports earlier research report of Anorico *et al* (2016) that teachers in Basic Education Departments in Metro Manila have a positive attitude towards upward evaluation.

On account that there are responses regarding the attitude towards upward evaluation between the teachers and the school heads that were found significantly different and also that there are those that were not significantly different, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the teachers' and school heads' attitude towards upward evaluation is not accepted. In other words, the teachers and school heads have similarities and differences in their attitude regarding the conduct of performance appraisal of school head by their subordinates or their teachers.

### Teachers' and School Heads' Ideas or Opinions of How Upward Evaluation Should be Designed

As to how upward evaluation should be designed, the distributions of the frequency of responses of both groups of respondents are presented in Table 2.1, Table 2.2, and Table 2.3, with the results of the test of difference of the responses.

In Table 2.1 can be noted that a greater number of the teachers and school heads alike identified both the teacher and the immediate superior of the school head among those who should be involved in upward evaluation. As to the involvement of the immediate superior, this means that, for instance, a head teacher is to be evaluated by a school supervisor. Moreover, same head teacher is to be evaluated by the teachers under his/her direct control. Probably, this respondents' agreement on the participation of teachers in upward evaluation conforms with the idea of Caruso (2014) that direct reports (in this study the teachers) provide a valuable and unique viewpoint and suggestions on leadership effectiveness since direct reports are the only feedback source that can accurately offer feedback on a manager's ability to provide clear direction, motivate performance, coach for performance improvement and recognize accomplishments and also that of Zetterquist (2010) who stated that feedback from subordinates are very valuable in evaluating their manager.

The results of the test of difference in the frequency of response as to who should be involved in upward evaluation as reflected in Table 2.1 reveal a no-significant difference. This finding means that the teachers and school heads generally agree on who should take part in the performance appraisal of school heads and these are the teachers and the immediate superior of the school head.

**Table 2.1 Frequency distribution of teachers' and school heads' responses on who should be involved in upward evaluation and the chi square values**

Who Should Be Involved in Upward Evaluation	Frequency of Response by Respondent		Chi Square Values	
	Teachers	School Heads	Computed	Tabular $\alpha = .05$
Teacher	16	3	4.32 <sup>ns</sup>	5.99
Immediate superior of the school head	8	2		
Both teacher and immediate superior of the school head	116	15		
Others, district supervisor	0	1		

<sup>ns</sup>Not significant

Table 2.2 presents the summary of responses in terms of procedures to be utilized in upward evaluation. Most of the school heads answered that rater's name should be provided, but most of the teachers said rater's name should not be given. However, the difference in the general response as to anonymity of rater in upward evaluation was found not statistically significant with computed chi square value of 1.92 not exceeding the tabular chi square value of 3.84. The response of most teachers about the anonymity of the rater might be in harmony with the statement of Conway (n.d.) that the challenging part in upward evaluation is that employees refrain from giving feedback to their managers as they are worried about the consequences of giving honest feedback, and such is the case when the name of the rater is provided.

Table 2.2 Frequency distribution of teachers' and school heads' responses on the procedures to be utilized in upward evaluation and the chi square values

Procedures to be Utilized in Upward Evaluation	Frequency of Response by Respondent		Chi Square Values	
	Teachers	School Heads	Computed	Tabular $\alpha = .05$
Anonymity of rater Rater's name not given or withheld	76	8	1.98 <sup>ns</sup>	3.84
Rater's name provided	64	13		
Rating approach to use			3.99 <sup>ns</sup>	5.99
Cost-related approach	34	6		
Judgment approach	19	0		
Behavior approach	78	15		
Rating technique to use			2.95 <sup>ns</sup>	5.99
Rating	48	6		
Critical incidents	36	2		
Both rating and critical incidents	56	13		
How often and when evaluation will be conducted	74	12	0.22 <sup>ns</sup>	3.84
Once in a school year, before the school year ends	66	9		
Twice in a school year, during the first week of November and first week of April				
How should the evaluation be conducted			0.00 <sup>ns</sup>	5.99
Evaluators/teachers shall be directed to attend a scheduled performance evaluation date by the school district supervisor and will be asked to give their performance appraisal of their respective school manager/head using the devised performance appraisal form	45	7		
Evaluators/teachers shall be asked to rate their school manager/head on station; the school district supervisor shall visit each school to facilitate the conduct of the upward evaluation using the devised performance appraisal form	93	14		
Others, the district supervisor is the best evaluator of school heads	2	0		

<sup>ns</sup>Not significant

Likewise, a general consensus or agreement can be observed on the two groups of respondents' responses on the rating approach to use and the rating technique to use in upward evaluation. As to the rating approach to use, majority of the respondents in each group mentioned behavior approach, while for the rating technique, majority responded to use both techniques – the rating and the critical incidents. In the case of the use of behavior approach in rating school heads via upward evaluation, this means that the rater should provide information of what the head or manager does or has to change to become more effective. Whereas, for the rating technique to use in upward evaluation, this finding means that the evaluators/teachers should rate the school managers or heads based on different characteristics and also that evaluators/teachers should create descriptions of good and bad behavior and then assign those descriptions to their school managers or heads. In both procedures – the rating approach to use and the rating technique to use – the difference in the responses of the two groups of

respondents are not statistically significant as suggested by the computed chi square values that are both lesser than the tabular chi square value of 5.99 (Table 2.2). The response of the respondents on the use of rating scale was similar to what has been done as early as 1994 as reported by Antonioni (1999) that employees rate the performance of individuals who manage them directly, usually by responding to a questionnaire using a rating scale.

On how often and when upward evaluation will be conducted, in general both the school heads and the teachers are agreed that it should be done once in a school year and before the school year ends (Table 2.2). Hence, the result of the test of difference using chi square test of homogeneity was not significant at the .05 level of significance. The above finding on how often and when upward evaluation will be conducted upholds Kolin's (2008) answer when asked if upward evaluation is a one-time event or if it should be repeated often. Kolin's (2008) answer was: "If it is truly wanted to change behavior and improve leadership skills, then it is imperative that upward evaluation become part of the annual review process so that partners have an ongoing base to work from in terms of improving their leadership skills." In short, upward evaluation should be once a year or in a school year as revealed by the finding of this study.

Three different answers were identified by the teachers as to how upward evaluation should be conducted: 1) evaluators/ teachers shall be directed to attend a scheduled performance evaluation date by the school district supervisor and will be asked to give their performance appraisal of their respective school manager/head using the devised performance appraisal form, 2) evaluators/teachers shall be asked to rate their school manager/head on station; the school district supervisor shall visit each school to facilitate the conduct of the upward evaluation using the devised performance appraisal form, and 3) the district supervisor is the best evaluator of school heads. For the school heads, they have identified only the first two of the above answers. Generally speaking, the school heads and teachers responded that evaluators/teachers shall be asked to rate their school manager/head on station and the school district supervisor shall visit each school to facilitate the conduct of the upward evaluation using the devised performance appraisal form. Again, a no-significant difference was found in the frequency of responses of the two groups of respondents in the above findings based from the computed chi square value of 0.00 and a tabular chi square value of 5.99 (Table 2.2).

The respondents' responses on how the results of upward evaluation should be communicated are shown in Table 2.3. In general, majority of the respondents answered that this should be a week after the performance appraisal, with the results discussed between the school manager/head and immediate superior. In other words, the respondents favored that the way the results should be communicated should not be given only to the ratee but it should be deliberated between the ratee and his/her immediate superior. The idea behind this finding is probably so that strong and weak points or ratings of performance areas should be thoroughly discussed for sustained or improved future performance. Such implication is what was revealed in study of Howe *et al* (2011) about the potential benefits of upward evaluation, which is that, at the director or supervisors' supervisor level, upward evaluation can provide valuable input regarding the supervisory skills and knowledge of the supervisors they oversee.

The results of the test of difference between the teachers' and school heads' responses on how the results of upward evaluation should be communicated in Table 2.3 did not reveal any significant difference as indicated by the computed chi square value of 2.21 and a tabular chi square value of 3.84.

Table 2.3 Frequency distribution of teachers' and school heads' responses on how the results of upward evaluation should be communicated and the chi square values

Procedure of Communicating the Results of Upward Evaluation	Frequency of Response by Respondent		Chi Square Values	
	Teachers	School Heads	Computed	Tabular $\alpha = .05$
A week after the performance appraisal, with the results inside an envelope given to the school manager/head	53	4	2.21 <sup>ns</sup>	3.84

A week after the performance appraisal, with the results discussed between the school manager/head and immediate superior	87	17		
---	----	----	--	--

<sup>ns</sup>Not significant

In sum, the results of the test of difference above mentioned warrant the acceptance of the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the teachers' and school heads' ideas or opinions of how upward evaluation should be designed.

### Performance Areas to be Included in Upward Evaluation from the Point of View of Teachers and School Heads

The study considered five performance areas to be included in upward evaluation. The performance dimensions for each area which were identified by the teachers and school heads who participated in this study are summarized in Tables 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5.

In the performance area of instructional leadership (Table 3.1), the study identified three dimensions which were all chosen by the two groups of respondents. The greater majority (125 out of 140) of the teacher-respondents declared that in performing its instructional leadership, the school head should check lesson plan and daily lesson logs of activities including adequate and updated instructional materials of a teacher daily. On the other hand, the majority of the school heads (17 out of 21) said this should be on observing teachers and on checking the implementation of remedial instruction. Three school heads moreover added one dimension, that is, manage the development and production of instructional materials. Overall, testing for the significance of difference in the responses of the school heads and teachers as regards performance dimensions to be included in evaluating the instructional leadership of the school heads using chi square test has given a computed value of 0.378 which is way lower than its corresponding tabular value of 5.99 at the .05 level of significance. This finding means that there is no significant difference in the distribution of responses regarding the identified performance dimensions in instructional leadership that should be included in upward evaluation.

**Table 3.1 Frequency distribution of teachers' and school heads' response on performance dimensions in instructional leadership to be included in upward evaluation and the chi square values**

Performance Dimensions in Instructional Leadership	Frequency of Response* by Respondent		Chi Square Values	
	Teachers	School Heads	Computed	Tabular $\alpha = .05$
Check lesson plan and daily lesson logs of activities including adequate and updated instructional materials of a teacher daily	125	20	0.38 <sup>ns</sup>	5.99
Observe teachers	99	17		
Check implementation of remedial instruction	97	17		
Others (Manage the development and production of instructional materials)	0	3		

\*Multiple Response

<sup>ns</sup>Not significant

As to performance dimensions in learning environment, the data in Table 3.2 seem to have agreement in the responses between the teachers and school heads that is confirmed by the result of the test of difference with

computed chi square value of 0.16 smaller than the tabular chi square value of 5.99; hence, the null hypothesis relevant to this finding was accepted. In order of frequency, most respondents believed it should focus on formulating school-based child-protection and anti-bullying policies, while relatively more respondents on providing ICT room as learning support systems than on improving children’s nook. Probably, this finding is in keeping with one important state’s law against child bullying in school as expressed in the Republic Act No. 10627.

Table 3.2 Frequency distribution of teachers’ and school heads’ response on performance dimensions in learning environment to be included in upward evaluation and the chi square values

Performance Dimensions in Learning Environment	Frequency of Response* by Respondent		Chi Square Values	
	Teachers	School Heads	Computed	Tabular $\alpha = .05$
Formulate school-based child-protection and anti-bullying policies	127	20	0.16 <sup>ns</sup>	5.99
Provide ICT room as learning support systems	110	17		
Improve two children’s nook	72	13		
Others (Maintain a safe, secure, clean and green school environment)	0	1		

\*Multiple Response

<sup>ns</sup>Not significant

As regards the performance area of human resource management and development, it can be gleaned from Table 3.3 that most teachers and school heads cited enhancement of classroom management skills and instructional competence as an important performance dimension, followed by the conduct of INSET/LAC sessions. One school head said that during the conduct of LAC sessions, teachers are able to discuss solutions to some problems affecting their classroom instruction. Two teachers cited other dimension not found/included in the research instrument and this is recommending teachers and other school personnel for career advancement. This last finding suggests that teachers are aware of what their school heads are doing in as far as human resource development is concerned.

The frequency distribution of the above responses was found not significantly different with the chi square test yielding a computed chi square value of 0.55 which is smaller compared to the tabular chi square value of 5.99.

Table 3.3 Frequency distribution of teachers’ and school heads’ response on performance dimensions in human resource management and development to be included in upward evaluation and the chi square values

Performance Dimensions in Human Resource Management and Development	Frequency of Response* by Respondent		Chi Square Values	
	Teachers	School Heads	Computed	Tabular $\alpha = .05$
Enhancement of class-room management skills and instructional competence	123	19	0.55 <sup>ns</sup>	5.99
Conduct INSET/LAC sessions	116	18		
Conduct RPMS review among teachers with at least very satisfactory rating	89	17		
Others (Recommend teachers and other school personnel for career advancement)	0	2		

\*Multiple Response

<sup>ns</sup>Not significant

Both teachers and school heads agreed that the performance dimensions in parents' involvement and community partnership to be included in upward evaluation are in this order of preference: conduct GPTA meetings, organize WATCH programs with the stakeholders, and obtain resources for the improvement of the proposed school library (Table 3.4). These findings probably suggest that the weights to be given in giving the performance ratings should conform to or be aligned with this order of preference. One school head, however, identified networking with GOs and NGOs and negotiate for needed resources as another possible dimension for inclusion in community partnership. With the same order based on the proportion of the frequency of responses by the two groups of respondents, a no-significant difference was obtained from the chi square test (computed chi square value = 0.41, tabular chi square value = 5.99) resulting to the acceptance of the relevant null hypothesis.

Table 3.4 Frequency distribution of teachers' and school heads' response on performance dimensions in parents' involvement and community partnership to be included in upward evaluation and the chi square values

Performance Dimensions in Parents' Involvement and Community Partnership	Frequency of Response* by Respondent		Chi Square Values	
	Teachers	School Heads	Computed	Tabular $\alpha = .05$
Conduct GPTA meetings	134	21	0.41 <sup>ns</sup>	5.99
Organize WATCH programs with the stakeholders	96	16		
Obtain resources for the improvement of the proposed school library	83	15		
Others (Network with GOs and NGOs and negotiate for needed resources)	0	1		

\*Multiple Response

<sup>ns</sup>Not significant

For the performance area of school leadership, management and operation, the data in Table 3.5 tell that school heads have to be evaluated more on how they allocate funds for prioritized needs as indicated in the school procurement plan, then on how they coordinate with stakeholders on resource mobilization, and on presenting school report card to all stakeholders. One school head mentioned supervising the maintenance and improvement of physical facilities and equipments. The frequency distribution of these mentioned responses do not seem to vary as suggested by the computed chi square value of 0.12 and tabular chi square value of 5.99 at .05 level of significance.

Table 3.5 Frequency distribution of teachers' and school heads' response on performance dimensions in school leadership, management and operation to be included in upward evaluation and the chi square values

Performance Dimensions in School Leadership, Management and Operation	Frequency of Response* by Respondent		Chi Square Values	
	Teachers	School Heads	Computed	Tabular $\alpha = .05$
Allocate funds for prioritized needs as indicated in the school procurement plan	127	20	0.12 <sup>ns</sup>	5.99
Coordinate with stake-holders on resource mobilization	110	19		
Present school report card to all stakeholders	92	16		
Others (Supervise the maintenance and improvement of physical facilities and equipments)	0	1		

\*Multiple Response

<sup>ns</sup>Not significant

The foregoing results of the chi square test of homogeneity warranted the acceptance of the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the teachers' and school heads' responses on the performance dimensions to be included in upward evaluation. This finding means that teachers and school heads are both aware of what school heads are doing in their respective schools regarding the five performance areas considered in this study that may have caused their agreement or the no-significant difference in their responses.

### **Procedural Guidelines for Upward Evaluation based on the Results of the Study**

These Procedural Guidelines aim to provide the operating procedures in the conduct of upward evaluation among public elementary school heads based on the results of the present study. Although performance evaluation of school heads is already being conducted, this is only done by the immediate supervisor of these school heads. The one they supervised, the teachers, have no hand in the performance appraisal. And since these teachers they supervised know best how their school heads perform their daily tasks because, as earlier mentioned, they receive directly the flow of implementation, command and request from these heads, it is practically significant to involve them in the conduct of upward evaluation. Hence, in the conduct of upward evaluation, both the teachers and the school heads themselves should be involved. And in the words of Portin *et al* (2006), assessing leadership performance can cater three different, but interrelated, functions: "personnel management, professional development, and organizational improvement." This study also believes that these three should be the topmost important end results of conducting an upward evaluation.

The following may serve as guide in the conduct of upward evaluation as an output of this study.

### **Who Should be Involved in Upward Evaluation**

Both the teacher and the immediate superior of the school head should be involved in upward evaluation. These are the ones who will give the performance rating or the raters of the school heads.

### **Evaluation Procedures**

The rater's name should be provided for the purpose of validation or verification of the results of the evaluation. The five key performance areas and the performance dimensions considered in this study shall also be the ones included in upward evaluation which are as follows:

- (1) instructional leadership with the following performance dimensions: check lesson plan and daily lesson logs of activities including adequate and updated instructional materials of a teacher daily, observe teachers, and check implementation of remedial instruction;
- (2) learning environment with performance dimensions of formulating school-based child-protection and policies, providing ICT room as learning support systems, and improving two children's nook;
- (3) human resource management and development on these performance dimensions: enhancement of classroom management skills and instructional competence, conduct of INSET/LAC sessions, and conduct of RPMS review among teachers with at least very satisfactory rating;
- (4) parent's involvement and community partnership with the following performance dimensions: conduct GPTA meetings, organize WATCH programs with the stakeholders, and obtain resources for the improvement of the proposed school library;
- (5) school leadership, management and operation with these three performance dimensions: allocate funds for prioritized needs as indicated in the school procurement plan, coordinate with stakeholders on resource mobilization, and present school report card to all stakeholders.

The rating scale currently in use for the evaluation of school heads in the above five key performance areas by their immediate superior as found in the OPCR form for school heads with the descriptions for low to high performance of poor (P), fair (F), satisfactory (S), very satisfactory (VS), and outstanding (O) shall be used in upward evaluation. This current practice is in consonance with the finding of this study on the rating approach

(behavioral) and technique (rating and critical incidents) where evaluators judge the school heads based on different characteristics (the performance areas in this study) and descriptions of good and bad behavior (P, F, S, VS, and O) are created and then evaluators assign those descriptions to the school heads.

Moreover, to comply with the behavior approach of rating as found in this study, the rater should be provided a means by which he/she can give information of what the school head should do or has to change to become more effective in his/her performance. Likewise, means of verification of the performance of the school head should be considered, that is, it is not enough to use simply the rating scale for the different performance indicators. In this regard, the use of portfolios may be encouraged. Such portfolios are “conceptual containers” in which school head can organize variety of artifacts or evidence to document their achievements. The benefit of using portfolios is that they encourage the principal being evaluated to engage in self-reflection (Portin *et al* 2006).

Upward evaluation should be done once in a school year and before the school year ends.

### **Communicating the Results of Evaluation**

Another essential component of upward evaluation is communicating the results. The study revealed that it should be a week after the performance appraisal, with the results discussed between the school manager/head and immediate superior. Such should be a candid process and challenging feedback should be provided by the immediate superior to the school head for whom the results of upward evaluation should be communicated taking into account the school context and the locale of the person being evaluated.

### **Other Activities**

Should upward evaluation be undertaken in the future, elementary school leadership shall follow an action research model such that at each phase the draft policies and procedures will be field tested, refined on the basis of the feedback received, tested again and then further refined. During year 1, for example, participants (stakeholders of the schools) should be requested to offer feedback on numerous aspects of the policy/procedure to be developed. The resulting feedback will be used to fine-tune the policy/procedure and to develop rubrics for evaluating the extent to which school heads should have achieved each of the performance dimensions. A small pilot test will then be undertaken at the end of year 1 to test the evaluation procedure. The participants in the pilot test will be interviewed, and their feedback will be used to revise the rubrics and to develop additional documents to support the evaluation procedures, if needed. In year 2, another evaluation of school heads will be done using the revised procedures and rubrics, this time using the feedback that will be provided in follow-up interviews to evaluate finally the effectiveness of the policy/procedure on upward evaluation.

## **SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Summary**

Upward evaluation is a process that involves the evaluation of supervisors by those they supervise (Howe et al 2011). In the elementary school setting, upward evaluation can be done for school heads labelled as principals, head teachers, and teachers in-charge by their subordinates or teachers. Such a process is unheard of in the public elementary schools. Thus, this study was undertaken to explore teachers’ perspectives of upward evaluation and those of their school heads as regards their opinions and procedures on how the process should be conducted with the involvement of 140 elementary teachers assigned at Oras East School District during the school year 2018-2019 and so with the 21 school heads of these teachers who was either a teacher-in-charge, head teacher or principal. Specifically, the study was aimed to attain the following objectives: (1) to determine teachers’ and school heads’ attitude towards upward evaluation; (2) to find out teachers’ and school heads’ ideas or opinions of how upward evaluation should be designed; (3) to identify performance areas to be included in upward evaluation from the point of view of the teachers and school heads; (4) to compare teachers’ and school heads’ attitude towards upward evaluation, on how upward evaluation should be designed, and the performance areas to be included in upward evaluation; and (5) to evolve procedural guidelines to be used for upward evaluation based on the results of the study. From the data collected from the school heads and teachers using self-developed

questionnaire, the following were the significant findings obtained from the statistical analysis performed to these data.

Majority of the teachers and school heads “strongly agree” and “agree” to the seven statements on the importance of undertaking upward evaluation, indicating a favorable attitude towards upward evaluation.

As regards the ideas or opinions the teachers and the school heads have on how upward evaluation should be designed, the following were found: (1) both the teacher and the immediate superior of the school head should be involved in upward evaluation; (2) the one to give the rating in upward evaluation should specify his /her name; (3) the rating approach to be used should follow the behavioral approach where information of what the manager does or has to change to become more effective should be provided; (4) upward evaluation should use both the rating and critical incidents technique where evaluators judge the school heads based on different characteristics and descriptions of good and bad behavior are created and then evaluators assign those descriptions to the school heads; (5) upward evaluation should be done once in a school year and before the school year ends. Evaluators shall be asked to rate the school head on station with the school district supervisor visiting each school to facilitate the conduct of the upward evaluation using the devised performance appraisal form; and (6) communicating the results of upward evaluation should be a week after the performance appraisal, with the results discussed between the school manager/head and immediate superior.

The five key performance areas and the performance dimensions identified by the teachers and school heads to be included in upward evaluation are those found in the OPCR form for school heads. These are in the areas of instructional leadership, learning environment, human resource management and development, parents’ involvement and community partnership, and in school leadership, management and operation. Likewise, the performance dimensions included in the OPCR form are the ones identified by the teachers and school heads, with the addition of one to two other dimensions specified by the school heads.

Generally, comparing the distribution of the frequency of responses of the teachers and the school heads in their attitude towards upward evaluation, their opinions on how upward evaluation should be designed as well as the performance areas to be included in upward evaluation and testing for the significance of difference using chi square test of homogeneity revealed a not significant difference at the .05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the responses of teachers and school heads as to attitude towards upward evaluation, on how upward evaluation should be designed, and the performance areas to be included in upward evaluation was accepted. Procedural guidelines in the conduct of upward evaluation were evolved based on the results of the study above

## CONCLUSIONS

The following are concluded based on the findings of the study.

1. The teachers and school heads have a favorable attitude towards upward evaluation.
2. Upward evaluation should be designed with the subordinates (teachers) and immediate superior (supervisor) as raters with their names given, using the behavior approach and both the rating and critical incidents techniques in rating, to be conducted once in a school year, before the school year ends where evaluators shall be asked to rate the school head on station with the school district supervisor visiting each school to facilitate the conduct of the upward evaluation using the devised performance appraisal form. The results of upward evaluation should be communicated a week after the performance appraisal, which will be discussed between the school manager/head and immediate superior.
3. The performance areas for school heads to be included in conducting upward evaluation should focus on (a) instructional leadership by checking daily lesson plan and daily lesson logs of activities, observing teachers, and checking the implementation of remedial instruction, (b) creating a conducive learning environment through the formulation of school-based child-protection and anti-bullying policies, provision of ICT room as learning support systems, and improving two children’s nook, (c) human resource management and development around the enhancement of class room management skills and instructional

competence, conduct of INSET/LAC sessions, and the conduct of RPMS review among teachers with at least very satisfactory rating, (d) parents' involvement and community partnership with the conduct of GPTA meetings, organization of WATCH programs with the stakeholders and obtaining resources for the improvement of the proposed school library, and (e) school leadership, management and operation via the allocation of funds for prioritized needs as indicated in the school procurement plan, coordination with stakeholders on resource mobilization, and the presentation of school report card to all stakeholders.

4. The teachers and school heads agreed on their responses in terms of attitude towards upward evaluation, on how upward evaluation should be designed, and the performance areas to be included in upward evaluation.
5. The procedural guidelines evolved based on the results of this study described how upward evaluation may be undertaken to produce results fair enough to provide feedback of school heads' performance from the point of view of the school heads themselves and their teachers.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the conclusions drawn from the findings of the study, the following are recommended:

1. upward evaluation may be tried in public elementary schools as school heads and teachers have favorable attitude;
2. the procedural guidelines evolved this study may be used as course of actions if and when upward evaluation will be embraced in the future. However, the performance standards included in the OPCR form may be revisited such that these should be flexible enough in some areas to allow school jurisdictions to adapt the criteria to accommodate local needs and priorities;
3. a replicate of the study may be conducted to include other variables that may have practical significance to the conduct of upward evaluation or in another area (school district or school division) to verify and compare results of the study; and
4. in future research expand the scope to include multiple school districts or school divisions. Integrate qualitative methods.

## REFERENCES

1. Abraham, A. (2013). Performance appraisal. Hamburg: Anchor Academic Publishing, Retrieved January 5, 2019, from <https://books.google.com.ph>
2. Derrington, M. L., Campbell, J., & Kamer, J. (2024). Teacher and principal working alliance: The foundation of teacher evaluation
3. Jang, S.T., & Alexander, N. A. (2025). Exploring the link between principal evaluation policies and student achievement
4. Jones, E. A., Tsai, C-L., & Bergin, C. (2024). Teachers' differentiation of leadership competencies in evaluation surveys
5. Anorico, H.C., Valdez, L.P., & Gaerlan, A. A. (March 2016). Teachers' perspective on upward evaluation in Basic Education Departments in Metro Manila. In *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, Volume 48. Retrieved May 4, 2019 from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/>
6. Antonioni, D. (Spring 1999). Predictors of upward appraisal ratings. In *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Volume XI, Number 1. Retrieved May 4, 2019 from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/>
7. Caruso, K. (2014). Improve performance appraisals with upward feedback. Retrieved January 5, 2019, from <http://web.viapeople.com/viaPeople-blog/bid/99522/Improve-Performance-Appraisals-With-Upward-Feedback>
8. Conway, B. (n.d.). Why you should love upward feedback. Retrieved February 2, 2019, from <https://www.employeeconnect.com>
9. Department of Education (Oras East District). Office performance commitment and review (OPCR).

10. Department of Education-Third Elementary Education Project (DepEd-TEEP). (January 2006). Operations manual on school-based management and Its support system.
11. Hoque, K. & Kamalludin, M. A. (2014). Human resource managers in education: their roles in school effectiveness. Munich, Germany: GRIN Publishing.
12. Howe, C.L., Auflick, P., & Freiburger, G. (2011). Upward evaluation at the Arizona Health Sciences Library, *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 99 (1), 91-94, Retrieved January 12, 2019, from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3016658>
13. Koltin, A. (2008). The most powerful leadership development tool of the decade — upward evaluations. Retrieved January 5, 2019, from [https://koltin.com/pdfs/KCG-Upward\\_Evaluation\\_Article\\_jun08.pdf](https://koltin.com/pdfs/KCG-Upward_Evaluation_Article_jun08.pdf)
14. McCarthy, A. M., & Garavan, T. N. (2001). “360° feedback process: performance, improvement and employee career development. In *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 25(1), 5-32. Retrieved May 4, 2019 from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/215393096?accountid=14779>
15. Morris, A., Smith, A., Stephens, M. N., Carroll, A. & Felkins, J. (2004). Faculty evaluation of administrators. Retrieved February 2, 2019, from <https://www.uvu.edu>
16. Opeña, Glen Rey D. (2018). Level of school-based management practices and school performance among public elementary schools in Eastern Samar Division. Unpublished Master’s Thesis, Eastern Samar State University-Graduate School, Borongan City
17. Patro, C.S. (2013). Performance appraisal system effectiveness: A conceptual review. In *Handbook of Research on Human Factors in Contemporary Workforce Development* edited by Christiansen, B. and Chandan, H.C., USA: IGI Global, Retrieved January 12, 2019, from <https://books.google.com.ph>
18. Portin, B.S., Feldman, S. & Knapp, M.S. (October 2006). Purposes, uses, and practices of leadership assessment in education, center for the study of teaching and policy, University of Washington, Retrieved January 12, 2019, from <https://studylib.net/doc/18432302/>
19. RA 9155. (August 11,2001). An act instituting a frame work of governance for basic education.
20. RA 10627. (June 5, 2013). An act requiring all elementary and secondary schools to adopt policies to prevent and address the acts of bullying in their institutions
21. Stein, J. E. (1995). Upward appraisal: A tool for the continuous improvement of library managers’ skills. Retrieved January 5, 2019, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED405882.pdf>
22. Walker, A. G. & Smither J. W. (June 1999). A five-year study of upward feedback: What managers do with their results matters. In *Personnel Psychology*. Retrieved May 4, 2019 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/>
23. Zetterquist, J. B. (2010). "Effect of upward feedback on the gap between manager and subordinate perception of manager behavior". Brigham Young University, BYU Scholars Archive, All Theses and Dissertations. 2523. Retrieved January 12, 2019, from <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/2523>
24. Effective performance appraisals and evaluation – toolpack consulting. Retrieved January 5, 2019, from <https://www.toolpack.com/performance.html>
25. Upward appraisal. Retrieved January 5, 2019 from <https://www.mbaskool.com/business-concepts/human-resources-hr-terms/13556-upward-appraisal.html>

## **APPENDICES**

### **Appendix A**

#### **Letter Request to Conduct the Dry-Run of the Questionnaire**

**Republic of the Philippines**

**Eastern Samar State University**

**Maypangdan, Borongan City**

March 25, 2019

**BASILISA P. DOCENA**

District Supervisor

Oras West District

Oras, Eastern Samar

**Dear Ma'am:**

The undersigned is conducting a study on “**Elementary Teachers’ and School Heads’ Perspectives of Upward Evaluation: Inputs to Procedural Guidelines Development**” in partial fulfillment of the requirements of Master of Arts in Education major in Educational Management.

In connection with this, the undersigned request your good office to allow him to conduct a dry-run of his survey questionnaire to your teachers and school heads in Oras West District. Rest assured that all the data elicited from the questionnaire will be treated with confidentiality and will be used solely in this study. Further the researcher shall observe ethics in research of the subject herein involved.

May this request merit your favorable consideration.

Thank you and God bless.

Very truly yours,

**RIOLANDO B. LOBINA**

Graduate Student

Approved:

**BASILISA P. DOCENA**

District Supervisor

### **APPENDIX B**

#### **Letter Request to the Respondent**

**Republic of the Philippines**

**EASTERN SAMAR STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Maypangdan, Borongan City**

April 1, 2019

---

Dear Valued Respondents:

I am a graduate student of Eastern Samar State University, Borongan City and is currently conducting a study entitled “Elementary Teachers’ and School Heads Perspectives of Upward Evaluation: Inputs to Procedural Guidelines Development” in Partial Fulfillment of the requirement for the program am enrolled in, Masters of Arts in Education major in Educational Management.

To realize the objectives of the study, I am earnestly asking your consent to participate as my study-respondent. Your response to the attached research instrument will be used solely for the purpose of the study and will be kept with utmost confidentiality.

Thank you very much for your favorable support and cooperation.

Very truly yours,

**RIOLANDO B. LOBINA**

Graduate Student

**APPENDIX C**

**Letter Request to Conduct the Survey Questionnaire**

**Republic of the Philippines**

**EASTERN SAMAR STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Maypangdan, Borongan City**

March 27, 2019

**ZITA P. ENGO**

District Supervisor

Oras East District

Oras, Eastern Samar

**Dear Ma’am:**

I am a graduate student of Eastern Samar State University, Borongan City and is currently conducting a study entitled “**Elementary Teachers’ and School Heads’ Perspectives of Upward Evaluation: Inputs to Procedural Guidelines Development**” in partial fulfillment of the requirements of Master of Arts in Education major in Educational Management.

In connection with this, I am respectfully requesting from your good office to allow me to gather data from teachers and heads assigned at the 18 elementary schools and 2 integrated schools of Oras East School District. If you will allow me, I will administer the data collection on the first until the second week of April 2019.

May this request merit your favorable consideration. Thank you in advance.

Very truly yours,

**RIOLANDO B. LOBINA**

Graduate Student

Noted:

**FELIX A. AFABLE, Ph. D.**

Dean, Graduate Studies

Approved:

**ZITA P. ENGO**

District Supervisor

**APPENDIX D**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Part I. ATTITUDE TOWARDS UPWARD EVALUATION**

**Directions:** Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree to the following statements regarding your attitude towards Upward Evaluation. Upward Evaluation is an evaluation of the performance of heads by their subordinates. Give an honest response for each statement as they apply to you by putting a check (/) mark on the appropriate column for your answer by using the scale below.

5 – If you strongly agree

4 – If you agree

3 – If you neither agree nor disagree (undecided)

2 – If you disagree

1 – If you strongly disagree

NO.	STATEMENTS	5	4	3	2	1
1.	Upward evaluation is an important technique that can be used by any management or organization such as an elementary school if it really wants to achieve its set objectives.					
2.	Upward evaluation can be used to measure school managers' performance fairly and objectively against job requirements.					
3.	Upward evaluation is a way of ensuring adequate performance for school managers and their teachers.					
4.	Upward evaluation or appraisal will give the teachers the opportunity to evaluate their school managers' performance in terms of their job knowledge as well as the quality and quantity of work..					
5.	Upward evaluation will help the school managers to recognize their strengths and weaknesses and will enlighten them as to what performance is expected of them by their subordinates or teachers.					
6.	Upward evaluation can be used as a basis for promotion, transfer or training and development of school managers.					
7.	Appraising a school manager through upward evaluation should be part of a teacher's job so that the manager can adjust his/her performance relevant to the work productivity of the teachers under his/her supervision.					

---

## Part II. Ideas or Opinions on the Design/Conduct of Upward Evaluation

Which of the following methods would you like if upward evaluation will be conducted in your school?

a) Who should be involved in upward evaluation/appraisal?

\_\_\_\_\_ teacher

\_\_\_\_\_ immediate superior of the school head

\_\_\_\_\_ both of the above

\_\_\_\_\_ others, specify \_\_\_\_\_

b) Which procedures should be utilized?

1. Anonymity of rater:

\_\_\_\_\_ Rater's name not given/withheld

\_\_\_\_\_ Rater's name provided

2. Rating approach to use

\_\_\_\_\_ Cost-related approach. Product quantity/quality and return on investment are taken as criteria in the appraisal

\_\_\_\_\_ Judgement approach. Provides no information why the manager is effective or ineffective

\_\_\_\_\_ Behavior approach. Provides information of what the manager does or has to change to become more effective

3. Rating technique to use

\_\_\_\_\_ Rating, in which evaluators/teachers judge their school managers or heads based on different characteristics

\_\_\_\_\_ Critical incidents, in which descriptions of good and bad behavior are created and then evaluators/teachers assign those descriptions to their school managers or heads

\_\_\_\_\_ Both technique

\_\_\_\_\_ Others, specify \_\_\_\_\_

4. How often and when evaluation will be conducted

\_\_\_\_\_ Once in a school year, before the school year ends

\_\_\_\_\_ Twice in a school year, during the first week of November and first week of April

\_\_\_\_\_ Others, specify \_\_\_\_\_

5. How should the evaluation be conducted?

\_\_\_\_\_ Evaluators/teachers shall be directed to attend a scheduled performance evaluation date by the school district supervisor and will be asked to give their performance appraisal of their respective school manager/head using the devised performance appraisal form

\_\_\_\_\_ Evaluators/teachers shall be asked to rate their school manager/head on station; the school district supervisor shall visit each school to facilitate the conduct of the upward evaluation using the devised performance appraisal form

\_\_\_\_\_ Others, specify \_\_\_\_\_

c) How will the results be communicated?

\_\_\_\_\_ A week after the performance appraisal, with the results inside an envelope given to the school manager/head

\_\_\_\_\_ A week after the performance appraisal, with the results discussed between the school manager/head and immediate superior

\_\_\_\_\_ Others, specify \_\_\_\_\_

**Part III. Performance Areas for Inclusion in Conducting Upward Evaluation**

1. Based on RA 9155, School head's exercise of administrative management and instructional leadership roles. Check all that you believe should form part of upward evaluation and supply those which you would like to suggest in the other part.

a) Instructional Leadership

\_\_\_\_\_ Check lesson plan and daily lesson logs of activities including adequate and updated instructional materials of a teacher daily

\_\_\_\_\_ Observe teachers

\_\_\_\_\_ Check implementation of remedial instruction

\_\_\_\_\_ Others, specify \_\_\_\_\_

b) Learning Environment

\_\_\_\_\_ Formulate school-based child-protection and anti-bullying policies

\_\_\_\_\_ Provide ICT room as learning support systems

\_\_\_\_\_ Improve two children's nook

\_\_\_\_ Others, specify \_\_\_\_\_

c) Human Resource Management and Development

\_\_\_\_ Enhancement of classroom management skills and instructional competence

\_\_\_\_ Conduct INSET/LAC sessions

\_\_\_\_ Conduct RPMS review among teachers with at least very satisfactory rating

\_\_\_\_ Others, specify \_\_\_\_\_

d) Parents' Involvement and Community Partnership

\_\_\_\_ Conduct GPTA meetings

\_\_\_\_ Organize WATCH programs with the stakeholders

\_\_\_\_ Obtain resources for the improvement of the proposed school library

\_\_\_\_ Others, specify \_\_\_\_\_

e) School Leadership, Management and Operation

\_\_\_\_ Allocate funds for prioritized needs as indicated in the school procurement  
plan

\_\_\_\_ Coordinate with stakeholders on resource mobilization

\_\_\_\_ Present school report card to all stakeholders

\_\_\_\_ Others, specify \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your precious time and cooperation!

**RIOLANDO B. LOBINA**

MA Educational Management Student

Graduate School, ESSU, Borongan City

**APPENDIX E**

**CERTIFICATION FROM THE EDITOR**

This is to certify that this thesis titled **“ELEMENTARY TEACHERS’ AND SCHOOL HEADS’ PERSPECTIVES OF UPWARD EVALUATION: INPUTS TO PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT”** was edited by the undersigned.

**JOVITO B. MADEJA, Ph. D.**

Editor

## APPENDIX F

### CERTIFICATION FROM THE STATISTICIAN

This is to certify that the undersigned was the statistician of Mr. Riolando B. Lobina, titled “ **ELEMENTARY TEACHERS’ AND SCHOOL HEADS’ PERSPECTIVES OF UPWARD EVALUATION: INPUTS TO PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT.**”

**EVA P. PALADA, Ph. D.**

Statistician

## APPENDIX G

### CERTIFICATION FROM THE PROOFREADER

This is to certify that this thesis titled “**ELEMENTARY TEACHERS’ AND SCHOOL HEADS’ PERSPECTIVES OF UPWARD EVALUATION: INPUTS TO PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT**” by Riolando B. Lobina, was reviewed/proofread by the undersigned.

**VIOLETA A. AFABLE, Ph. D.**

Proofreader

## APPENDIX H

### Distribution of School Heads and Teachers in Oras East School District,

#### Oras, Eastern Samar, SY 2018-2019

Name of School	Number of School Head	Number of Elementary Grades Teachers
Bagacay Elementary School	1	3
Balocawe Elementary School	1	6
Bantayan Elementary School	1	7
Burak Elementary School	1	7
Dalid Elementary School	1	6
Dao Integrated School	2	20
Factoria Elementary School	1	5
Japay Elementary School	1	2
Kalaw Elementary School	1	3
Mabuhay Elementary School	1	7
Malingon Elementary School	1	4
Nadacpan Elementary School	1	5
Oras East SPED Center	1	23
Pangudtan Elementary School	1	8
Sabang Elementary School	1	6
San Eduardo Elementary School	1	16
Sta. Monica Integrated School	1	8
Saugan Elementary School	1	6
Saurong Elementary School	1	6
Tawagan Elementary School	1	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>155</b>

## APPENDIX I

### Turnitin Similarity Index Result

# ELEMENTARY TEACHERS' AND SCHOOL HEADS' PERSPECTIVES OF UPWARD EVALUATION: INPUTS TO PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT

#### ORIGINALITY REPORT

<b>18%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>14%</b>
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

#### PRIMARY SOURCES

<b>1</b>	<b>Submitted to Manuel S. Enverga University</b> Student Paper	<b>2%</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Submitted to South Bank University</b> Student Paper	<b>2%</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>www.teachers.ab.ca</b> Internet Source	<b>1%</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>web.viapeople.com</b> Internet Source	<b>1%</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Submitted to Our Lady of Fatima University</b> Student Paper	<b>1%</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Chandra Sekhar Patro. "chapter 7 Performance Appraisal System Effectiveness", IGI Global, 2017</b> Publication	<b>1%</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Submitted to Polytechnic University of the Philippines - Sta. Mesa</b> Student Paper	<b>1%</b>

8	Submitted to University of Melbourne Student Paper	1%
9	Submitted to Marikina Polytechnic College Student Paper	1%
10	Submitted to Chamberlain College of Nursing Student Paper	1%
11	Anorico, Heiden C., Les Paul Valdez, and Amelita A. Gaerlan. "Teachers' perspective on upward evaluation in basic education departments in Metro Manila", Studies In Educational Evaluation, 2016. Publication	1%
12	Submitted to iGroup Student Paper	1%
13	Submitted to Xavier University Student Paper	1%
14	Chandra Sekhar Patro. "chapter 19 Performance Appraisal System Effectiveness", IGI Global, 2019 Publication	1%
15	Submitted to South Dakota Board of Regents Student Paper	<1%
16	Patricia Drentea, Melinda A. Goldner. "Caregiving Outside of the Home: The Effects of Race on Depression", Ethnicity & Health,	<1%

## 2006

Publication

17	<a href="http://koltin.com">koltin.com</a> Internet Source	<1%
18	<a href="http://www.ijirmf.com">www.ijirmf.com</a> Internet Source	<1%
19	<a href="http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu">citeseerx.ist.psu.edu</a> Internet Source	<1%
20	<a href="http://pdfs.semanticscholar.org">pdfs.semanticscholar.org</a> Internet Source	<1%
21	Submitted to Iqra Uniniversity, Gulshan Student Paper	<1%
22	<a href="http://aft1493.org">aft1493.org</a> Internet Source	<1%
23	Submitted to University of Greenwich Student Paper	<1%
24	Submitted to Mindoro State College of Agriculture and Technology Student Paper	<1%
25	<a href="http://lib.dr.iastate.edu">lib.dr.iastate.edu</a> Internet Source	<1%
26	Submitted to Laguna State Polytechnic University Student Paper	<1%

27	<a href="http://www.ukessays.com">www.ukessays.com</a> Internet Source	<1%
28	JAMES W. SMITHER. "DOES PERFORMANCE IMPROVE FOLLOWING MULTISOURCE FEEDBACK? A THEORETICAL MODEL, META-ANALYSIS, AND REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL FINDINGS", Personnel Psychology, 3/2005 Publication	<1%
29	Submitted to CSU, Long Beach Student Paper	<1%
30	<a href="http://esirc.emporia.edu">esirc.emporia.edu</a> Internet Source	<1%
31	Submitted to Lebanese International University Student Paper	<1%
32	<a href="http://orbilu.uni.lu">orbilu.uni.lu</a> Internet Source	<1%
33	<a href="http://dspace.iup.edu">dspace.iup.edu</a> Internet Source	<1%
34	<a href="http://documents.mx">documents.mx</a> Internet Source	<1%
35	<a href="http://www.principalstest.com">www.principalstest.com</a> Internet Source	<1%
36	Submitted to Ateneo de Manila University Student Paper	<1%

---

37	<b>Submitted to Australian Institute of Business</b> Student Paper	<1 %
38	<b>repository.up.ac.za</b> Internet Source	<1 %
39	<b>www.unn.edu.ng</b> Internet Source	<1 %
40	<b>www.ijert.org</b> Internet Source	<1 %
41	<b>Submitted to Midlands State University</b> Student Paper	<1 %
42	<b>Submitted to University of Sunderland</b> Student Paper	<1 %
43	<b>Submitted to De La Salle University - Manila</b> Student Paper	<1 %
44	<b>www.depedcebuprovince.ph</b> Internet Source	<1 %
45	<b>Submitted to Mount Kenya University</b> Student Paper	<1 %
46	<b>Submitted to EDMC</b> Student Paper	<1 %
47	<b>Submitted to London School of Commerce</b> Student Paper	<1 %

---

H. John Bernardin. "Subordinate appraisal: A

---

**48** valuable source of information about managers", Human Resource Management, 23/1986 <1%  
Publication

---

**49** Submitted to Higher Education Commission Pakistan <1%  
Student Paper

---

**50** Submitted to University of Johannesburg <1%  
Student Paper

---

**51** John E. Hewett, John D. Spurrier. "A survey of two stage tests of hypotheses: theory and application", Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods, 2007 <1%  
Publication

---

**52** Submitted to Cebu Technological University <1%  
Student Paper

---

**53** Submitted to University of Wales central institutions <1%  
Student Paper

---

**54** Submitted to University of Fort Hare <1%  
Student Paper

---

**55** Submitted to Queensland University of Technology <1%  
Student Paper

---

**56** Submitted to University of Leicester <1%  
Student Paper

---