

Perception of Head Teachers regarding the Current practices of Monitoring and Evaluation at Primary School Level in District Kech Balochistan

Abid Hussain

PhD Scholar, Department of Education, Greenwich University Karachi

Mehnaz Bashir

M.Phil Scholar, Lecturer Department of Education, University of Turbat

Sanam Memon

Junior Lecturer, Faculty of Education, University of Sindh.

Received on: 22-04-2022

Accepted on: 26-05-2022

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to find out the Perception of Head Teachers regarding the current practices of monitoring and evaluation at Primary School Level in District Kech Balochistan. It was quantitative study. The nature of the study was descriptive and survey type. The population is comprised of 85 primary Schools heads, DEO and Divisional Directors of Primary School Level in District Kech Balochistan. There are total 92 Girls and Boys Secondary School in Kech. Pilot testing was done in 10 schools out of 92. Questionnaire was used as research tool. Tool development is a most important part of the study. In this process, experts was consulted and previous research and appropriate literature was studied and reviewed to construct the tool. For collecting data, questionnaire used as data collection tools. The five point rating scale as strongly agree, disagree, not sure, agree and strongly disagree was used to collect data. It was improved in consultation with the experts in the field and through pilot testing by head teachers of secondary schools. The reliability of these tools were calculated through SPSS. After finalizing and pilot testing, the questionnaire was distributed to the respondent for collecting data. The questionnaires were served through postage, email by hand in face-to-face meeting by the researcher to the respondent. The questionnaire was scrutinized for errors and omission, ambiguity and relevance. The reliability was calculated through SPSS (Version, 24) by using Cronbach Alpha. The data obtained through questionnaires and observations were interpreted and analyzed by using, Chi square, percentage and mean.

Keywords: Perception, Head Teachers, Monitoring, Evaluation, Primary School Level

Introduction

In the year, 2000 Pakistan introduced devolution of power program with due legislative

Perception of Head Teachers regarding the Current practices ...

support. Under the devolution program the district management and community has been empowered at the grass roots level in planning, management, resource mobilization, utilization, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the education system. Decentralization of educational administration in Pakistan is a major innovation and reform in the political and educational system. It not only shortens the distance between the citizen-parent and policymaker but also shortens the distance between policymaker and the school. Let us discuss some important decentralization practice of head teachers that are often accompanied for the improvement of education such as accountability framework, community/parental involvement, budgeting/ tendering etc.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) have gained more attention recently as a way to ensure and improve the quality of higher education. While performing faculty duties, monitoring is the constant and systematic collection of data, whereas evaluation is the periodic and methodical collection of data to draw conclusions about the faculty (Njenga & Kabiru, 2009). M&E are intertwined, and Njenga and Kabiru (2009) stated that using monitoring data to conduct an evaluation that is effective. Both focus on monitoring the status of activities and performance evaluation.

Many academics have written about M&E and how it affects worker productivity (Itolondo, 2012; Ngware & Ndirangu, 2015; Khan, & Fatima, 2019; Tozoglu, 2016). The connection to employee motivation, however, has not been extensively covered. Any endeavour to build internal evaluation processes serves as a tool for assessing external accountability, according to Brauckmann and Pashiardis' (2019) observation. Additionally, the process of continuous quality improvement requires institutions to be able to critically assess both their own and their workers' performance. The implementation of a successful quality management system in higher education is a dynamic process of monitoring, continual improvement, and change, according to O'Mahony and Garavan (2012). It follows that M&E at the school level necessitates proper management of the faculty, students, and other stakeholders to continuously develop.

The education system of Pakistan faces with multiple challenges such as how to interpret national goals through local authority and how to ensure the quality of learners' through addressing local needs (Asad, 2018). In order to cope with these challenges, Norway moved towards some appropriate decentralized measures such as formation of monitoring and evaluation team with the consultation of school head teachers. The team assigned with some responsibilities such as to investigate how school follow and implement plan. Then after, quality assurance cell was formed through national testing, monitoring and providing guidance and support for curriculum development and resources. These measures improved the students' achievement level and made head teachers to feel better about their schools and their learning environment (Winkler, 2015).

It also aims at expansion and strengthening of centre/cluster school scheme for making management and supervision of schools more effective. District Education Officers (D.E.Os), Deputy District education officers (D.D.E.Os), Assistant District Education Officers (A.D.E.Os), Learning Coordinators (L.Cs), and Parent Teachers Management Committee (PTSMC) shall be imparted training in management. Technical support to the teacher shall be strengthened to ensure that his performance is appropriately and accurately monitored. The policy asserts on the capacity development of federal and provincial departments regarding

Perception of Head Teachers regarding the Current practices ...

planning, management, monitoring and evaluation for achieving policy targets. It also focuses on the decentralization of selected management functions in elementary education towards the district, the school, and the community, and on effective organization of efforts of local bodies and communities (Government of Pakistan, 1998).

The administration of education had been reviewed from time to time to achieve this vital objective of quality education as well as for creating relationship between education and environment. The major objective of the devolution plan is to empower the community at the grassroots level in planning, management, resource mobilization and utilization, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the education system to improve the service delivery at that level. The main inherent issues of education systems are: teacher absenteeism, high dropout rates particularly at primary level, high repetition rates, low completion rates, inequalities by gender, location and social groups, low literacy rate and unsatisfactory performance of schools. These issues have been addressed under D.O.P through empowerment of local communities (Shah, 2003).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to find out the Perception of Head Teachers regarding the current practices of monitoring and evaluation at Primary School Level in District Kech Balochistan.

Research Methodology

The nature of the study was descriptive and survey type. The population is comprised of 85 primary Schools heads, DEO and Divisional Directors of Primary School Level in District Kech Balochistan. There are total 92 Girls and Boys Secondary School in Kech. Pilot testing was done in 10 schools out of 92. Questionnaire was used as research tool. Tool development is a most important part of the study. In this process, experts was consulted and previous research and appropriate literature was studied and reviewed to construct the tool. For collecting data, questionnaire used as data collection tools. The five point rating scale as strongly agree, disagree, not sure, agree and strongly disagree was used to collect data. It was improved in consultation with the experts in the field and through pilot testing by head teachers of secondary schools. The reliability of these tools were calculated through SPSS (Version, 24). After finalizing and pilot testing, the questionnaire was distributed to the respondent for collecting data. The questionnaires were served through postage, email by hand in face-to-face meeting by the researcher to the respondent. The questionnaire was scrutinized for errors and omission, ambiguity and relevance. The reliability was calculated through SPSS (Version, 24) by using Cronbach Alpha. The data obtained through questionnaires and observations were interpreted and analyzed by using, Chi square, percentage and mean.

Results

Table 1 Proper *Checking of Teaching and Learning Process*

Description	SD	DA	UD	A	SA	Total	Mean Score	X ²
Frequency	5	2	2	5	54	68		

Perception of Head Teachers regarding the Current practices ...

* Significant df =4

X² at P-value 0.05=0.00

According to Table 4 shows that 63.2% teachers strongly agreed, 16.2% agreed, 8.8% undecided, 8.8 % disagreed and 2.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that you think that monitoring and evaluation have enhanced the performance of both teacher and students. Value of mean score was (1.72), the value of X² was (82.441), which was greater than table value (0.00) at significant level (0.05). Therefore, it is concluded that you think that monitoring and evaluation have enhanced the performance of both teacher and students.

Table 5 You Think That Monitoring and Evaluation Is a Progressive Approach and Only Viable If Head Teacher Is Proficiently Skilled

Description	SD	DA	UD	A	SA	Total	Mean Score	X ²
Frequency	2	8	2	4	52	68	1.59	137.294
Percentage	2.9	11.8	2.9	5.9	76.5	100		

* Significant df =4

X² at P-value 0.05=0.00

According to Table 5 shows that 76.5% teachers strongly agreed, 5.9% agreed, 2.9% undecided, 11.8 % disagreed and 2.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that you think that monitoring and evaluation is a progressive approach and only viable if head teacher is proficiently skilled. Value of mean score was (1.59), the value of X² was (137.294), which was greater than table value (0.00) at significant level (0.05). Therefore, it is concluded that you think that monitoring and evaluation is a progressive approach and only viable if head teacher is proficiently skilled.

Table 6 You Think That Strong Monitoring and Evaluation Can Best Be Achieved Through Record Keeping, And Proper Reporting System

Description	SD	DA	UD	A	SA	Total	Mean Score	X ²
Frequency	2	4	4	7	51	68	1.51	129.500
Percentage	2.9	5.9	5.9	10.3	75.0	100		

* Significant df =4

X² at P-value 0.05=0.00

According to Table 6 shows that 75.0% teachers strongly agreed, 10.3% agreed, 5.9% undecided, 5.9% disagreed and 2.9% strongly disagreed with the statement that You think that strong monitoring and evaluation can best be achieved through record keeping, and proper reporting system. Value of mean score was (1.51), the value of X² was (129.500), which was greater than table value (0.00) at significant level (0.05). Therefore, it is concluded that you think that strong monitoring and evaluation can best be achieved through record keeping, and proper reporting system.

Conclusion

Most of the respondents agreed that Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is a process that helps improve performance and achieve results. Its goal is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact. The credibility and objectivity of monitoring and evaluation reports depend very much on the independence of the evaluators.

The monitoring procedure aided in raising student academic achievement as well as teacher

Perception of Head Teachers regarding the Current practices ...

performance evaluations. Improvement in academic performance, the monitoring method, and teacher effectiveness all showed a favourable association. 3. The current monitoring method did not completely locate the teachers. The main causes of the teachers' unhappiness with RTSM were their academic credentials and their unrelated experience. Additionally, the teachers guarantee their attendance on the designated days of visits to RTSM, but their attendance declined after the visit.

The monitoring procedure in educational institutions, according to the study's findings, is concentrated on the teaching-learning process and aids in raising teacher performance. Additionally, it raises the standard of instruction, which benefits students' academic performance. To get better outcomes from the monitoring process, the monitoring team should be made up of academic experts.

Recommendations

1. Monitoring and Evaluation Assistants (MEAs) must be university graduates and should possess professional training to monitor the schools effectively. Two different RTSM Team member should visit a school once a month on different dates to overcome the absenteeism among teachers in schools.
2. Performance Evaluation Performa (PEP) may be developed and used in order to check and improve the performance of DDOEs, RTSM and LC
3. Future researchers may work to explore the same phenomenon at secondary and higher secondary levels in public as well as private sector schools. The results of studies may be compared to find a meaningful difference between these.
4. Policymakers should focus on enhancing the professional skills of the monitoring team.
5. RTSM should bring under District Education Officer rather Deputy Commissioner.
6. There should be strong coordination between RTMS and Learning Coordinators for better monitoring.
7. The data/report of mentoring should be linked with policy planning process

References

1. ABD, World Bank. (2004). Devolution in Pakistan - an assessment and recommendation for action.
2. Abu-Duhou, I. (1999). School-Based Management. Paris: UNESCO. International Institute for Educational Planning.
3. Ahmad, E. (2018). Local service provision in selected OECD countries: Do decentralized operations work better? IMP Working Paper (WP/08/67). Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.
4. Brauckmann, A. and Pashiardis, B., (2019). Decision Making Process in the Decentralized Educational System' *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 149, 37-42.
5. Borman, G., Hewes, G., Overman, L., & Brown, S. (2003). Comprehensive school reform and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 73(2), 125.
6. O'Mahon, K. M., & Garavan, S. R. (2012). Finding, supporting, and keeping the role of the principal in teacher. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 8(1), 37 -63.
7. Creswell, J., & Plano, C.V. (2011). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (2ndEd). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
8. Glewwe, P., & Kremer, M. (2006). Schools, teachers, and education outcomes in developing countries. *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, 2, 945-1017.
9. Government of Pakistan. (PSLM, 2011). *Pakistan Social and Living Standards Measurement Survey*

Perception of Head Teachers regarding the Current practices ...

- (PSLM) (2010-2011). Statistics Division, Islamabad: Federal Bureau of Statistics.
10. Khan, E., & B. Fatima. (2019). *what's Decentralization Got to Do with Learning? The Case of Nicaragua's School Autonomy Reform*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
 11. Itolondo, D. A. (2012). *The role of coordinators between central and local government*. Paper presented at the 2012 Summer Conference of the Korean Association for Public Administration on the challenges of nation development and its strategies, Seoul, Korea.
 12. Memon et al. (2002). *Decentralization of the Education System in Sindh; Critical Review*" in *Research and Policy Dialogues on Key Issues in Education: Decentralization*. IED-AKU, Islamabad.
 13. Ngware, J., & Ndirangu, S. (2015). *Decentralization and local governments in Kenya*. International Studies Programme working paper 08-32. Georgia State University, Atlanta.
 14. National Workshop Report. (2008). *Successful Models in Capacity Development for Local Self-Governance towards Urban Renewal & Rural Reconstruction Islamabad*, 18 - 19 August 2008 Ministry of Local Government & Rural Development Government of Pakistan.
 15. Njenga, K., & K. Kabiru. (2009). *School Councils' Influence on School and Classroom Practice*. *Peabody Journal of Education*, vol. 75 (4): 37-65.
 16. Tozoglu, H.F. (2016). *Fiscal decentralization, public spending, and economic growth in China*", *Journal of Public Economics*, 31 May-6 June, Vol. 67, pp. 221-40.
 17. UNESCO. (2006). *Decentralization in education in Pakistan*. Country report at the UNESCO seminar on "EFA implementation: teacher and resource management in the context of decentralization". Administrative staff college of India, Hyderabad, India, 6-8 January 2006.
 18. Winkler, D. R. (2015). *Understanding decentralization*. Retrieved February 20, 2006 from <http://www.equip123.net/docs/e2Understanding%20Decentralization.pdf>.
 19. Zafar, F. (2003). *Fiscal Devolution in Education-Case Study Reflecting Initial Responses*, Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education and UNESCO, Islamabad.