Evaluating the Difficulties in State Colleges and Universities' Implementation of the Four-Stage Strategic Performance Management Process

April V. Zaballa-Luzon

Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges – Buhi Campus, Buhi, Camarines Sur, Philippines
E-mail: aprilzluzon@cspc.edu.ph

ABSTRACT The challenges faced by teaching and non-teaching staff during the implementation of the Strategic Performance Management System at a state institution in Camarines Sur are examined in this paper. It aimed to develop a better way to evaluate employee performance so that the former had a lot of trust in the review process, and consequently, contributed significantly to the overall achievement of the organisation's goal. The findings of a descriptive study design indicate that employees are burdened by the broad goals set during performance planning and the lack of coaching and mentoring throughout the performance cycle. The study highlights the need for a thorough, ongoing review and assessment based on trustworthy metrics and staff-shared policies. It suggests that administrators and the performance management team develop strategies to enhance collaboration among administrative staff, upper management, and rank-and-file personnel in order to provide a common motivation for achieving organisational goals.

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The strategic approach to performance management is based on developing employees' capacity to plan, provide outstanding performance that meets the company's needs, and evaluate performance using standard criteria.

The Camarines Sur Polytechnic College (CSPC) is a top educational institution that understands the relationship between performance and goals. The institution is dedicated to providing services of the highest calibre and commitment. Along these lines, the College remains committed to its mission to carry out its four functions of production, research, extension, and instruction. There are already college-based management programs in the various university departments, and new ones are constantly added.

The CSPC administration, professors, and staff are dedicated to creating a system of high standards, effective management, and high student accomplishment. It incorporates tactics that promote improved student accomplishment and more effective school administration to maintain this change. A vital component of the College's dedication to raising staff performance is the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS). The CSPC SPMS is founded on the Constitution's mandate for CSC to implement policies that increase civil service efficiency (Section 3, Art. IX-B, Phil. Const.). The internal rules and procedures of the organisation for implementing SPMS in the College are established by CSC Resolution No. 1200481, issued on 16th March 2012, and CSC Memorandum Circular No. 06, s. 2012. It will be the cornerstone for achieving higher employee achievement and more effective performance.

A novel approach to performance management in the College, the SPMS is a performance-based assessment. It is an assessment method for evaluating individual or group performance within the College's smallest operational unit. The management created a system to connect agency and personal goals to improve the objectivity of individual performance reviews. The SPMS applies to units that produce output and evaluates the overall performance of an office by concentrating on outputs using a standard unit of measurement. This allows for performance comparisons between offices or departments and accounts for the productivity and efficiency of individuals and operational units. The College responds to the need to minimise subjective elements by producing measurable findings that show the performance level of units through the SPMS. A more objective measurement ensures that every achievement receives the credit it deserves. The outcomes of these metrics make it easier to compare outputs, enabling

management to assess the relative effectiveness of the units that fall under them and decide on the best course of action to show the unit's overall performance.

The SPMS criteria support the need for highly effective staff. All staff members are responsible for improving customer satisfaction through the performance-based evaluation system. It is predicated on the idea that taking performance outcomes into account needs to be a significant component of the assessment procedure. Employees must have access to sufficient resources for ongoing development to enhance their performance.

In CSPC, SPMS plays a significant role in individual ratings and ranking. Memorandum Circular 2018-1 issued by the Inter-Agency Task Force on the Guidelines of Performance-Based Bonus, the SPMS shall be a tool to measure employee performance. Without a properly rated and filled-out form, an employee cannot qualify for the grant, as this is an additional requirement aside from complying with many other performance indicators mandated by the Commission on Higher Education, Department of Budget and Management, Civil Service Commission, and many other agencies. However, several problems have been cited in its implementation, like the difficulty in identifying performance indicators, subjective ratings, lack of performance monitoring among departments, lack of feedback on results, and lack of feedback mechanism. From the problems cited above, the researcher, as a member of the Performance Management Team (PMT), deemed it proper to study the topic and help improve the implementation of SPMs in the College to provide the means through which better results can be obtained from the organisation, offices, and individuals.

This work aims to investigate the implementation of the Strategic Performance Management System in a state college to understand the process better. Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, Performance Review and Evaluation, and Performance Rewarding and Development Planning are the four stages of execution, and the main goal is to identify the difficulties that arise.

In line with the specific objective of the study, this work aims to provide measures to address the challenges encountered by the teaching and non-teaching personnel in the implementation of SPMS in Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges. Towards

this end, the research would like to establish a better way of evaluating employees' performance where the former have strong faith in the review process and contribute significantly to the overall achievement of the organisation's goal.

Objectives

This study aims to evaluate the challenges encountered by one State College in Camarines Sur on the implementation of the four-phase strategic management process, and to provide measures to address these challenges along Performance Planning and Commitment, Performance Monitoring and Coaching, Performance Review and Evaluation, and Performance Rewarding and Development Planning.

Specifically, it delves into the following objectives:
1. Identify the challenges encountered in the implementation of the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) along:
   a. Performance Planning and Commitment
   b. Performance Monitoring and Coaching
   c. Performance Review and Evaluation
   d. Performance Rewarding and Development Planning
2. Provide measures to improve the implementation of the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A descriptive research approach was used in this study to provide a comprehensive and accurate picture of the population or phenomenon being studied, as well as to explain the links, patterns, and trends discovered in the data. The traits and qualities of a group or phenomenon under study are described using descriptive research methodologies (Siedlecki 2020). Without compellingly examining the 'why' of the event being studied, the descriptive research approach concentrates on the 'what' of the investigation. To prevent this situation, a mixed strategy was employed to comprehend the deliberate conceptualisation of the 'whys' and their implications in the study (Christensen 2020). Fundamentally, a mixed study design is advantageous because it works well for examining complicated social issues. In this case, the study

examines the difficulties Camarines Sur Polytechnic College staff faced while implementing the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS). Numerical observation is employed to ascertain frequencies, averages, and other statistical computations utilised in the data collection process.

Sommer Harrits (2011) claims that using triangulation, the mixed method aids researchers in improving their scholarly and investigative abilities and enables evaluations from both the deductive and inductive perspectives. Research can be strengthened through the use of mixed methods. Combining thematic approaches with statistics makes it possible to capture softcore experiences and viewpoints, avoid an over-reliance on statistics, and improve comprehension of the issue while producing more feasible results (Harrits 2011).

Setting

The research locale is one state college in the Philippines. Known for being a polytechnic educational institution, the College caters to marginalised but deserving students enrolled in the fields of engineering, nursing, arts and sciences, education, and other technological and professional programs to cater to the needs of the industry. It focuses on its Instruction, Research, Extension, and Production mandate as part of its four-fold functions and expands its frontiers to international areas through intensive collaboration and partnership. The College is home to more than 10,000 students, 450 teaching and non-teaching personnel members, and a Rinconada area development arena. As it caters to the needs of the industry and community, service excellence and continuous improvement processes have become its mantra, and the reason for becoming the research locale to assess the performance management system of the institution.

Respondents

The respondents were carefully selected for this study to determine the challenges of implementing the four-stage performance management system. The study samples were from two distinct divisions, the Academic and the Administrative Divisions. Purposive sampling was used in the selection process because it enabled the researcher to select the participants with certain qualities relevant to the research objectives. For this study, regular employees who have been with the College for more than three (3) years were considered as the study's respondents since they already have a full grasp of the performance management cycle and were already evaluated using the SPMS tool of the Civil Service Commission. Sloven's formula was used to calculate the minimum sample size needed to estimate the number of respondents based on an acceptable margin of error of 0.05 out of the 181 regular employees, which are categorised into Administrative employees (52) and Academic employees (129), a total of 46 and 97 employees were chosen as respondents of the study. There is a one hundred percent retrieval rate from the respondents, which can be attributed to their interest in and willingness to answer questions based on their experiences in the performance management process. As Saleh and Bista (2017) emphasised, participants' interests, the survey structure, communication techniques, and the promise of privacy and confidentiality all influenced the response rate of research surveys.

Data Collection

The primary tool for gathering data was a two-page self-completion survey created in accordance with Babbie's (2013) recommendations. The questionnaire consisted of an introductory paragraph at the beginning of the questionnaire for the respondents to read, and the central section was composed of statements from SPMS practices. The instrument was divided into two (2) parts. Part 1 sought responses to the challenges faced in the four areas of SPMS, that is, performance planning and commitment, performance monitoring and coaching, performance review and evaluation, and performance rewarding and development planning. In contrast, Part 2 sought recommendations for improving the implementation of SPMS in the College.

As Adams et al. (2007) recommended, the questionnaire was pre-tested among ten teaching and non-teaching staff members before being given to the study population to eliminate any unclear questions or typographical, grammatical, or ordering mistakes.

Since the study sought strong cooperation and collaboration from the respondents, a face-to-face follow-up semi-structured interview was conducted with some faculty and non-teaching personnel

during the data gathering to learn about their SPMS practices in the College. The interview utilised open-ended questions to allow the respondents to provide opinions or explain their responses (Singer and Couper 2017). The interview questions were asked of participants with various roles directly tied to strategic performance management, including performance planning and commitment, performance monitoring and coaching, performance review and evaluation, and performance rewarding and development planning.

In the study, the respondents were formally informed of the research's purpose, methods, and intended possible uses. The researcher observed the confidentiality of information supplied by the respondents, and their anonymity was highly observed in this study. The three-phase coding process comprising open coding, axial coding, and selective coding, was used to critically and thoroughly analyse the information acquired during the interview. Axial coding arranges concepts and themes according to open coding, selective coding extracts themes from data, and open coding looks for themes and groups the raw data into several categories. The study's conclusions were completed by integrating and analysing the quantitative data that had been gathered. Weighted Mean was one of the statistical methods used to analyse the survey data to ascertain the degree of awareness and satisfaction with SPMS implementation. Using standardised response categories in survey surveys, the Likert scaling technique is primarily used to gauge respondents' attitudes and perceptions (Babbie 2013).

To gauge the difficulty level, the weightage is such that 4 is Strongly Agree, 3 is Agree, 2 is Disagree, and 1 is Strongly Disagree. To gauge respondents' level of satisfaction and provide general conclusions, the Likert scores for each statement were also computed and averaged.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) serves as the cornerstone of employee performance evaluation in government agencies. Designed to align individual and organisational goals, SPMS promotes accountability, transparency, and efficiency in public service delivery. While it is widely accepted and endorsed as an effective framework by numerous scholars and practitioners (Armstrong and Appelbaum 2009; Tymon and Rees 2013), its implementation is not without challenges. Issues frequently arise across various phases of the performance management cycle, including performance planning, coaching and mentoring, evaluation, and rewards and recognition.

This paper delves into these challenges, providing a detailed analysis of their root causes. Furthermore, it offers strategies and actionable recommendations to address these issues, ensuring that the SPMS fulfills its intended purpose of fostering a culture of excellence and continuous improvement in government agencies.

Challenges in the Implementation of a Strategic Performance Management System

In addition to providing a method for managing and developing personnel that enhances individual, team, and organisational performance, performance management creates a shared understanding of what has to be accomplished and how it will be done (Armstrong and Appelbaum 2009). In the context of higher education institutions, this shared understanding is operationalised through strategic alignment of institutional goals with individual performance objectives, participatory target-setting processes, and comprehensive communication strategies that ensure clarity among faculty and staff. This fosters a collaborative environment where the unique challenges of academic settings, such as tenure considerations and diverse roles, are effectively addressed, enabling both personal and organisational growth. Because of its intricacy, this system is regarded as the "Achilles Heel" of human resource management despite its significance in a company (Pulakos 2015). Effective performance management is essential for universities to grow and become more responsible for adapting to changing conditions and obtaining a competitive edge. Furthermore, specialisation, tenure, faculty choices, and staff rigidities make control difficult and limited in higher education institutions (Lindsay 1981).

To be successful, performance management must first guarantee that individuals possess the skills and knowledge necessary to carry out its duties, second, it must be strategic to encompass longer-term objectives and broader issues, and third, it must be integrated to connect different business, people management, individual, and

team aspects (Tymon and Rees 2013). Employee commitment, motivation, and satisfaction are the results of a good PM, and these factors eventually result in improved performance (Decramer et al. 2012). In higher education institutions, these outcomes are often facilitated through mechanisms such as structured faculty development programs, transparent and merit-based reward systems, and regular feedback loops tailored to academic and administrative roles. For example, performance evaluations linked to professional development grants or teaching innovation awards can motivate faculty to align individual achievements with institutional goals, thereby fostering a culture of excellence. According to Deshmukh et al. (2010), HEIs must implement a PM system to learn about job performance through performance measurements, individual employee rewards and recognition, and development chances through accurate performance evaluation and constructive feedback.

The study by Torneo and Mojica (2020) emphasised the flawed implementation of the performance management system and pointed out that it is highly administrative and drawn out, rater biased, strained relationship, and lenient (Pulakos and O'Leary 2011). Given the rapid improvement of human resource management, root cause analysis, and policy measures are imperative to improve the performance management system in the College.

Performance Planning and Commitment

Table 1 shows the challenges encountered during Performance Planning and Commitment, the first stage of the Performance Management Cycle. The lack of focus and priority on performance planning and commitment ranked second with a WM of 3.55, while the third challenge in the implementation was identified as a lack of orientation and reorientation on the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS). It is clear that employees feel overburdened by the numerous performance indicators, which ranked first among teaching and non-teaching personnel and received a high mean of 3.70 or Strongly Agree. Higher education institutions can address this by implementing recurring reorientation workshops for all staff members and regular orientation sessions for new hires. Interactive workshops, comprehensive manuals, and online modules customised for the SPMS architecture are a few examples of these initiatives. Furthermore, establishing a feedback system to gauge comprehension and modify the material in response to staff suggestions helps guarantee ongoing enhancement and promote a deeper comprehension of the system's features. With an average weighted mean of 3.47, the respondents also strongly agreed that some of the targets are unrealistic. They also cited faculty and staff members' lack of involvement in performance indicator target setting as a major obstacle during the planning and commitment phase of performance management.

The IPCRs for Faculty A in the College of Engineering and Faculty B in the College of Arts and Sciences are 25 and 23 pages respectively, according to the document evaluation that was done. Given that teaching is their primary responsibility,

Table 1: Challenges in performance planning and commitment

	Academic		Non-teaching		Total		
	WM	VI	WM	VI	AWM	VI	Rank
Unrealistic targets and expectations	3.28	SA	3.65	SA	3.47	Strongly agree	4
Failure to communicate the performance targets and expectations	3.26	SA	3.31	SA	3.29	Agree	6
Lack of attention and priority to performance planning and commitment	3.64	SA	3.45	SA	3.55	Strongly agree	2
Delay in target setting	3.28	SA	3.26	SA	3.27	Strongly agree	7
Resistance to change in policies	2.90	A	3.1	A	3.0	Agree	9
Lack of consultation in the identification of targets	3.15	A	3.29	SA	3.22	Agree	8
Vague provisions of the SPMS, OPCR, and IPCR	2.51	A	2.55	A	2.53	Agree	10
Too many performance indicators	3.72	SA	3.67	SA	3.70	Strongly agree	1
Lack of orientation/re-orientation on SPMS	3.53	SA	3.54	SA	3.53	Strongly agree	3
Lack of participation of faculty and staff in target setting of performance indicators	3.35	SA	3.27	SA	3.31	Strongly agree	5

Source: Researcher-made validated questionnaire

faculty members believe that the targets are extremely onerous based on this list of metrics. In contrast, the Performance Management Team (PMT) reviews the list of harmonised indicators after a deliberative assembly, which ensures that all employees take targets into consideration.

Lack of SPMS orientation seemed to rank second among the difficulties faced by the staff as well. This makes it difficult to comprehend the SPMS's provisions. It is noteworthy that they believe performance planning receives little attention and that there is no participatory planning. This goes against the College's biannual and annual Performance Target Setting process, which is carried out in December and will be repeated in July.

Performance Monitoring and Coaching

Table 2 lists the challenges in putting Performance Monitoring and Coaching into practice as part of the SPMS. It shows that the respondents' greatest problem was the lack of coaching and mentoring, which is supported by the consistent answers from both teaching and non-teaching staff, which had the highest mean of 3.47, or Strongly Agree. They also rated second and third that performance coaching is delayed, and that staff are not given feedback on time, respectively. With WMs of 2.46 and 2.25 respectively, respondents disagreed that a hostile work environment and tense interactions with managers and staff led to low morale.

It is important to highlight that, in spite of meetings, one-on-one conversations with staff, and reminders, both teaching and non-teaching staff believe that the biggest obstacle to performance monitoring and coaching in the SPMS is the absence of coaching. According to Woodside's (2011) research, coaching cannot ensure efficacy and can result in 'incompetence coaching' and 'incompetence training'. Nearly half of the coaches are unhappy with their coaching, according to a research by Hutchinson and Purcell (2010), and a failing process can have a detrimental impact on the participants as well as the company.

Because they fear retaliation or destroying their connections with the people they rely on to complete tasks, managers are hesitant to conduct open discussions and offer staff members frank criticism (Pulakos 2015). However, several tactics have proven successful in overcoming these obstacles, such as organised training courses on providing constructive criticism and precise instructions for carrying out performance evaluations. Initiatives like 360-degree feedback systems or manager role-playing exercises, for example, can reduce retaliation fears and enhance the feedback culture in organisations, creating a more open and trustworthy atmosphere. Employees think their managers are inept at addressing their performance and at helping them to develop their skills. In comparison to their utility, performance management systems are frequently criticised for being cumbersome, bureaucratic, and time-consuming. Therefore, managers and employees view performance management as a necessary workplace evil that should be avoided rather than as a crucial process that pro-

Table 2: Challenges in performance monitoring and coaching

	Teaching		Non-teaching		Total		
	WM	VI	WM	VI	AWM	VI	Rank
Absence of coaching and mentoring	3.43	SA	3.51	SA	3.47	Strongly agree	1
No monitoring tool used for targets	2.5	D	2.7	A	2.6	Agree	8
Feedback not communicated to employees on time	3.38	SA	3.29	SA	3.33	Strongly agree	2
Unfriendly working environment resulting in low employee morale	2.4	D	2.1	D	2.25	Disagree	10
Little or absence of communication on employees' performance	3.36	SA	3.27	SA	3.31	Strongly agree	4
Unimplemented coaching journal	3.08	A	3.07	A	3.07	Agree	7
Frequent changes of staff to be monitored and coached	3.09	A	3.11	A	3.1	Agree	6
Lack of documentation on employees' performance	3.15	A	2.9	A	3.02	Agree	5
Delayed performance coaching	3.35	SA	3.29	SA	3.32	Strongly agree	3
Strained relationships with supervisors and employees	2.5	D	2.42	D	2.46	Disagree	9

Source: Researcher-made validated questionnaire

duces meaningful results for both individuals and the company.

Employees still desire a more meaningful relationship and a real coaching process, according to the comments, even if efforts have been made to engage with direct supervisors and offer coaching and mentoring to subordinates.

Challenges in Performance Review and Evaluation

The challenges related to performance reviews and assessments in the third stage of performance management are listed in Table 3. The difficulty with the highest mean score, 3.77, was the absence of performance feedback. The respondents also overwhelmingly agreed that the process and outcome are not transparent, and that one of the biggest obstacles to performance assessment and evaluation is the absence of documentation attesting to the accomplishments. Despite difficulties, respondents voiced issues about the rating scale's complexity and the inadequate production of performance evaluation records, both of which were orally interpreted as disagree and obtained an average weighted mean of 2.4.

Lack of performance feedback is the first issue noted, and it is similar to the issue that arises during performance coaching and monitoring, that "Feedback is not communicated to employees on time". It is also important to note that respondents believe there are biases in ratings even though there are comprehensive guidelines for rating and evaluating employee performance and the Performance Management Team's (PMT) performance review of the offices.

Similar to the results of Dizon et al.'s (2018) study, employees reported not receiving on-time performance reviews. According to their findings, a Results-Based Performance Management System (RBPMS) provides specific processes, criteria, and guidelines for establishing performance objectives, monitoring, evaluating, and planning rate development. However, the majority of raters do not discuss the process of creating the Individual Performance Commitment and Review Form or the people who get the rates. It has been demonstrated that some raters rarely provide their ratees with feedback, despite the fact that ensuring both individual growth and efficiency and organisational performance is essential, they said.

These issues still remain at the College even if performance appraisals and assessments have a high satisfaction rating. During the review and evaluation stage, further issues include rating bias, poor evaluator judgment, office politics, and unfair treatment. This is in line with the results of Dizon et al. (2018), who discovered that the absence of a second review, high anxiety, infrequent feedback, rater inconsistency, and recent errors are the main barriers to using RBPMS.

The College's Performance Management Team (PMT) makes an attempt to effectively review and evaluate ratings and performance based on verifiable indicators that have been duly validated by concerned offices, even though perfection in performance review and evaluation is still a struggle.

The "Achilles heel" of human resource management, according to Pulakos (2004), is performance management and evaluation. In many businesses, they have shortcomings, and management and staff frequently lament their inefficiency. Al-

Table 3: Challenges to performance review and evaluation

	Teaching		Non-teaching		Total		
	WM	VI	WM	VI	AWM	VI	Rank
Poor judgment of the appraiser or evaluator	2.8	A	2.67	A	2.73	Agree	6
Lack of performance feedback	3.73	SA	3.82	SA	3.77	Strongly agree	1
Biases in rating	2.67	A	2.51	A	2.59	Agree	7
Unfair treatment and favoritism among employees	2.51	A	2.6	A	2.55	Agree	8
Presence of office politics	2.73	A	2.79	A	2.76	Agree	5
Lack of transparency	3.35	SA	3.41	SA	3.38	Strongly agree	2
Complexity of the rating scale	2.5	D	2.3	D	2.4	Disagree	9.5
Lack of documents to support the accomplishments	3.26	SA	3.35	SA	3.30	Strongly agree	3
Vague provision on rating scheme	3.26	A	3.11	A	3.18	Agree	4
Lack of adequate preparation of documents for performance evaluation	2.3	D	2.51	D	2.4	Disagree	9.5

Source: Researcher-made validated questionnaire

though many businesses may have badly planned systems, performance management problems are usually not caused by poorly designed tools and procedures. Rather, issues emerge because performance management is fundamentally a very private and frequently intimidating process for both managers and employees.

Managers are hesitant to engage in open communication and provide candid feedback to employees because they worry about reprisals or damaged relationships with the people they depend on to finish tasks. Employees think their managers are inept at addressing their performance and at helping them to develop their skills. In comparison to their utility, performance management systems are frequently criticised for being cumbersome, bureaucratic, and time-consuming. Therefore, managers and employees view performance management as a necessary workplace evil that should be avoided rather than as a crucial process that produces meaningful results for both individuals and the company.

The study by Siraj and Hágen (2023) provides valuable information about doable strategies for implementing an effective performance management system that can raise employee productivity in Ethiopian SMEs. The results show that by using an effective performance management system, SMEs may significantly boost their output by implementing an effective performance management system that consists of: clearly defining job respon-

sibilities through performance planning; regularly providing feedback on progress toward planning-stage goals; conducting periodic appraisals that offer constructive criticism as well as praise for good work; offering training opportunities to help employees develop new skills or improve existing ones; and rewarding high-performing employees who meet or exceed expectations with incentives like bonuses or promotions to further motivate them.

Affirming the findings of the above study, Maley et al. (2024) emphasized that goal alignment, enhanced communication, performance assessment, staff development, engagement, and talent retention are considered significant advantages of performance management and review.

Despite given advantages and challenges, conducting a performance review is one of a manager's most important responsibilities. It is an essential tool for high-performing organisations. Performance reviews and assessments can also be very beneficial to a company, its management, and its employees.

Performance Rewarding and Development Planning

The difficulties that the two groups of respondents encountered in completing the four-phase cycle of the College's Strategic Performance Management System with regard to Performance Rewarding and Development Planning are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4: Challenges in performance rewarding and development planning

	Teaching		Non-teaching		Total		
	WM	VI	WM	VI	AWM	VI	Rank
Lack of leadership support on performance rewarding	3.27	SA	3.21	SA	3.24	Agree	4
Lack of incentives and recognition for performing employees	3.26	SA	3.20	A	3.23	Agree	5
No clear guidelines on rating and ranking employees	2.5	D	2.3	D	2.4	Disagree	10
Performance rating not linked to scholarship and training opportunities	3.42	SA	3.5	SA	3.46	Strongly agree	2
The untimely or late reward for good performance	3.24	A	2.98	A	3.11	Agree	7
Financial reward prioritized over praise and recognition	2.90	A	3.23	A	3.05	Agree	9
Inadequate management support in development planning	3.25	A	3.11	A	3.18	Agree	6
Training and development needs not implemented before the subsequent evaluation	3.29	SA	3.33	SA	3.31	Strongly agree	3
Lack of supervisors' commitment to developing staff under them	3.26	A	2.9	A	3.08	Agree	8
The content of IDP does not capture the development gap of employee	3.45	SA	3.51	SA	3.48	Agree	1

Source: Researcher-made validated questionnaire

According to the list of issues, it seems that the employees' development gaps are not addressed in the Individual Development Plan, and intervention programs are not carried out promptly, if at all, before the beginning of a new rating period. With a WM of 3.46, the respondents also strongly agreed that training and development needs are not met prior to the next evaluation period, and that performance ratings are not connected to scholarship and training possibilities. With a weighted mean of 2.4, respondents disagreed that there are no explicit criteria for assessing and ranking staff, notwithstanding the difficulties. Performance management is a useful technique for professional development and behavioural treatments, according to Dizon et al.'s (2018) study. But the raters do not know enough about the right developmental intervention for the ratings. This is the situation with CSPC, where the ratee is the only one who suggests intervention programs, and they are all included in the self-evaluated Individual Development Plan.

Despite the availability of numerous incentive programs, including PRAISE benefits, loyalty pay, certificates and recognitions, Collective Negotiation Agreement incentives, and other government incentives, it is concerning that employees do not receive credit for their contributions. Implementing focused recognition programs, such as peer-nominated prizes, real-time acknowledgments, and customised thank-you notes, can assist in overcoming this obstacle. A 'Faculty of the Month' initiative or highlighting accomplishments at monthly meetings are two examples of doable actions. Additionally, including acknowledgment into digital platforms, like e-certificates or intranet shoutouts, could improve consistency and visibility while encouraging a culture of gratitude and inspiration.

Employee recognition has been shown to be a very successful motivational strategy that may greatly improve a company's overall performance as well as the job happiness and productivity of its employees (Rahim and Daud 2013). Employees who receive the proper recognition are more motivated to become committed to their work and give their best effort, which fosters a healthy work environment, according to Freeman (1978). Because they enable a company to accomplish its goals, carry out its business plan, and expand and succeed, highly motivated employees give it a competitive edge (Danish and Usman 2010). On the other hand, it has been discovered that demotivated workplaces produce hesitant or low-motivated employees who are not creative, rarely use their skills, and are not fully committed to the level that an organisation demands.

Non-monetary rewards like acknowledgment have a favourable effect on organisational performance and employee work satisfaction (Erbasi and Arat 2012). According to Imran et al. (2014), happy employees have a positive attitude toward the business and their work, which improves the standard and amount of employee productivity.

Applying frequently and consistently for daily, informal, and formal recognition programs provides businesses with a strong tool to motivate employees to respect and value the company's principles. Setting an example for other employees, it also allows the business to highlight desired behaviours and actions. An influential employee recognition culture is achieved when the organisation's corporate values and strategic goals are fully supported by the recognition programs developed and implemented, according to Nelson (1995), cited in Luthans (2000). A 2011 Maritz Institute study found that a recognition culture increases an organisation's sensitivity to market shifts and facilitates its alignment with corporate strategy, ultimately resulting in a competitive edge. Organisations demonstrate to their employees that their efforts are appreciated and recognised by clearly reinforcing expected behaviour, in addition to teaching them the organisation's values, goals, objectives, priorities, and their role in achieving them.

It has been demonstrated that employee recognition programs highlight employees' accomplishments and worth at the right time because of their direct nature and the dynamic nature of the workplace. According to Abiola and Ajila (2004), because customary annual awards are unrelated to the accomplishment they are meant to honour, they are neither suitably helpful nor meaningful. By assisting employees in understanding how their efforts impact financial results and how they will be immediately recognised and rewarded, employee recognition programs are a powerful motivational tool. Long-deferred incentives lose most of their effect and do not offer many opportunities to talk about success.

CONCLUSION

Given the need to deliver exceptional customer service to government employees, human resourc-

es' role in successfully implementing the Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) is a pre-requisite for a positive corporate culture. There are still flaws in the four-stage cycle that require refinement and filtering, even with efforts to perfect implementation at every level.

The difficulty in performance planning and commitment is ascribed to the excessive number of targets established in the planning stage, as well as the lack of awareness and involvement of employees in the target-setting process. This is made worse by the lack of coaching and mentoring, the opaqueness of the review process, the absence of supporting documentation for performance ratings, and the delayed communication of performance improvement comments. The performance review process fails to identify the employee's development gap that is essential to their advancement, and training and development requirements are not met prior to the next evaluation cycle because of the lack of leadership support for performance rewarding and development planning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings suggest concise but precise planning and performance goals at the start of the rating period. Coaching and mentoring must be done quarterly to monitor them. This will make it easier to conduct an accurate and timely performance evaluation using verified documentation as a measurement. After sharing with personnel, the outcome will guide intervention, development plans, awards, and recognition.

Regular Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS) orientation and reorientation for new and experienced employees is the greatest strategy to improve it based on timely calendar for Performance Planning and Commitment to match expectations and targets before the rating period. Supervisors' feedback must also be given swiftly to remedy deviations and missed goals. Top management should review recognition programs to ensure they are current, relevant, and aligned with the institution's aims and principles. This might focus the appreciation program and highlight employee actions that support company goals.

To monitor employee performance, improve management-staff communication, and reduce bureaucracy, the college may adopt a continuous feedback system. The report also proposes using performance management systems to promote open communication, staff consultation, and continuous development. To progress continuously, staff must be supported in learning and development programs that align with the company's strategy and goals. Increase leadership commitment and support for SPMS implementation, engage staff in a culture of accountability and continuous improvement, and constantly review and adapt the SPMS implementation in response to feedback and new institutional needs.

LIMITATIONS

This study focused on the challenges encountered in implementing the four-stage Strategic Performance Management System in one state college in the Philippines. Although it can conclude the process in said school, it cannot be assumed that all state universities and colleges implementing the SPMS have experienced the same problems. Moreover, since the study focuses on the challenges experienced by the teaching and non-teaching personnel, future researchers may conduct further studies involving the perception of the Performance Management Team and correlate the difficulties perceived from the perspective of the implementers of the SPMS.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Abiola A, Ajila C 2004. Influence of rewards on worker's performance in an organization. *Journal of Social Sciences,* 8(1): 7-12.

Adams J, Khan HT, Raeside R, White DI 2007. *Research Methods for Graduate Business and Social Science Students.* Sage.

Armstrong S, Appelbaum M 2009. *Stress-Free Performance Appraisals: Turn Your Most Painful Manage-*

ment Duty into a Powerful Motivational Tool. 1st Edition. Franklin Lakes: Career Press.

Babbie ER 2013. *The Basics of Social Research.* 6th Edition. Wadsworth.

Christensen JH 2020. Enhancing mixed methods pragmatism with system theory: Perspectives from educational research. *Systems Research and Behavioral Sciences.* https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2751

Civil Service Commission 2012. Guidelines in the Establishment and Implementation of Agency Strategic Performance Management System (SPMS), pp. 2-10. NCR, Philippines: Republic of the Philippines. From <http://csc.gov.ph/2014-02-21-08-28-23/pdf-files/file/199-guidelines-in-the-establishment-and-implementation-of-agency-strategic-performance-management-system-spms> (Retrieved on 15 August 2024).

Danish RQ, Usman A 2010. Impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation: An empirical study from Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management,* 5(2): 159.

Decramer A, Smolders C, Vanderstraeten A, Christiaens J 2012. The impact of institutional pressures on employee performance management systems in higher education in the law countries. *British Journal of Management,* 23(S1): S88-S103.

Deshmukh AM, Sharma S, Ramteke AY 2010. 2010. *Performance Management Practices in Higher Education.* India: Excel India Publisher.

Dizon AD, San Pedro AB, Munsayac MM, Padilla J, Pascual MCG 2018. Level of implementation of the Results-Based Performance Management System in the Department of Education Division of Gapan City, Philippines. *International Journal of Research – Granthaalayah, 6*(1): 484-503. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1172398.

Erbasi A, Arat T 2012. The effect of financial and non-financial incentives on job satisfaction: An examination of food chain premises in Turkey. *International Business Research,* 5(10): 136-145. DOI:10.5539/ibr.v5n10p136

Freeman RB 1978. Job satisfaction as an economic variable. *The American Economic Review*, 68(2): 135-141. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1816677

Hutchinson S, Purcell J 2010. Managing ward managers for roles in HRM in the NHS: Overworked and under-resourced. *Human Resource Management Journal,* 20(4): 357-374. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2010.00141.x

Imran A, Ahmad S, Nisar QA, Ahmad U 2014. Exploring relationships among rewards, recognition and employees' job satisfaction: A descriptive study on libraries in Pakistan. *Middle-East Journal Scientific Research,* 21(9): 1533-1540.

Lindsay A 1981. Assessing institutional performance in higher education: A managerial perspective. *Higher Education,* 10(6): 687-706.

Luthans K 2000. Recognition: A powerful but overlooked leadership tool to improve employee performance. *Journal of Leadership Studies,* 7(1): https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190000700104

Maley JF, Dabiæ M, Neher A, Wuersch L, Martin L, Kiessling T 2024. Performance management in a rapidly changing world: Implications for talent management. *Management Decision*, 62(10): 3085-3108. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-07-2023-1162

Maritz White Paper 2011. From <https://www.maritz.com/-/media/Files/MaritzDotCom/White%20Papers/Motivation/White_Paper_The_Science_of_Giving.> (Retrieved on 15 August 2024).

Pulakos ED 2004. *Performance Management: A Roadmap for Developing, Implementing and Evaluating Performance Management Systems.* USA: The SHRM Foundation.

Pulakos ED, Hanson RM, Arad S, Moye N 2015. Performance management can be fixed: An on-the-job experiential learning approach for complex behavior change. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1): 51-76. doi:10.1017/iop.2014.2

Pulakos ED, O'Leary RS 2011. Why is performance management broken? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* 4(2): 146-164. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01315.x

Rahim MA, Daud WNW 2013. Rewards and motivation among administrators of University Sultan Zainal Abidin (UnisZA): An empirical study. *International Journal of Business Society,* 14(2): 265-286.

Saleh A, Bista K 2017. Examining Factors Impacting Online Survey Response Rates in Educational Research: Perceptions of Graduate Students. ERIC (Education Resources Information Center). From <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED596616> (Retrieved on 30 June 2023).

Siedlecki S 2020. Understanding descriptive research design and methods. *Clinical Nurse Specialist,* 34(1): 8-12. https://doi.og/10.1097/nur.0000000000000493

Singer E, Couper M 2017. Some methodological uses of responses to open questions and other verbatim comments in quantitative surveys. *Methods, Data, Analyses,* 11: 20. https://doi.org/10.12758/mda.2017.01

Siraj N, Hágen I 2023. *Performance management system and its role for employee performance: Evidence from Ethiopian SMEs. Heliyon,* 9(11): e21819. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e21819

Sommer Harrits G 2011. More than method. A discussion of paradigm differences within mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research,* 5(2): 150-166. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689811402506

Torneo AR, Mojica BJ 2020. The Strategic Performance Management System in selected Philippine National Government Agencies: Assessment and policy recommendations. *Asian Politics and Policy,* 12: 432-454. https://doi.org/10.1111/aspp.12540

Tymon A, Rees G 2013. Performance management, motivation and reward. In: G Rees, R French (Eds.): *Leading, Managing and Developing People.* 4th Edition. UK: CIPD Publications, pp. 247-272.

Woodside A 2011. Incompetency training: Theory, practice, and remedies. *Journal of Business Research,* 65(3): 279-293. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.10.025