EFFECTIVENESS OF MONITORING SYSTEM AT PRIMARY LEVEL IN PAKISTAN

Dr. Muhammad Munir Kayani
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
International Islamic University
Islamabad, Pakistan

Nasim Begum
Post-graduate Student
Department of Education
International Islamic University
Islamabad, Pakistan

Dr. Anisa Kayani
Education Department
Govt. of Punjab
Pakistan

Dr. Shazia Naureen
Assistant Professor
Department of Education
International Islamic University
Islamabad, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to find out effectiveness of monitoring system and to review the implementation of the monitoring system at primary level in Pakistan. A sample of 39 head-teachers of girl's primary schools and 20 monitoring evaluation assistants (MEAs) were selected randomly as respondents of the study. Two separate questionnaires were developed and administered after pilot testing to head-teachers and MEAs. Percentage and chi-square are used for analysis of the data. Major findings of the study are: most of MEAs had Matric / F.A as academic qualification and most of MEAs had no professional qualification and did not get special training for monitoring the school; MEAs checked all the record of school council and Farogh-e-Taleem funds; MEAs checked all the record which was related to teaching and non-teaching staff; Most of the teachers became regular and punctual after the implementation of monitoring program.

Key words: effectiveness, monitoring system, primary level

1. INTRODUCTION

Adequate, rigorous, inclusive and continuous monitoring and supervision are one of the most important keys to successful implementation of any educational program. Whenever any educational program comes into operation there arises the need for some kind of mechanism by which the progress of implementation can be readily assessed. Such a mechanism is generally referred to as the monitoring mechanism. Within the education system, monitoring covers activities of inspection and supervision (Khawaja, 2001). According to International Dictionary of Education, educational monitoring is: "Assumption of responsibility for bringing about specified result in the field of education". According to Collins Dictionary "Monitoring means to observe or record the activity or performance; to monitor or monitoring means to be aware of the state of a system".

Specifically, monitoring is defined as, "the continuous assessment of project implementation in relation to agreed schedules and of use of inputs, infrastructure and services by project beneficiaries" (Mertens, 2005). Monitoring is the process of gathering data and periodically assembling key indicators to count or measure inputs, outputs and processes to report on the functions of elements of the education system (Mishra, 2005). "Monitoring is a type of evaluation that collects concrete information utilized for program reformation." (Noh, 2006). Monitoring is an ongoing function that uses the systematic collection of data related to specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of a development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement with regard to expected results and progress in the use of allocated funds.

Monitoring provides an early indication of the likelihood that expected results will be arraigned and provides an opportunity to validate program theory and logics and make necessary changes in program activities and approaches. A good monitoring system for a partnership combines information at all levels to give the management team, and ultimately the governing body, a picture of performance and helps facilitate decision-making and learning by the partners (Marriott & Goyder, 2009).

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Types of Monitoring System

Willms (2003) describes three types of monitoring system which are as below:

2.1.1 Compliance Monitoring

It stresses that school inputs, particularly teacher and fiscal resources. It tries to ensure that certain standards of education provision are being met. It might be involved of average class size, pupil teacher's ratio, expenditures on instructional materials, size of the library, teacher qualification, number of support staff, or the proportion of pupils receiving special education. Typically some sanction is applied to schools not meeting specified standards. For example, a school may be required to submit a plan for correction, or in an extreme case, be subject to closure. The assumption underlying the use of compliance is that if schools meet specified standards on various inputs measures, then adequate levels of performance will necessary follow.

2.1.2 Diagnostic Monitoring

It emphasizes the output side of the input-output model, particularly academic outcomes. Their goals are to determine whether specific aspects of the curriculum are beings masters by the majority of pupils. In the same manners that teachers use classroom tests to identify areas where certain pupils need further instructions and remedial activities, diagnostic monitoring systems seek to identify particular skills and concepts that require greater emphasis in certain schools.

2.1.3 Performance monitoring

It includes measures of both schooling inputs and outputs. Typically the outcome measures are standards achievement tests, which are fewer curriculums specific but cover a broader domain of skills. PM strive to make comparison between schools and school districts in their outcomes. The implicit intention of these systems is to make schools publically accountable through market forces. The belief is that interschool or inter district comparison will stimulate competition and motivate educators to provide a better education. Another type that is concluded form the researches is progress monitoring which is a researches based method that facilitates the assessment of learner academic and/or social-emotional progress on regular and consistent basis. Its main object is to determine the extent to which students are learning which is being taught and effectiveness of instructions. More specifically, progress monitoring determines both levels of achievement as well as rate of improvement or progress for the purpose of implementing more effective education to students. Progress monitoring may be used to assess progress both individual students as well as whole classroom of learners (Hoover, 2009).

2.2 Steps for Monitoring

Hoover (2009) mentions the followings steps for monitoring:
- Identify skill to monitored
- Select/develop valid assessment measures to quickly assess skills
- Determine monitoring schedule
- Conduct assessment adhering to the established schedule
- Graph or chart for the results of each assessment
- Evaluate level of performance and rate of progress
- Adjust instructions based on progress –monitoring data
- Continue with ongoing progress monitoring, charts, result, and adjust instructions as needed.

The theory of monitoring tells us that teachers and school system should take responsibility for improvement in pupil's achievement and teachers effectiveness by criterion should be measured by external monitors. Monitoring or keeping an eye on how things are going more informal. However it is an important part of the middle manager's role in checking standards in the department. It involves and provides information which then leads to corrective action on an ongoing basis.

2.3 Evaluation of Monitoring System

Evaluation of monitoring system is necessary, firstly, because it helps in matching the achievement with predetermined objectives of monitoring system in order to check its validity and secondly, it helps in identifying the strength and weaknesses of monitoring system and give suggestions for its improvement.

2.4 Need for Monitoring Framework in Education System

Monitoring of education sector performance and programs has developed in response to the need to give timely feedback to stakeholders on the efficacy of education programs undertaken in achieving their objectives and their cost-effectiveness and sustainability. Monitoring should be developed with both formative and summative functions. It should be routine activity which is institutionalized and used as decision support tools to improve the management and delivery of education. It is therefore necessary to take sector –wise approach to monitoring rather than think of a set of disparate or unconnected activities. Consequently all monitoring activities should be components of a sector-wise system (Mishra, 2005). Sound assessment of the educational system is a key component in developing policies to optimize the development of human capital around the world (Greaney & Kellaghn, 2008). A monitoring system does more than gather data. It also reports the data in accessible formats, back to decision-makers and other stakeholders in such a way that performance can be monitored and sector management improved. It is important that the data gather should be used; otherwise the various stakeholders will have little commitment to the monitoring system, leading to a vicious circle of low reliability and poor utility. The successful implementation of the monitoring system depends on the use that is made of the data and information gathered. All levels of education sectors and sub-sectors should use data generated by monitoring system for improved management (Mishra, 2005).

2.5 Need of Monitoring System in Primary School

Luginbuhl, Webbink & Wolf (2009) indicated that school improvement has proven to be a continual challenge. Effective monitoring is an essential element of a learning and ultimately sustainable educational initiative (Marriott & Goyder, 2009). Although monitoring reach far and deep into the workings of a school and the function of its staff in particular of its teachers and managers, they do not in most cases serve to dictate how you should teach individual classes. Nor in most cases do they seek to control the way in which the national curriculum is delivered. Monitoring is an assessment of how well a school is doing, covering strengths and weaknesses and what may be done to make improvements. In this respect monitoring is important but should not be considered exceptional experience. (Holems, 2003). Monitoring and evaluation is not an end unto itself. It is tool to be used to promote good governance, modern management practices, innovation and reforms, and better accountability. When used properly, this system can produce information that is trustworthy, transparent and relevant. M&E systems can help policymakers to track and improve the outcomes and organizations make more well-informed decisions and policies by providing continuous feedback on results In most developing countries, national monitoring and evaluation (M&E) suffers from inadequate financial and performance capacity. Amongst local authorities and at the school level, the need for evaluation may not even be fully accepted. Evaluation can be seen as a threat to, rather than as support for, local development. Quantitative data can be erratic, while qualitative data may be misinterpreted. Therefore, data often fails to be updated and/or fully reliable (Kusek, 2004).

2.6 Basic Qualification of a Person Who Monitor the School

Numerous countries have utilized school inspectorates to monitor and evaluate the performance of schools. (OECD, 2007). Holems (2003) identified the basic qualification for a person who monitors the school;

1. Monitors are appropriately qualified, and trained to monitor the school, they have no connection with the school such that would undermine their objectivity.
2. Before the monitoring starts the leader monitor talks to the staff, explains the monitoring process and answers questions, and meets with parents to seek their views of the school, the team is familiar with the context of the school and has read the relevant school documents.
3. Monitor establishes positive relationships with staff, pupils and governors. They observe lessons, look at pupils, previous work and talk to pupils; they discuss aspects of the work of the school with members of the staff and listen to their views.
4. Monitors provide clear developmental feedback on all judgments they have made; individual teachers are given feedback on their teaching and the co-ordination tasks they undertake; the evidence used in order to reach judgments is clear and there is an opportunity for discussion.

5. The report of monitors clearly states the judgments made and reflects what was   conveyed to staff orally at the end of the monitoring.

2.7 Present Monitoring System at Primary Level in Pakistan:

Mechanism for monitoring the quality of education systems have already been set in place by most developed countries. The Integrated performance monitoring system (IPMS) was developed in 1996 for Education Sector Institutional Reform Project (ESIRP) for Pakistan. It was anticipated that the World Bank would fund the project if the Government of Pakistan made such request. The outcome objectives of IPMS would be to monitor the education system. Under the ESIRP project several interventions were expected to be made in the provinces and some at Federal level hence it was considered necessary that a proper monitoring mechanism has to be developed within the system. It was this driving need that this serious effort was made to draft a system of monitoring (Khawaja , 2001). Fegan & Field (2009) mentions one of the main objective of such project is to strengths monitoring and evaluation of education performance and to use the outcomes. In July 2004 Chief Minister of Punjab introduced the monitoring program in four districts of Punjab for the improvement of primary education. These four districts were Jhelum, Chakwal, Attock and Rawalpindi.

There were only four monitoring evaluation assistants (MEAs) for monitoring the schools of whole districts. So this program could not give reasonable results for the betterment of the schools. Later on in 2006, Chief Minister of Punjab introduced a free monitoring program for the implementation of education reforms and guidance. Its aim is to directly monitor the progress of schools and report it. The monitoring staff is linked to educational institutions in such a way that it can observe the daily performance independently. Monitoring evaluation assistant (MEAs) duty is to report but not the accountability of teachers. Only the district government and higher authorities of education department can do accountability. To achieve the objectives of monitoring the following code of conduct has been formulated:

2.8 Duties of Monitoring Evaluation Assistants (MEAs)

 1. First of all contact the head-teacher and show identity card. Get information through head- teacher or representative of head-teacher. In female education institutions they should inform before entering in the office.
 2. They should not go to classes directly.
 3. The MEAs should treat the teachers respectfully specially in girl's schools because they observe *Parda*.
 4. They should restrict themselves to their preformed. They should not interfere other matters of schools beyond their proforma. They should not interfere the administrative affairs.
 5. They should visit schools during the timing hours suggested by Punjab Government after timing hours they should delay their visit till the next day.
 6. They should not write anything in school record.
 7. They should not share information provided by head-teacher to any other person except related monitoring district officer or provincial officer of Chief Minister monitoring force.
 8. They are not allowed to use motor-cycle provided by Government for personal   use.
 9. They can not call teacher's meeting in school.
10. They cannot check any personal matter of teachers and students not related to their proforma (Govt. of Punjab, 2007).

2.9 Duties of Head-Teachers in Monitoring Program

1. The head-teacher should provide correct information to MEAs.
2. The computerized ID card copy of all teaching and non-teaching staff should be available.
3. All record should be available at school all the time. It includes school council fund, *Farog-e-Taleem* fund, attendance register, free books register and register *Dakhil   Kharij*. If head-teacher is not present the record should be in the custody of another incharge.
4. The head-teachers are responsible to show record according to MEAs proforma.
5. The head-teacher should sign the proforma of MEAs.
6. The monitoring system should be made convenient by head-teacher.
   (Govt. of Punjab, 2007)

3.   *METHODS AND PROCEDURE OF RESEARCH*

This study has been accomplished to evaluate the present monitoring system at primary school level.

It is expected that this study will help in the improvement of this monitoring system at primary level. For this study questionnaire was considered as the best tool to get maximum information for the present monitoring system at primary level in Pakistan. It was administrated for getting the opinions of head-teachers and MEAs about the present monitoring system which was introduced by chief Minister of Punjab in 2006. We contacted head-teachers working in girl's primary schools and 20 MEAs selected randomly as sample and requested to fill-in the questionnaires. The data was tabulated separately, percentage and Chi-Square were calculated and with this picture in view the findings of the study are made. The analysis was carried out keeping in view the objectives of the study.

4. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

In table 1, the calculated Chi-Square values for head-teachers and MEAs are greater than the table value at 0.05. Hence the statements that MEAs checked School Council and Farogh-e-Taleem Funds, Number of Meetings held by School Council during last three months, Visits of District Education Officer and Deputy District Education Officer to schools, Cleanliness Building and Lawns/ Playground and Class environment are accepted. It is observed that in the opinion of head-teachers the monitoring system is not beneficial.

In table 2, The calculated Chi-Square values for head-teachers and MEAs are greater than the table value at 0.05. Hence the statements that MEAs visited the School regularly, Training of MEAs, MEAs spend 3 to 4 hours in school and MEAs Inform Deputy District officer before Visit are accepted. It is also indicated that MEAs were not informing DEO/Dy. DEO about their visit to dchool.

In table 3, The calculated Chi-Square values for head-teachers and MEAs are greater than table value at 0.05. Hence the statements that MEAs checked Participation of teachers in any training program, Number of teaching and non-teaching staff on sanctioned leave, official duty and unauthorized absence and Sanctioned posts for teaching and non-teaching staff are accepted.

In table 4, The calculated Chi-Square values for head-teachers and MEAs are greater than table value at 0.05. Hence the statements that MEAs checked the permissible amount to be received per student for Farogh-e-Taleem fund, Classes, Number of Students in a Class and the Number of Students Present at the day of Monitoring, Free Textbook Sets and Cleanliness of Students are accepted.

5. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of data analyses, the following conclusions are drawn.

1. MEAs checked the balance/record of School Council (SC), Farogh-e-Taleem funds.
2. MEAs checked the number of meetings held by school council (SC) during last three months and the visit of District Education Officer and Deputy District Education officers.
3. MEAs checked the missing facilities, cleanliness of building and lawns and playgrounds of school and class environment.
4. This monitoring system is beneficial for the improvement of primary school
5. MEAs visited the school regularly and spent 3 to 4 hours in a school.
6. MEAs did not get training for monitoring the school.
7. MEAs did not inform deputy district education officer before the visit to any school.
8. MEAs checked the participation of teachers in any training program, and number of teaching and non-teaching staff who are on sanctioned leave, official duty and unauthorized absence and sanctioned posts for teaching and non-teaching staff.
9. Head-teachers co-operated with MEAs during their visit to school..
10. MEAs checked the permissible amount to be received per student for Farogh-e-Taleem, number of students in a class and number of students present at the day of monitoring.
11. MEAs checked the level of cleanliness of students and number of free textbook sets received by students.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the conclusions following recommendations are made:

1. MEAs had no training for monitoring the school therefore before the appointment as MEAs fifteen days orientation course on monitoring for MEAs should be provided.
2. MEAs did not inform District Education Officer / Deputy District Education Officer before the visit to any school so it is recommended that MEAs should provide the visit schedule to District Education Officer/ Deputy District Education Officer.

3. The monitoring system was beneficial for the improvement of primary school, therefore, head-teachers and teachers should be informed about the importance of monitoring system and they should co-operate with MEAs. Luginbuhl, Webbink & Wolf, (2009) also advocated that school monitoring not only make schools accountable but also aim to provide recommendation for school improvement.
4. MEAs should have the following necessary qualities:
    a) MEAs should be sensible and having good manners.
    b) Female MEAs should be appointed for the monitoring of girl's schools.

References

Aggarwal, J. 2004. Teachers and Education in Developing Society, The Mc Graw-Hill companies. USA. pp 3-9

AIOU. 1998. Allied Material of Educational Administration and Supervision.
(Code 845) Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad. p 18

A World Bank Review. 1995. Development in Practice Priorities and Strategies for Education. The World Bank, Washington. pp 6, 100-102

Chapman, C. 2005. Improving Schools through External Intervention. Continuum International Publication Group. London. p 7

Evertson, C. and Emmer, E.T. 1999. Classroom Management for Elementary Teachers. Nancy Forsyth. USA. pp 116-133

Fegan, J. and Field, M.H. 2009. Education across Borders: Politics, Policy and Legislative Actions. Springer.

Govt .of the Punjab. 2007. Code of Conduct for Monitoring. Lahore, Pakistan.

Gower, R. and Walters, S. 2000. Teaching Practice Handbook Continuum International Publication Group. London. p 45

Greaney, V. and Kellaghn, T. 2008. Assessing National Achievement Levels in Education vol 1. World Bank, Washington.

Holmes, E. 2003. School Inspection. The Stationary Office. London. pp 4-19

Hoover, J. J. 2009. RTI Assessment Essentials for Struggling Learners. Corwin Press.

Khawaja, S. 2001. Educational Evaluation and Monitoring Concepts and Techniques Mr. Book Super Market. Islamabad. pp 73-117.

Khalid, T. 2005. An Introduction to Educational Philosophy and History National Book Foundation. Karachi. p 5

Kusek, J. Z. 2004. Ten Steps to a Result-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System: A Handbook for Development Practitioners, volume 289. World Bank Publication.

Lockheed, M. E. and Verspoor, A.M. 1994. Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries. Oxford University Press. USA. p 131

Luginbuhl, R., Webbink, D. and Wolf, I. 2009. Do Inspection Improve Primary School Performance? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 31(3) 231-237.

Marriott, N. and Goyder, H. 2009. Manual for Monitoring and evaluating education Partnership. International Institute for Educational Planning. Paris.

Mertens, D. M. 2005. Research and Evaluation in Education and Psychology. Sage Publications. London. pp 45- 47

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. 2005. Monitoring and Indicators in the Education Sector. Denmark.

Mishra, R.C. 2005. Educational Research. A.P.H. Publishing Corporation. New Delhi. pp 210-217

Nehal, A. 1999. Dictionary of Primary Education. A.P.H. Publishing Corporation. New Delhi. p 45

Newble, D. and Cannon, R. A. 1995. Handbook for Teachers in Universities and Colleges. Mc Graw Hill Book Company. London. p 93

Noh, H. J. 2006. Policy Evaluation. 2nd ed.. Bupmunsa. Seoul, Korea.

OECD. 2007. Education at a Glance 2007: OECD Indicators. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development Publishing. p 413

Page, G. T. and Thomas, J. B. 1998. International Dictionary of Education . Kogan Page Limited. London. p 224

Teddlie, C. and Reynolds, D. 2001. The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research. Zig Kapelis. New York. pp 210-211

Willms, J. D. 2003. Monitoring School Performance: A Guide for Educators. Washington: The Flamer Press.

Table 1: Related to school

S.No	Statements	Responses	Yes	TSE	No	Total	χ^2
1.	MEAs checked School Council and Farogh-e-Taleem Funds	Head-teachers	37	02	00	39	66.60*
		MEAs	18	02	00	20	29.19*
2	School Council meetings held during last three months	Head-teachers	30	08	01	39	35.23*
		MEAs	15	03	02	20	15.69*
3.	District/ Deputy District Education Officers visited primary schools regularly	Head-teachers	34	04	01	39	51.23*
		MEAs	18	02	00	20	29.19*
4.	Facilities in School are missing	Head-teachers	29	03	07	39	30.15*
		MEAs	10	07	03	20	3.71
5.	Cleanliness Building and Lawns/ Playground	Head-teachers	30	07	02	39	34.31*
		MEAs	13	02	05	20	9.69*
6.	Friendly Class environment	Head-teachers	25	03	11	39	19.08*
		MEAs	12	04	04	20	6.40*
7.	Present monitoring system is beneficial for school.	Head-teachers	15	10	14	39	1.08
		MEAs	14	04	03	20	11.15*

*Significant   df= 2   P= 0.05   Table value = 5.991

Table 2: Related to MEAs

S.NO	Factors	Responses	Yes	TSE	No	Total	χ^2
1.	MEAs visit the School regularly:	Head-teachers	30	09	00	39	36.46*
		MEAs	17	02	01	20	24.09*
2.	Training of MEAs	Head-teachers	12	05	22	39	11.23*
		MEAs	17	02	01	20	24.09*
3.	MEAs spend 3 to 4 hours for visit in a school	Head-teachers	12	14	13	39	5.68
		MEAs	03	04	13	20	9.09*
4.	MEAs Inform Deputy District officer before Visit to the school	Head-teachers	13	06	20	39	5.40
		MEAs	03	06	11	20	4.89

*Significant   df= 2   P= 0.05   Table value = 5.991

Table 3: Related to teachers

SNo	Factors	Responses	Yes	TSE	No	Total	χ^2
1.	Participation of teachers in any training program.	Head-teachers	32	05	02	39	42.0*
		MEAs	12	02	06	20	7.60*
2.	Cooperation with Head-teachers	Head-teachers	20	09	10	39	5.69
		MEAs	15	03	02	20	15.69*
3.	Number of teaching and non-teaching staff on sanctioned leave, official duty and unauthorized absence	Head-teachers	24	06	09	39	14.31*
		MEAs	15	01	04	20	16.29*
4.	Sanctioned posts for teaching and non-teaching staff.	Head-teachers	35	02	02	39	55.85*
		MEAs	18	01	01	20	28.89*

*Significant   df= 2   P= 0.05   Table value = 5.991

Table 4: Related to students

S.No	Factors	Responses	Yes	TSE	No	Total	χ^2
1.	The permissible amount to be received per student for Farogh-e-Taleem fund	Head-teachers	30	09	0	39	36.46*
		MEAs	14	02	04	20	12.40*
2.	Classes, Number of Students in a Class and the Number of Students Present at the day of Monitoring:	Head-teachers	32	03	04	39	41.69*
		MEAs	16	04	0	20	20.79*
3.	Free Textbook Sets provided to the students	Head-teachers	28	04	07	39	26.31*
		MEAs	17	02	01	20	24.09*
4.	Cleanliness of Students	Head-teachers	30	07	02	39	34.31*
		MEAs	13	02	05	20	9.69*

*Significant   df= 2   P= 0.05   Table value = 5.991