

Department of Education
 OFFICE PERFORMANCE MID-YEAR REVIEW FORM (OPMR)
 Revised 2014

Name of Employee:	Luiz E. Gonnora
Position/Designation:	Chief Education Specialist
Review Period:	January - December 2014
Strand/Bureau/Center/Service/Region/Division:	Region V-A CALABARZON
Statement of Purpose:	The Quality Assurance Division (QAD) monitors and evaluates the performance of RO-FDs and SDOs on the compliance to statutory and policy standards and requirements for the continuous improvement of organizational performance and delivery of basic education services.
Name of Rater:	Loida N. Mula
Position:	Assistant Regional Director
Approving Authority:	ATTY. ALBERTO T. ESCOBARTE
Date of Review:	July 2014

PART I. A. COMMITMENT TO ORGANIZATIONAL OUTCOMES (MVA)
 Part I-A. Commitment to Organizational Outcomes shall capture office commitments, performance, and accomplishments based on office mandates and KPIs as reflected in the official issuances on the Compendium of Office Functions. This part shall capture the contributions of the office directly towards the Organizational Outcomes indicated in the General Application Act (GAA) Programs/Subject Programs, Basic Education Development Plan (BEDP) Pillars, MATATAG Agenda priority deliverables, and other national level commitments that are aligned with and relevant to the office KPIs. Clear attribution shall be made to ensure such alignment.

Quality Assurance	Organizational Outcomes Alignment	Key Results Areas (KRAs) Based on Office Mandates and Programs/Subject Programs	Organizational Outcomes Attribution (Refer to the GAA Programs/Subject Programs and BEDP Pillars)	Objectives (based on Office Functions)	Performance Targets (Output of the Bureau/Center/Service/Division aligned with the output/service)	Weight Allocated on the Basis of (Number of students)	Description (Expanded output/service)	Performance Measure (Quality, Efficiency, Timeliness)	Rating Scale					Means of Verification (MOV)	Actual Accomplishment (Q1-3)	AVERAGE (Q1-3)	UNRATED AVERAGE	REMARKS	MID-YEAR REVIEW RATING
									8	7	6	5	4						
									Efficiency	Observed 85% - 100% of on time implementation of regional and SDO QAMEA	Observed 84% of on time implementation of regional and SDO QAMEA	Observed 45%-64% of on time implementation of regional and SDO QAMEA	Observed 25%-44% of on time implementation of regional and SDO QAMEA	Observed below 25% of on time implementation of regional and SDO QAMEA					
						31	RO-FDs and SDOs institutionalizing QAMEA Framework	Quality	Timeliness	Regional QAMEA including SDO MVA reports was conducted within 1 week after each quarter	Regional QAMEA including SDO MVA reports was conducted 8-12 days after each quarter	Regional QAMEA including SDO MVA reports was conducted 13-17 days after each quarter	Regional QAMEA including SDO MVA reports was conducted 18-22 days after each quarter	Regional QAMEA including SDO MVA reports was conducted 22 days or more after each quarter					
							RO-FDs and SDOs utilizing QAMEA results	Quality		Total of 31 RO-FDs and SDOs utilized the results of the QAMEA	Total of 29-30 RO-FDs and SDOs utilized the results of the QAMEA	Total of 27-28 RO-FDs and SDOs utilized the results of the QAMEA	Total of 25-26 RO-FDs and SDOs utilized the results of the QAMEA	Total of 24 RO-FDs and SDOs utilized the results of the QAMEA					

TO BE ACCOMPLISHED DURING PLANNING

TO BE FILLED DURING EVALUATION

Quality Assurance	Support to Learners and Schools	Enabling Mechanisms for Governance	Take steps to accelerate delivery of basic education facilities and services. Take good care of learners by promoting well-being, inclusive education, and positive learning environment.	Approved the establishment, recognition and reopening of public and private schools.						
					31	Applications for permits, recognitions and special orders will be approved	Quality	Permits, renewal permits and government recognitions and special orders of all the private and public schools with complete requirements were approved.	Permits, renewal permits and government recognitions and special orders of 80-99% of private and public schools with complete and Special requirements were approved.	Permits, renewal permits and government recognitions and special orders of 60-79% of public and private schools with complete and compliant application requirements were approved.
							Efficiency	100% of the application processed and were processed and strategized within the given timeline	80%-99% of the applications were strategized and processed within the given timeline	60%-79% of the applications were processed and strategized within the given timeline
							Timeliness	Approved permits, renewal permits and government recognitions as well as special orders were issued within 5 days upon full compliance with the requirement	Approved permits, renewal permits and government recognitions as well as special orders were issued 5-11 days upon full compliance with the requirement	Approved permits, renewal permits and government recognitions as well as special orders were issued 12-14 days upon full compliance with the requirement
							Utilization of QAME	Utilization of QAME resulted to an average improvement of at least 10% improvements in based on the evaluation	Utilization of QAME resulted to an average improvement of 5.0%-7.9% improvement in based on the evaluation	Utilization of QAME resulted to an average improvement of 4.0%-5.9% improvement in based on the evaluation
							QAME results were submitted, reported and summarized on average of 5-8 days after the activities	QAME results were submitted, reported and summarized on average of 9-11 days after the activities	QAME results were submitted, reported and summarized on average of 12-14 days after the activities	QAME results were submitted, reported and summarized on average of more than 15 days after the activities

TO BE FILLED IN DURING PLANNING

TO BE FILLED DURING EVALUATION

Key Result Area (KRA)	Objectives	Strategies	High Impact Activities	Performance Targets (Target Outcome, Output of the Bureau/Center/Service/Division that are enabling, supporting and/or contributing to the achievement of the organizational outcomes and KRA's Part (A))	The Institution (Name of the Institution, Location, Address, Contact Number, E-mail, Website)	Quality Assurance, Monitoring, Evaluation (QAME) Framework	RATING SCALE						Status of Verification (MOVA)	Actual Rating/Assessment/Remarks	Average Rating (Q.E.T)	Weighted Average	Final Rating	Mid-Year Review Rating						
							5 (Excellent)	4 (Very Satisfactory)	3 (Satisfactory)	2 (Unsatisfactory)	1 (Poor)													
Quality Assurance	Institutionalized a Quality Assurance, Monitoring, Evaluation (QAME) Framework			Performance Targets (Target Outcome, Output of the Bureau/Center/Service/Division that are enabling, supporting and/or contributing to the achievement of the organizational outcomes and KRA's Part (A))	The Institution (Name of the Institution, Location, Address, Contact Number, E-mail, Website)	Quality Assurance, Monitoring, Evaluation (QAME) Framework	Quality	8 FDs and 23 SDOs institutionalized the regional QAME Framework	21-22 SDOs institutionalized the regional QAME Framework	19-20 SDOs institutionalized the regional QAME Framework	17-18 SDOs institutionalized the regional QAME Framework	16 SDOs or below institutionalized the regional QAME Framework												
							Efficiency	Observed 83% - 100% of on time implementation of regional and SDO reports	Observed 65% - 84% of on time implementation of regional and SDO reports	Observed 43% - 64% of on time implementation of regional and SDO reports	Observed 23% - 41% of on time implementation of regional and SDO reports	Observed 25% or below of on time implementation of regional and SDO reports												
							Timeliness	Regional QAME including SDO MEA reports was conducted 8-12 days after each report was submitted	Regional QAME including SDO MEA reports was conducted 8-12 days after each report was submitted	Regional QAME including SDO MEA reports was conducted 8-12 days after each report was submitted	Regional QAME including SDO MEA reports was conducted 8-12 days after each report was submitted	Regional QAME including SDO MEA reports was conducted 8-12 days after each report was submitted												
							Quality	Total of 31 RO-FDs and SDOs utilized the QAME Framework	Total of 29-30 RO-FDs and SDOs utilized the QAME Framework	Total of 27-28 RO-FDs and SDOs utilized the QAME Framework	Total of 25-26 RO-FDs and SDOs utilized the QAME Framework	Total of 24 RO-FDs and SDOs utilized the QAME Framework												
	Utilized the results of QAME to improve functional divisions and SDOs performance by providing support to RO/SDO in understanding their situational analysis and craft adjustment plans			Performance Targets (Target Outcome, Output of the Bureau/Center/Service/Division that are enabling, supporting and/or contributing to the achievement of the organizational outcomes and KRA's Part (A))	The Institution (Name of the Institution, Location, Address, Contact Number, E-mail, Website)	Quality Assurance, Monitoring, Evaluation (QAME) Framework	Quality	PIPR Report, Midterm Review results and Analyzed BKR 1 Report																
							Efficiency	Improvement based on the evaluation																
							Timeliness	Improvement based on the evaluation																

31

31

Office Administration and Performance Management	Managed the implementation of the Program Implementation Review and Performance Assessment (PIRPA) at the RO/ Division Level.	100%	RO/SDOs assisted the implementable in and Administration of PIRPA	Comprehensively M&E mechanism will be developed	Established M & E for partnership sustainability	Quality	23 SDOs were managed and assisted in the implementation of PIRPA	21-22 SDOs were managed and assisted in the implementation of PIRPA	19-20 SDOs were managed and assisted in the implementation of PIRPA	17-18 SDOs were managed and assisted in the implementation of PIRPA	16 SDOs or below were managed and assisted in the implementation of PIRPA													
						Efficiency	Observed 85% - 100% efficient implementation of PIRPA	Observed 65% - 84% efficient implementation of PIRPA	Observed 45%-64% efficient implementation of PIRPA	Observed 25%-44% efficient implementation of PIRPA	Observed below 25% efficient implementation of PIRPA													
						Timeliness	PIRPA reports were submitted to the RO 1 week after the conduct in each quarter	PIRPA reports were submitted to the RO 8-12 days after the conduct in each quarter	PIRPA reports were submitted to the RO 13-17 days after the conduct in each quarter	PIRPA reports were submitted to the RO 18-22 days after the conduct in each quarter	PIRPA reports were submitted to the RO 22 days after the conduct in each quarter													
						Quality	The M&E mechanism established contains implementing systems that are very useful in sustaining partnership	The M&E mechanism accurately and adequately convey information that would aid in the decision making for sustainability of partnership	The M&E mechanism somewhat accurately and adequately convey information that would aid in the decision making for sustainability of partnership	The M&E mechanism very barely and inadequately convey information that would aid in the decision making for sustainability of partnership	The M&E mechanism is inaccurate and lack information that would aid in the decision making for sustainability of partnership													
						Timeliness	The establishment of M&E mechanism was done ahead of schedule	The establishment of M&E mechanism was done on schedule.	The establishment of M&E mechanism was done a week late behind the schedule	The establishment of M&E mechanism was done 2 weeks late behind the schedule	The establishment of M&E mechanism was done more than 2 weeks behind the schedule													

PART I: ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS DATA
 Part C: Organizational Effectiveness Data capture accountability/competency produced or related on the aspects of Financial Stewardship, Process Improvement, and Client Satisfaction. It shall focus on the results achieved by the office that are aligned with the Performance Award Bonus (PAB) ownership requirements.

Part I: Total Score

Organizational Performance Area	Objectives	Timeline	Weight Allocation	Performance Indicators	Rating Scale	Measure of Variance (MOV)	Actual Results/Agency/Unit	Ratio (Q.E.T)	Average (Q.E.T)	Weighted Average	Remarks	Mid-Year Review Rating
Financial Stewardship	Utilized 98% of the budget allocation in accordance with the quarterly disbursement program with no over/deficit/deduction/allowance from oversight agency/ies	Within the rating period	5%	<p>Quality</p> <p>Budget allocation disbursed within the regulatory period with no over/deficit/deduction/allowance from oversight agency/ies</p> <p>Efficiency</p> <p>Budget is utilized according to the BUR target, based on the official BUR report of the Finance Service/Section/Unit (i.e. 98% of the budget allocation is utilized within the FY)</p> <p>Timeliness</p> <p>Quarterly basis: Budget is utilized according to the quarterly disbursement program (i.e. 93-97% of the quarterly BUR target is utilized by the end of each quarter)</p>	<p>1. Budget allocation disbursed within the regulatory period with 1-2% over/deficit/deduction/allowance from oversight agency/ies</p> <p>2. Budget is utilized with 1-5% variance from BUR target, based on the official BUR report of the Finance Service/Section/Unit (i.e. 93-97% of the budget allocation is utilized within the FY)</p> <p>3. Budget is utilized with 6-10% variance from BUR target, based on the official BUR report of the Finance Service/Section/Unit (i.e. 88-92% of the budget allocation is utilized within the FY)</p> <p>4. Budget is utilized with 11-15% variance from BUR target, based on the official BUR report of the Finance Service/Section/Unit (i.e. 83-87% of the budget allocation is utilized within the FY)</p> <p>5. Budget is utilized with more than 15% variance from the quarterly disbursement program (i.e. below 83% of the quarterly BUR target is utilized by the end of each quarter)</p>							
Process Improvement	Streamlined core processes and management of service provisioning of frontline and other office deliverables to ensure ease of transactions and/or digitalization/digitization	Within the rating period	5%	<p>Quality</p> <p>Improvements/reductions on all of the service standards</p> <p>1. no. of documents 2. total processing time 3. transaction cost 4. client steps/agency signatures</p>	<p>1. improvement/reduction on 1-2 service standards</p> <p>2. total processing time 3. transaction cost 4. client steps/agency signatures</p> <p>3. improvement/reduction on 2-3 service standards</p> <p>4. no. of documents 5. total processing time 6. transaction cost 7. client steps/agency signatures</p> <p>5. no change in no. of documents</p> <p>6. total processing time 7. transaction cost 8. client steps/agency signatures</p>							

Client Satisfaction	Achieved 100% resolution and compliance rate to #8888 and CCB complaints within the prescribed processing time (simple - 3 days; complex - 7 days; highly technical - 20 days) with at least Satisfactory overall average result on the Client Satisfaction Measurement	5%	Timeliness	Streamlined and/or digitized all office core processes identified in the OMS planning documents	Streamlined and/or digitized 76.9% of the office core processes identified in the OMS planning documents	Streamlined and/or digitized 51.7% of the office core processes identified in the OMS planning documents	Streamlined and/or digitized 26.5% of the office core processes identified in the OMS planning documents						
				Efficiency	Streamlined and/or digitized 100% of the office core processes identified in the OMS planning documents	Streamlined and/or digitized 80.9% of the office core processes identified in the OMS planning documents	Streamlined and/or digitized 60.0% of the office core processes identified in the OMS planning documents	Streamlined and/or digitized 0% of the office core processes identified in the OMS planning documents					
			Quality	100% resolution and compliance rate to #8888 and CCB complaints	At least 80% resolution and compliance rate to #8888 and CCB complaints	At least 50% resolution and compliance rate to #8888 and CCB complaints	At least 1% resolution and compliance rate to #8888 and CCB complaints	0% resolution and compliance rate to #8888 and CCB complaints					
			Efficiency	Complaints acted upon and closed within prescribed processing time (simple complex - 7 days; highly technical - 20 days)	Complaints are acted upon and closed with documented delays based on the prescribed processing time (simple - 3 days; complex - 7 days; highly technical - 20 days)		No complaint acted upon and resolved						
			Timeliness	Complaints acted upon and closed within prescribed processing time (simple complex - 7 days; highly technical - 20 days)									

Luz E. Osameña
RATER

Loida N. Rudea
RATER

ATTY. ALBERTO T. ESCOBARTE, CESO-I
APPROVING AUTHORITY

Part C Total Score