

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Education
REGION IV-A CALABARZON



QAD-RM-2024-297

29 April 2024

Regional Memorandum
No. 297 s.2024

**REGIONAL ONSITE MONITORING OF THE DIVISION
TRAINING OF TRAINERS (DTOT) FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF MATATAG CURRICULUM**

To **Schools Division Superintendents**
Regional Functional Division Chiefs
All concerned personnel

1. Pursuant to DepEd Memorandum No. 044, s. 2023 on Interim Guidelines for the Quality Assurance and Monitoring and Evaluation of the NEAP Core programs, this Office in cooperation with QAD, HRDD-NEAP-R, and CLMD shall conduct a Regional Onsite Monitoring of the Division Training of Trainers for School Leaders (DTOT) in the Implementation of MATATAG Curriculum on specified dates and venues attached hereto.
2. The objective of this activity is to ensure that the conduct of the Division Training of Trainers (DTOT) meets the standards set in the implementation of the MATATAG Curriculum Training of Trainers in the Schools Division Offices.
3. Please refer to the attached NEAP- QAD- M&E Tools to be used and the list of monitoring officials during the conduct of the said activity per SDO.
4. The Regional Monitoring Team is composed of the Functional Division Chiefs, Education Program Supervisors, Senior Education Program Specialists, EPS II, and other RO personnel trained on Monitoring and Evaluation of PD programs. Please refer to the attached Terms of Reference of Monitoring and Evaluation Team and the NEAP- QAD- M&E Tools to be used and the list of regional monitoring personnel during the conduct of the said activity per SDO. The list of names of regional monitoring personnel will serve as their Authority to Travel (TA) during the onsite monitoring and the scheduled date of Division Training of Trainers (DTOT) per SDO.
5. The Regional Monitoring Officials are expected to comply with **R.A. 6713, the Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees**, especially Section 7d. *“Public Officials and employees shall not solicit or accept, directly or indirectly, any gift, gratuity, favor, entertainment, loan, or anything of*





Address: Gate 2, Karangalan Village, Cainta, Rizal
Telephone No.: 02-8682-2114 local 450
Email Address: region4a@deped.gov.ph
Website: depedcalabarzon.ph



Certificate No. PHP QMS
22 93 0085

monetary value from any person in the course of their official duties or in connection with any operation being regulated by, or any transaction which may be affected by the functions of their office. They are also entitled to *Compensatory Time Off (CTO)* in their rendered services during holidays such as **May 1, 2024, Labor Day** if the monitoring activity falls on this date per Civil Service Commission and Department of Budget Management Joint Circulars No. 2-A, s. 2005 and No. 2, s. 2004

6. Travel and other incidental expenses of Regional Monitors relative to the conduct of the said activity shall be charged against the Regional Fund subject to the usual accounting and auditing rules and regulations.
7. For further clarifications, please contact Emelia M. Aytona, EPS-QAD, through email at qad.calabarzon@deped.gov.ph.
8. Immediate dissemination of and compliance with this Memorandum is earnestly desired.


ATTY. ALBERTO T. ESCOBARTE, CESO II
Regional Director 

05/ROQ4

**MONITORING OF DIVISION TRAINING OF SCHOOL TRAINERS
ON MATATAG CURRICULUM**

Schools Divisions	Schedule of DTOT	Venue	Assigned Regional Monitor	Dates of Monitoring
Antipolo City	April 29-May 3, 2024	Tagaytay Town Country, Tagaytay City	Jeffrie. F. Ditablan	May 1-3, 2024
Bacoor City	April 29-May 3, 2024	Hotel Dominique, Tagaytay City	Lowiesito O. Erni	April 29- May 3, 2024
Batangas City	May 20-24, 2024	TBD	Luz E. Osmena	May 20-22, 2024
			Elinos S. Garcia	May 23-24, 2024
Batangas Province	May 13-17,2024	TBD	Jeffrie F. Ditablan	May 13-14, 2024
			Randie B. Atienza (Lot 2)	May 15-17, 2024
			Elinos S. Garcia (Lot3)	
Biñan City	July 1-5, 2024	TBD	Elena L. Lopez	July 1-2, 2024
Cabuyao City	May 21-25, 2024	TBD	Elena L. Lopez,	May 21-22, 2024
Cavite City	May 6-10, 2024	Tanza Oasis Hotel & Resort, Tanza, Cavite	Normita M. Datinggaling	May 6-9, 2024
Cavite Province	April 27-May 1, 2024	Cluster 1: Tanza Oasis Hotel & Resort, Tanza, Cavite	Margaret P. Musa	April 29-May 1, 2024
		Cluster 2: Summit Ridge, Tagaytay	Paul Gence L. Ocampo	April 29 -30, 2024
Calamba City	April 29 - May 3, 2024	Batangas Country Club Resort and Hotel	Emelia M. Aytona	April 29-May 1, 2024
Dasmariñas City	April 29-May 3, 2024	Elijah Hotel and Residences, Dasmariñas City	Margaret P. Musa	May 2-3, 2024
General Trias City	May 6-10, 2024	Tanza Oasis Hotel & Resort, Tanza, Cavite	Paul Gence L. Ocampo	May 6-8, 2024
Imus City	April 29 to May 3, 2024	Hacienda Isabella, Indang, Cavite	Ma. Lourdes O. Manimtim	May 1-3, 2024
Laguna Province	April 29 to May 3, 2024	Great Eastern Hotel, Quezon City	Michael Girard R. Alba	April 29 - May 1, 2024
Lipa City	May 6-10, 2024	TBD	Loida G. Tomelden	May 8-10, 2024
			Elinos S. Garcia	May 6-8, 2024
Lucena City	May 6-10, 2024	Nawawalang Paraiso Resort	Eugene Ray F. Santos	May 6-9, 2024

		& Hotel, Tayabas City		
Quezon Province	May 6-10, 2024	TBD	Ma. Lourdes O. Manimtim	May 6-8, 2024
			Viernalyn M. Nama	May 9-10, 2024
Rizal Province	April 29-May 3, 2024	Cluster 1: Eurotel Hotel, Makati	Emelia Crescini	May 2-3, 2024
		Cluster 2: Axiaa Hotel, West Ave., Project 7, QC	Dianne Catherine T. Antonio	
		Cluster 3: Madison Hotel, Aurora Blvd, New Manila, Quezon City	Hazel Angelyn Tesoro	
Sta. Rosa City	April 29-May 3, 2024	La Virginia Hotel & Resort Batangas	Maricris R. Tadioan	May 1-3, 2024
Sto. Tomas City	May 6 - 10, 2024	TBD	Lorenzo Ruiz Costo	May 8-10, 2024
San Pablo City	May 6-10, 2024	View Park Hotel, Tagaytay City	Emelia M. Aytona	May 8-10, 2024
San Pedro City	July 8-12, 2024	Batangas Country Club	Emelia M. Aytona	July 8-12, 2024
Tanauan City	April 29- May 3, 2024	Sunny Glades Properties Corporation, Demeter Farm, Lipa City, Batangas	Loida G. Tomelden	May 1-3, 2024
Tayabas City	April 29 - May 3, 2024	Nawawalang Paraiso Resort and Hotel, Tayabas City	Eugenio S. Adrao	April 29-30, 2024



Republic of the Philippines
Department of Education
NATIONAL EDUCATORS ACADEMY OF THE PHILIPPINES

ON-SITE MONITORING AND EVALUATION FORM
(To be accomplished by individual monitors)

GENERAL INFORMATION			
PROGRAM/ ACTIVITY MONITORED			
REGION		LEARNING AREA	
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS		NUMBER OF TRAINERS	
VENUE		INCLUSIVE DATES	
DATE MONITORED			

I. Checklist

MONITORING SYSTEM	YES	NO
1. Division Monitoring & Evaluation Implementation Plan was duly signed.		
2. Division Monitoring Team was present.		
3. Daily End-of-Day Evaluation was in place.		
4. At least one (1) monitor is assigned per class.		
5. Latest Monitoring and Evaluation tools and forms were used.		
6. Conducted daily debriefing.		
7. Issues discussed in debriefing sessions were resolved/addressed.		

Comments and Suggestions:



Republic of the Philippines
Department of Education
NATIONAL EDUCATORS ACADEMY OF THE PHILIPPINES

- II. **CRITICAL INCIDENTS:** For any remarkable event/situation (positive or negative) encountered, accomplish the **STAR** form.
Situation/Task- Describe the specific situation and/or task that needed to be accomplished.
Action – Describe how the person/s or the team responded to the situation or acted on the task at hand.
Result – Describe the effect of the action or lack of action.

CRITICAL INCIDENTS

(STAR form will be used to document critical incidents not captured in M&E Tools; to be accomplished as needed)

Situation/Task- Describe the specific situation and/or task that needed to be accomplished.	Action – Describe how the person/s or the team responded to the situation or acted on the task at hand.	Result – Describe the effect of the action or lack of action.

Prepared by:



Republic of the Philippines
Department of Education

NATIONAL EDUCATORS ACADEMY OF THE PHILIPPINES

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PD) COMPLIANCE MONITORING TOOL

This tool will be used by the assigned Monitoring and Evaluation Officer during the MATATAG Curriculum 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			
<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Signature</i>

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
<input type="checkbox"/> About 91-100% of the actual participants are the target participants of the PD Program.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 81-90% of the actual participants are the target participants of the PD Program.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 51-80% of the actual participants are the target participants of the PD Program.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 50% or less of the actual participants are the target participants of the PD Program.
<input type="checkbox"/> About 91-100% of the actual participants are qualified to the selection criteria of the PD Program.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 81-90% of the actual participants are qualified to the selection criteria of the PD Program.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 51-80% of the actual participants are qualified to the selection criteria of the PD Program.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The delivered PD Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● fully complied with and was consistent with the quality assured PD Program Design. 	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The delivered PD Program made minimal adjustments in any of the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Professional Standards ● Learning Objectives ● Session Contents ● Time Allotment ● Logical Sequence ● Program Methodology ● Session Outputs ● Workplace Application 	<p><input type="checkbox"/> There were minor revisions in the design aspects of the PD Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Professional Standards ● Learning Objectives ● Session Contents ● Logical Sequence ● Program Methodology ● Program Methodology ● Session Outputs ● Workplace Application ● Time Allotment ● Logical Sequence 	<p><input type="checkbox"/> There were major revisions in the design aspects of the PD Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Professional Standards ● Learning Objectives ● Session Contents ● Time Allotment ● Logical Sequence ● Program Methodology ● Session Outputs ● Workplace Application

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
<input type="checkbox"/> All the sessions were delivered by the resource speakers/subject-matter experts as identified RPs who attended the MATATAG Training for Trainers.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 are equally excellent (or better). NEAP was informed of the changes ahead of time.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 identified RPs who attended the MATATAG Training for Trainers. NEAP was not informed of the changes ahead of time.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 identified RPs who attended the MATATAG Training for Trainers. NEAP was not informed of the changes ahead of time.
<input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> About 81-90% of the following indicators in the PD Program Quality Standards for Learning Management were accomplished by resource speakers/subject-matter experts.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.



<i>in the Standards Checklist for all the sessions.</i>	<i>Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklists for all the sessions.</i>	<i>Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklists for all the sessions.</i>	<i>Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklists for all the sessions.</i>
---	---	---	---

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
<input type="checkbox"/> The learning resource materials were the same as the quality assured learning materials. The program owner fully complied with the PD LRMs Quality Standards.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.
<input type="checkbox"/> About 91-100% of the learning materials aligned with the purpose of the methodology of the learning design were distributed.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 81-90% of the learning materials aligned with the purpose of the methodology of the learning design were distributed.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 51-80% of the learning materials aligned with the purpose of the methodology of the learning design were distributed.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 50% or less of the learning materials aligned with the purpose of the methodology of the learning design were distributed.

<input type="checkbox"/> About 91-100% of the participants received a copy of the learning resource materials.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 81-90% of the participants received a copy of the learning resource materials.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 51-80% of the participants received a copy of the learning resource materials.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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
<input type="checkbox"/> 91-100% of the following Program Management indicators were implemented: <i>Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> 81-90% of the following Program Management indicators were implemented: <i>Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> 51-80% of the following Program Management indicators were implemented: <i>Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> 50% or less of the following Program Management indicators were implemented: <i>Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.</i>

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
<input type="checkbox"/> About 91-100% of the following indicators of the learning environment and venue were met. Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 81-90% of the following indicators of the learning environment and venue were met. Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.	<input type="checkbox"/> About 51-80% of the following indicators of the learning environment and venue were met. Note: Average all the indicators met in the Standards Checklist.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.

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

REMARKS

**GUIDE FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF MATATAG CURRICULUM TRAINING
FOR MONITORING OFFICIAL/M&E OFFICER**

Monitoring Section/Aspects	MOVs	Rating (A=4 Points, B=3 Points, C=2 Points, D= 1 point)
1. Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memorandum • Filled Up Registration Form • Attendance • Profile of the Participants 	
2. Program Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prescribed PD from NEAP Slide Decks Session Guides 	
3. Resource Speakers/Subject Matter Experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profile of Resource Speakers • M&E Results for Speakers • Accomplished Learning Management Quality Standards 	
4. Learning Resource Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E Results (Checklist of LRMs compliant with PD LRMs QS) 	
5. Program Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD Program Delivery M&E Results 	
6. Learning Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E results for venue and accommodation 	
Overall Rating		

<p>5.0 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT</p> <p>To what extent was the Program Management compliant to the PD Program Delivery Quality Standards?</p>	
<p>6.0 LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: FACE-TO-FACE PD PROGRAM</p> <p>To what extent was the venue for the face-to-face PD Program compliant to standards?</p>	
<p>TOTAL RATING</p>	

<p align="center">MAJOR OBSERVATION, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS</p>	
<p>MAJOR OBSERVATION AND FINDINGS</p>	<p>RECOMMENDATIONS</p>

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
<p>1.0 PARTICIPANTS</p> <p>Are the actual participants the same with the target participants of the PD Program?</p>	
<p>2.0 LEARNING DESIGN</p> <p>To what extent was the delivered PD Program compliant to the Detailed PD Program Design?</p>	
<p>3.0 RESOURCE PERSONS/SUBJECT-MATTER EXPERTS</p> <p>To what extent were the resource speakers and subject-matter experts compliant to the PD Program Delivery Quality Standards?</p>	
<p>4.0 LEARNING RESOURCE MATERIALS</p> <p>To what extent were the LRMs compliant to the PD LRMs Quality Standards?</p>	