PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD) COMPLIANCE MONITORING TOOL

This tool will be used by the assigned Monitoring and Evaluation Officer during the MATATAG Training. Please fill out all the fields below.

I. PROGRAM OWNER PROFILE AND PROGRAM DETAILS	
PD Program Owner:	
PD Program Manager:	
Title of the PD Program:	
Venue of the PD Program:	
Implementation Dates of the PD Program:	

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OFFICER			
Name	*Position*	*Office*	*Signature*

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Put a check (/) in the box that corresponds to your observation to the program.
2. Assign the following points to each column that was selected during the monitoring.
3. Points for each column are as follows: A = 4 points; B = 3 points; C = 2 points; and D = 1 point.
4. For items with more than one indicator, compute the average to obtain a single rating.
5. All categories are considered crucial to any program, thus, weights are inapplicable.

II. PD PROGRAM MONITORING SECTION

1.0 PARTICIPANTS

Are the actual participants the same with the target participants of the program?

COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C	COLUMN D
☐ About **91-100%** of the actual participants are the **target participants** of the PD Program.	☐ About **81-90%** of the actual participants are the **target participants** of the PD Program.	☐ About **51-80%** of the actual participants are the **target participants** of the PD Program.	☐ About **50% or less** of the actual participants are the **target participants** of the PD Program.
☐ About **91-100%** of the actual participants are **qualified to the selection criteria** of the PD Program.	☐About **81-90%** of the actual participants are **qualified to the selection criteria** of the PD Program.	☐ About **51-80%** of the actual participants are **qualified to the selection criteria** of the PD Program.	☐ About **50% or less** of the actual participants are **qualified to the selection criteria** of the PD Program.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(e.g., Reasons for deviation, especially for responses made under Columns C and D.)*

REMARKS

2.0 PROGRAM DESIGN

To what extent was the delivered PD Program compliant to the quality assured PD Program Design?

COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C	COLUMN D
☐ The delivered PD Program: • **fully complied** with and was **consistent** with the quality assured PD Program Design.	☐ The delivered PD Program **made minimal adjustments** in any of the following aspects: • Professional Standards • Learning Objectives • Session Contents • Time Allotment • Logical Sequence • Program Methodology • Session Outputs	☐ There **were minor revisions** in the design aspects of the PD Program: • Professional Standards • Learning Objectives • Session Contents • Logical Sequence • Program Methodology • Program Methodology • Session Outputs • Workplace Application	☐ There were **major revisions** in the design aspects of the PD Program: • Professional Standards • Learning Objectives • Session Contents • Time Allotment • Logical Sequence • Program Methodology • Session Outputs • Workplace Application

	• Workplace Application	• Time Allotment • Logical Sequence	

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(e.g., Reasons for deviation, especially for responses made under Columns C and D.)*

REMARKS

3.0 RESOURCE PERSONS/SUBJECT-MATTER EXPERTS

To what extent were the resource speakers/subject-matter experts compliant to the PD Program Delivery Quality Standards?

COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C	COLUMN D
☐ All the sessions were delivered by the resource speakers/subject-matter experts as identified RPs who attended the MATATAG Training for Trainers.	☐ Most of the sessions were delivered by the resource speakers/subject-matter experts as identified RPs who attended the MATATAG Training for Trainers. Some of the sessions were delivered by **alternatives** who	☐ There were **minor changes** regarding the expected resource speakers/subject-matter experts to deliver the sessions. **Almost half** of the sessions were delivered by different resource speakers/subject-matter experts from those originally	☐ There were **major changes** regarding the expected resource speakers/subject-matter experts to deliver the sessions. **More than half** of the sessions were delivered by different resource speakers/subject-matter experts from those originally

	are equally excellent (or better). **NEAP was informed** of the changes ahead of time.	identified RPs who attended the MATATAG Training for Trainers. **NEAP was not informed** of the changes ahead of time.	identified RPs who attended the MATATAG Training for Trainers. **NEAP was not informed** of the changes ahead of time.
☐ The resource speakers/subject-matter experts executed **91-100%** of the following indicators in the PD Program Quality Standards for Learning Management. ***Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist for all the sessions.***	☐ About **81-90%** of the following indicators in the PD Program Quality Standards for Learning Management were accomplished by resource speakers/subject-matter experts. ***Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklists for all the sessions.***	☐ About **51-80%** of the following indicators in the PD Program Quality Standards for Learning Management were accomplished by the resource speakers/subject-matter experts. ***Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklists for all the sessions.***	☐ About **50% or less** of the following indicators in the PD Program Quality Standards for Learning Management were accomplished by resource speakers/subject-matter experts. ***Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklists for all the sessions.***

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(e.g. Reasons for deviation, especially for responses made under Columns C and D.)*

REMARKS

4.0 LEARNING RESOURCE MATERIALS

To what extent were the LRMs compliant to the PD LRMs Quality Standards?

COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C	COLUMN D

☐ The learning resource materials **were the same as the quality assured learning materials**. The program owner fully complied with the PD LRMs Quality Standards.	☐ The learning resource materials used in the PD program **were different from the quality assured LRMs**. The LRMs were edited to better suit the session and are still compliant to the PD LRMs Quality Standards. **NEAP was informed of the changes ahead of time**.	☐ About 30-50% of learning resource materials used **were different to the quality assured LRMs.** **NEAP was not informed ahead of time** regarding the changes in the LRMs.	☐ There were **major changes in the learning resource materials** used in the program than the quality assured LRMs. **NEAP was not informed ahead of time** regarding the changes in the LRMs.
☐ About **91-100%** of the learning materials aligned with the purpose of the methodology of the learning design were distributed.	☐ About **81-90%** of the learning materials aligned with the purpose of the methodology of the learning design were distributed.	☐ About **51-80%** of the learning materials aligned with the purpose of the methodology of the learning design were distributed.	☐ About **50% or less** of the learning materials aligned with the purpose of the methodology of the learning design were distributed.
☐ About **91-100%** of the participants received a copy of the learning resource materials.	☐ About **81-90%** of the participants received a copy of the learning resource materials.	☐ About **51-80%** of the participants received a copy of the learning resource materials.	☐ About **50% or less** of the participants received a copy of the learning resource materials.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(e.g., Reasons for deviation, especially for responses made under Columns C and D.)*

REMARKS

5.0 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

To what extent was the Program Management compliant to the PD Program Delivery Quality Standards?

COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C	COLUMN D
☐ **91-100%** of the following Program Management indicators were implemented: ***Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.***	☐ **81-90%** of the following Program Management indicators were implemented: ***Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.***	☐ **51-80%** of the following Program Management indicators were implemented: ***Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.***	☐ **50% or less** of the following Program Management indicators were implemented: ***Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.***

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(e.g., Reasons for deviation, especially for responses made under columns C and D.)*

REMARKS

6.0 LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: FACE-TO-FACE PD PROGRAM

To what extent was the venue for the face-to-face PD Program compliant to standards?

COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C	COLUMN D
☐ About **91-100%** of the following indicators of the learning environment and venue were met.	☐ About **81-90%** of the following indicators of the learning environment and venue were met.	☐ About **51-80%** of the following indicators of the learning environment and venue were met.	☐ About **50% or less** of the following indicators of the learning environment and venue were met.

Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.	***Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.***	***Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.***	***Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.***

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION *(e.g., Reasons for deviation, especially for responses made under Columns C and D.)*

REMARKS

III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

INSTRUCTIONS:

Calculate the average of all six (6) categories to get the overall rating for the program. Compute the average of the rating to obtain the category rating.

1. Points for each column are as follows: A = 4 points; B = 3 points; C = 2 points; and D = 1 point.

2. For items with more than one indicator, compute the average to obtain a single rating.
3. All categories are considered crucial to any program, thus, weights are inapplicable.

INTERPRETATION PER CATEGORY:

Rating	Description
3.26 to 4.0	Fully met all agreed standards.
2.51 to 3.25	Partially met agreed standards.
1.76 to 2.50	Minimal conformance to the standards.
1.0 to 1.75	Non-conformance to the standards.

INDICATORS	Category Rating
1.0 PARTICIPANTS Are the actual participants the same with the target participants of the PD Program?	
2.0 LEARNING DESIGN To what extent was the delivered PD Program compliant to the Detailed PD Program Design?	
3.0 RESOURCE PERSONS/SUBJECT-MATTER EXPERTS To what extent were the resource speakers and subject-matter experts compliant to the PD Program Delivery Quality Standards?	
4.0 LEARNING RESOURCE MATERIALS To what extent were the LRMs compliant to the PD LRMs Quality Standards?	
5.0 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT To what extent was the Program Management compliant to the PD Program Delivery Quality Standards?	
6.0 LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: FACE-TO-FACE PD PROGRAM To what extent was the venue for the face-to-face PD Program compliant to standards?	

Address: Room 214, Mabini Building, DepEd Complex, Meralco Ave., Pasig City 1600
Telephone No.: (+632) 86337207
Email Address: neap.qad@deped.gov.ph | Website: www.deped.gov.ph

TOTAL RATING	

MAJOR OBSERVATION, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
MAJOR OBSERVATION AND FINDINGS	**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Address: Room 214, Mabini Building, DepEd Complex, Meralco Ave., Pasig City 1600
Telephone No.: (+632) 86337207
Email Address: neap.qad@deped.gov.ph | Website: www.deped.gov.ph