



Republic of the Philippines
Department of Education
Region VI – Western Visayas
SCHOOLS DIVISION OF CAPIZ

February 21, 2024

DIVISION MEMORANDUM

No. 115, s. 2024

**COMPOSITION OF RATERS FOR TEACHERS' REFLECTION FORM
OF TEACHER I APPLICANTS FOR SY 2024-2025**

To: OIC- Assistant Schools Division Superintendent
Chief Education Supervisors
Education Program Supervisors
Public Schools District Supervisors
Heads, Public Elementary, Secondary and Integrated Schools
All Others Concerned

1. Relative to the conduct of the recruitment, evaluation, and selection of Teacher I Applicants in SDO Capiz, this Office designates the following Education Program Supervisors (EPS), Public Schools District Supervisors (PSDS), and School Principal to be the raters of the Teachers' Reflection Forms (TRFs).
2. This activity aims to fast track the giving of ratings to the Teachers' Reflection Forms as one of the components in the ranking process.
3. The members of the Division Sub-Committee Raters are the following:

-Lalain de los Santos PhD	-Public Schools District Supervisor
-Salvador Dale B. Artates MA	-Education Program Supervisor (English)
-Andres Quiachon MAT	-Education Program Supervisor (Science)
-Angel Payo, Jr. PhD	-Public Schools District Supervisor
-Merlie Rubio, EdD	-Education Program Supervisor (Filipino)
-Elenia Baranda MAT	-Education Program Supervisor (Mathematics)
-Fe Banez EdD	-Public Schools District Supervisor
-Ronie Reteracion MA	-Education Program Supervisor (MAPEH)
-Ma. Theresa Villagrancia EdD	-Public Schools District Supervisor
-Rolando Jamora PhD	-Education Program Supervisor (TLE/TVL)
-Calin Bernales EdD	-Public Schools District Supervisor
-Reynaldo Azcarraga PhD	-Public Schools District Supervisor
-Ruth Gervero PhD	-Education Program Supervisor (ALS/MG/SPED)
-Zaldy Caalam PhD	-Public Schools District Supervisor
-Sephora Roldan EdD	-Education Program Supervisor (AP)
-Alan Vincent Altamia MAVE	-Education Program Supervisor (EsP)
-Judith Tu EdD	-Public Schools District Supervisor
-Lallaine Fundal EdD	-Public Schools District Supervisor
-Charlie Begas MS	-Secondary School Principal IV (CNHS)



Address: Banica, Roxas City

Contact Number: (036) 6518 456/0968-869-5867

Email Address: capiz@deped.gov.ph

Website: <http://depedcapiz.ph>



Republic of the Philippines
Department of Education
Region VI – Western Visayas
SCHOOLS DIVISION OF CAPIZ

4. The designated raters are advised to refer to the “*Rubrics for Rating the TRF*” to be used in evaluating Teacher-Applicants’ output found in the Annexes of DepEd Order No. 2 s. 2023 (Please see attached sheet).
5. Immediate dissemination of and compliance with this Memorandum are desired.


MIGUEL MAC D. APOSIN EdD, CESO V
Schools Division Superintendent

Encl.: As stated.

Reference: DepEd Order 7 s. 2023

To be indicated in the Perpetual Index
Under the following subjects:

EVALUATION

RECRUITMENT

SELECTION



Address: Banica, Roxas City

Contact Number: (036) 6518 456/0968-869-5867

Email Address: capiz@deped.gov.ph

Website: <http://depedcapiz.ph>



Rubrics for Rating the TRF

Exemplary (E) 5 points	Fully Acceptable (FA) 3 points	Not Fully Acceptable (NFA) 1 point
<p>The applicant was able to provide anecdotal and situational examples that support the demonstration of the objective. The examples/justifications/practices/instances provided by the applicant are aligned with the objective and showcase the applicant's deep understanding of the objective.</p> <p>The response contained little to no grammatical and technical (capitalization, punctuation, etc.) errors. The applicant has good command of the language used.</p>	<p>The applicant was able to give examples/justifications/practices/instances that somehow/do not fully align with the objective. The response demonstrates limited understanding of the objective.</p> <p>The response contained few grammatical and technical (capitalization, punctuation, etc.) errors. However, these did not greatly affect the quality of the response.</p>	<p>The applicant was unable to support/provide evidence of his/her demonstration/ability to demonstrate the objective. The examples/justifications/practices/instances do not align with the objective and demonstrate little to no understanding of the objective.</p> <p>The response contained several grammatical and technical (capitalization, punctuation, etc.) errors which interfere with the understanding of the ideas presented.</p>

Reminders for the evaluators:

1. Evaluators assess the applicant's demonstration and/or understanding of the objective based on the narrative and responses, NOT the quantity of narratives or experiences. **Long answers do not automatically merit an Exemplary rating.**
2. Use the portion **Comments from the Evaluator** to write down statement/s that support your given rating. Some examples:

My rating is 1 because the examples given are very general and do not demonstrate his/her understanding of the indicator.

I gave a rating of 3 because although the examples are aligned with the objective, the explanation was not focused on how the activities relate to his/her teaching practices.

My rating is 5 because although only 1 example was given, it demonstrated deep understanding of the objective. The explanation directly targets the intention of the objective.