

An Analysis of Monitoring and Evaluation System Launched by Punjab Education Department

Hamid Ali Nadeem*
Azhar Mumtaz Saadi**

Abstract

This study aimed to achieve following objectives: to analyze the monitoring and evaluation system of Punjab Education Department (Pakistan); to identify prevailing monitoring and evaluation practices in Punjab. The study was delimited to secondary schools of public sector in Punjab. Using multistage sampling technique, a sample of 32 head teachers, 320 teachers, 32 monitoring and evaluation assistants (MEAs) and 110 students was selected. Two questionnaires were developed for head teachers, teachers, and MEAs. The questions were asked about different dimensions of practices of monitoring & evaluation system. Three open ended questions were also added to enlist strong areas, weak areas and suggestions to improve the system. Data from the students was collected through group interviews by the researcher. Descriptive statistics was used for data analysis. Findings revealed that MEAs and Head teachers were fully aware about all monitoring indicators. Attendance and uniforms were maintained regularly to get minimum level of acceptable indicator. MEAs checked homework copies, cleanliness, uniform, textbooks. Suggestions included surprise visit after first scheduled visit, enhancement of remuneration for MEAs, joint meetings of monitoring staff and education department.

Keywords: monitoring, evaluation, secondary schools

* PhD Student, Lecturer EPPSL Department AIOU Islamabad,
Email: hamid.ali@aiou.edu.pk

** PhD Education, Assistant Professor, EPPSL Department AIOU Islamabad,
Email: drzhargiani@gmail.com

Introduction

According to Handbook of Monitoring and Evaluation (2002), monitoring can be defined as a continuing function that aims primarily to provide the management and main stakeholders of an ongoing intervention with early indications of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of results. According to Mtetsha (2012), monitoring and evaluation is critical to the success or failure of any educational program, project or policy. Fitz-Gibbon (1996) stated that monitoring is a technique which is used to inspect the quality of some indicators and it focuses on anticipated outcomes. Every educational system works in line with educational policies, programs and projects which need proper planning and implementation mechanisms to ensure compliance between targets and results. According to World Bank (2007) monitoring and evaluation both are management instruments to trace the development and assist the stage of decision making. By closely scrutinizing the work, one organization can plan programs and projects that are effective, efficient, and produce better outputs for the beneficiaries. As described in planning, monitoring and evaluating programmes and projects (2000), different purposes of monitoring system are:

1. Ensuring planned results are achieved
2. Improving and support management
3. Generating shared understanding
4. Generating new knowledge and support learning
5. Building the capacity of those involved
6. Motivating stakeholders
7. Ensuring accountability
8. Fostering public and political support

As described in designing effective monitoring and evaluation of education systems for 2030: A global synthesis of policies and practices' (2016), components of monitoring and evaluation system at school level include different components like school record keeping, statistical data, resource management, performance evaluation and student evaluation.

Harris & Herrington (2006) stated that process of monitoring and evaluation of educational institutions can be carried out externally and/or internally. Externally it is done by inspectors who are not part of those institutions. Those persons are managed by some directorate and they report to authorities of education department. Internal evaluation is carried out by different staff members of same institution.

External evaluation of educational institution is a well rooted approach for the target of quality assurance in education sector in

Europe. For example, in Turkey, external evaluation of schools is the responsibility of education directorates constituted at provincial level. These directorates are coordinated, guided and controlled by Ministry of National Education. Willims (2000) said that monitoring and evaluation is conducted in the education sector to monitor quality of education.

Govt. of Pakistan (1998) was of opinion that to reach the goal of school effectiveness and improvement use of monitoring and evaluation is very supportive. Similarly, well managed system of monitoring and evaluation is important for managing the school effectively.

A school must monitor its teaching –learning process (Sammons et al., 1995). This process supports and encourages the administration and the teaching staff. Systematic use of set procedures of monitoring and evaluation strengthens and improves practices of classroom teaching and learning (OFSTED, 1999). Ellis (1994) was of the view that individuals are more motivated when they are communicated clearly.

In Pakistan reforms in education sector were introduced at provincial level during 2003. The education is the provincial matter in Pakistan. With respect to population Punjab occupies the status of being the largest province in country having 60 % of the total population of the Pakistan. A program titled Punjab Education Sector Reforms Program (PESRP) was introduced in this province to upgrade its educational system. The main objective of this program was to create quality in education and ensure the easy access for all learners. These initiatives of reforms program emphasize on integral component of monitoring and improving the total quality of educational aspects. The Government of Punjab presented Chief Minister’s Road Map for educational reforms. The objective of this road map was to:

- Improve enrolment and attendance.
- Improve facilities and resources.
- Ensure basic missing facilities.
- Improve the quality of education.

Government of Punjab started a system of monitoring under the name ‘Chief Minister’s Monitoring Force’ to trace the progress and ensure the quality performance of different indicators related to educational institutions of all levels especially up to secondary level in the province. All Monitoring and Evaluation Assistant (MEAs) are responsible to visit at least three schools in a day including two schools of elementary level (primary and middle) and one secondary school. They collect information regarding different indicators according to prescribed Performa and report it to DMO office of the relevant district. The data collected by MEAs is entered and processed on daily basis and reports are generated about the performance of schools. The Project

Monitoring and Implementation Unit (PMIU) receives the hard and soft copies of monthly reports to prepare a consolidate report at provincial level. The provincial education authority prepares district wise reports for evaluation which are provided by District Monitoring Officer (DMO). Provincial education authority resends a copy of monthly report to Executive District Officer (Education) to take remedial and necessary actions on the issues which are indicated in the reports of MEAs.

Kiyani, Begum, Kiyani & Naureen (2011) found that this system of Monitoring and Evaluation has boosted the performance of primary schools in Punjab. A research in the same area was conducted by Saeed, Dilshad, & Nasir (2012) and revealed that monitoring and evaluation system has reduced teachers' absenteeism in Baluchistan. This study is intended to analyze monitoring and evaluation practices in Punjab at secondary school with an intention to get identify the gaps between standard and currents practices.

The objectives of the study were to:

1. Analyze the monitoring and evaluation system of Punjab Education Department as reflected in policy documents.
2. Identify prevailing monitoring and evaluation practices in Punjab Education Department.

Method and Procedure

The study was descriptive in nature and cross-sectional survey method was used to collect data. For the purpose of triangulation quantitative data as well as qualitative data were collected through documents analysis and interview. The researcher analyzed different documents related to policy, rules and regulations. Data were also collected through group interviews from students regarding the practices to implement this program in their schools. Using multi-stage random sampling technique, a sample of eight district education officers, eight district monitoring officers, 32 head teachers, 32 monitoring and evaluation assistants, 320 teachers and 110 students was selected. For this study two types of instruments were developed including questionnaire for head teachers, Teachers and MEAs, group interview for students and Data were collected personally and through mail by the researcher. Data from the students was collected through group interviews by the researcher. To get an overall picture of all respondents, frequency, percentage, means score and Standard Deviation (SD) were used to analyze data. Three groups Head teachers, teachers and MEAs,

ANOVA was applied. Answers of different open ended questions were enlisted per their frequency of responses under each category.

Findings and Results

Data were collected from MEAs, head teachers and teachers related to different aspects of SOPs for monitoring and evaluation system as written in the rules or policy guidelines. These aspects include basic facilities, staff, students, school record maintenance, school council, farogh e taleem fund and record of inspection of school. Students were interviewed in groups and the findings have been added also in this section.

Table 1

Recording the data of provisions of basic facilities

Statements	MEAs			Head Teachers			Teachers		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Monitoring & Evaluation Assistants record the information about:									
Boundary Wall of the school.	30 (100%)	--	-	32 (100%)	--	--	293 (98.7%)	3 (1%)	1 (0.3%)
Electricity (Lights and Fans) in the school.	30 (100%)	--	-	31 (96.9%)	1 (3.1%)	--	285 (96%)	11 (3.7%)	1 (0.3%)
Toilet Blocks in the school	29 (96.7%)	1 (3.3%)	-	30 (93.8%)	2 (6.2%)	--	289 (97.3%)	7 (2.4%)	1 (0.3%)
Number of Class Rooms.	30 (100%)	--	-	32 (100%)	--	--	284 (95.6%)	10 (3.4%)	3 (1%)
Library Facility.	29 (96.7%)	1 (3.3%)	-	25 (78.1%)	7 (21.9%)	--	233 (78.5%)	59 (19.9%)	5 (1.7%)
Means of Pure Drinking Water.	30 (100%)	--	-	31 (96.9%)	1 (3.1%)	--	255 (85.9%)	37 (12.5%)	5 (1.7%)
Proper First Aid Box.	29 (96.7%)	1 (3.3%)	-	20 (62.5%)	10 (31.2%)	2 (6.2%)	174 (58.6%)	97 (32.7%)	26 (8.8%)

Table 1 shows that (96.7% -100%) MEAs, (62%-100%) Head teachers and (58%-98%) teachers confirmed that information was recorded during the visit of MEAs about aspects of provision of physical facilities including boundary wall of, electricity, toilet blocks, and number of class rooms, library facility and means of pure drinking water in the schools.

Table 2
Recording the data about staff

Statements	MEAs			Head Teachers			Teachers		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Monitoring & Evaluation Assistants record the information about:									
100% Presence of Head Teacher.	30 (100%)	--	--	32 (100%)	--	--	278 (93.6%)	17 (5.7%)	2 (0.7%)
95% Attendance of Teachers.	28 (93.3%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)	31 (96.9%)	1 (3.1%)	--	284 (95.6%)	12 (4.0%)	1 (0.3%)
Physical Presence of Teaching Staff.	30 (100%)	--	--	29 (90.6%)	3 (9.4%)	--	282 (94.9%)	14 (4.7%)	1 (0.3%)
Physical Presence of Non-Teaching Staff.	30 (100%)	--	--	30 (93.8%)	2 (6.2%)	--	277 (93.3%)	17 (5.7%)	3 (1.0%)
Regularity of School Staff.	30 (100%)	--	--	30 (93.8%)	2 (6.2%)	--	270 (90.9%)	26 (8.8%)	1 (0.3%)
Absent staff.	30 (100%)	--	--	29 (90.6%)	3 (9.4%)	--	277 (93.3%)	17 (5.7%)	3 (1.0%)
Casual leaves of the staff	30 (100%)	--	--	27 (84.4%)	5 (15.6%)	--	239 (80.5%)	55 (18.5%)	3 (1.0%)

Table 2 shows that majority (93.3% -100%) MEAs, (84.4%-100%) Head teachers, (80.5%-98%) confirmed that information was recorded during the visit of MEAs about different aspects regarding attendance of staff including 100% attendance of head teachers, 95% attendance of teachers, physical presence of teaching staff, physical presence of non-teaching staff, regularity of school staff, about absent staff, casual leave of the staff.

Table 3
Recording of data about Students

Statements	MEAs			Head Teachers			Teachers		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Monitoring & Evaluation Assistants record the information about:									
90 % Attendance of Students on daily basis.	26 (86.7%)	4 (13.3%)	--	31 (96.9%)	1 (3.1%)	--	266 (89.6%)	30 (10.1%)	1 (0.3%)
School Uniform of the students	30 (100%)	--	--	29 (90.6%)	3 (9.4%)	--	272 (91.6)	24 (8.1%)	1 (0.3%)
Physical presence of the students in classes	30 (100%)	--	--	31 (96.9%)	1 (3.1%)	--	268 (90.2%)	29 (9.8%)	--
Collection of illegal funds from students.	21 (70%)	9 (30%)	--	20 (62.5%)	12 (37.5%)	--	176 (59.3%)	121 (40.7%)	--
Provision of Free Text Books.	30 (100%)	--	--	29 (90.6%)	3 (9.4%)	--	233 (78.5%)	61 (20.5%)	3 (1.0%)
Record of distribution of Free Text Books.	30 (100%)	--	--	29 (90.6%)	3 (9.4%)	--	285 (96.0%)	9 (3.0%)	3 (1.0%)

Table 3 shows that (70% -100%) MEAs, (62%-100%) Head teachers and (58%-98%) teachers confirmed that information was recorded regarding attendance of students i.e. 90% attendance of students on daily basis, school uniform of students, physical presence of students in classes, provision of free textbooks, record of distribution of free textbooks.

Table 4
Recording the data related to School Record Maintenance

Statements	MEAs			Head Teachers			Teachers		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Monitoring & Evaluation Assistants record the information about:									
Maintenance of Teachers' attendance register.	30 (100%)	--	--	32 (100%)	--	--	276 (92.9%)	17 (5.7%)	4 (1.3%)
Maintenance of Students' attendance registers	30 (100%)	--	--	32 (100%)	--	--	281 (94.4%)	9 (3.0%)	7 (2.4%)

Table 4 shows that 100% MEAs, 100% Head teachers and (92.9%-94.4%) teachers confirmed that information was recorded during the visit of MEAs about maintenance of Teachers' attendance register and students' attendance register.

Table 5

Recording the data to school council

Statements	MEAs			Head Teachers			Teachers		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Monitoring & Evaluation Assistants record the information about:									
School Council Meetings conducted during the last month.	30 (100%)	--	--	32 (100%)	--	--	265 (89.2%)	17 (5.7%)	15 (5.1%)
School Council Meeting during the last year.	30 (100%)	--	--	32 (100%)	--	--	254 (85.5%)	24 (8.1%)	19 (6.4%)
Maintenance of School Council Proceeding Register related to FTF Utilization.	30 (100%)	--	--	32 (100%)	--	--	258 (86.9%)	17 (5.7%)	22 (7.4%)

Table 5 shows that 100% MEAs, 100% Head teachers and (85.5%-89.2%) teachers confirmed that information was recorded during the visit of MEAs about school council meetings conducted during last month, school council meetings conducted during last year and maintenance of school council proceeding register related to FTF Utilization. Data shows that some of the teachers (ranging from 15-24 in numbers) have replied 'No' or 'Don't know' in response to these items. This might be due to the reason that teachers are not directly the part of that system of data reporting.

Table 6
Recording data related of Farogh E Taleem Fund

Statements	MEAs			Head Teachers			Teachers		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Monitoring & Evaluation Assistants record the information about:									
Maximum Utilization of Farogh-e-Taleem Fund.	30 (100%)	--	--	30 (93.8%)	2 (6.2%)	--	264 (88.9%)	14 (4.7%)	19 (6.4%)
Maintenance of Farogh-e-Taleem Fund's register.	30 (100%)	--	--	31 (96.9%)	1 (3.1%)	--	268 (90.2%)	12 (4.0%)	17 (5.7%)
Maintenance of all Vouchers Related to Expenditures	29 (96.7%)	1 (3.3%)	--	30 (93.8%)	2 (6.2%)	--	267 (89.9%)	12 (4.0%)	18 (6.1%)
Bank statement of the FTF	30 (100%)	--	--	32 (100%)	--	--	253 (85.2%)	21 (7.1%)	23 (7.7%)
Utilization of FTF during last year	30 (100%)	--	--	31 (96.9%)	1 (3.1%)	--	252 (84.8%)	20 (6.7%)	25 (8.4%)

Table 6 shows that 100% MEAs, (93.8 % - 100% Head teachers and (84.8%-90.2%) teachers confirmed that information was recorded during the visit of MEAs about utilization of Farogh e Taleem fund, maintenance of Farogh e Taleem fund register, maintenance of all vouchers related to expenditure, bank statement of FTF and utilization of FTF during last year. Data shows that some of the teachers (ranging from 12-25 in numbers) have replied 'No' or 'Don't know' in response to these items. This might be due to the reason that teachers are not directly the part of that system of data reporting.

Table 7
Recording the data related to inspection record

Statements	MEAs			Head Teachers			Teachers		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Monitoring & Evaluation Assistants record the information about:									
Scheduled visits of District Teacher Educators (DTEs).	30 (100%)	--	--	30 (93.8%)	2 (6.2%)	--	230 (77.4%)	36 (12.1%)	31 (10.4%)
Visits of Assistant Education Officers (AEOs).	30 (100%)	--	--	31 (96.9%)	1 (3.1%)	--	217 (73.1%)	56 (18.9%)	24 (8.1%)
Visits of Zonal Heads	30 (100%)	--	--	30 (93.8%)	2 (6.2%)	--	226 (76.1%)	46 (15.5%)	25 (8.4%)
Visits of EDOs, DEOs and Deputy DEOs.	30 (100%)	--	--	31 (96.9%)	1 (3.1%)	--	231 (77.8%)	53 (17.8%)	13 (4.4%)

Table 7 shows that 100% MEAs, (93.8 % - 96.9%) Head teachers and (73.1%- 77.8%) teachers confirmed that information was recorded during the visit of MEAs about scheduled visited of district teacher educators, visits of AEOs, Zonal Heads and EDOs/DEOs/Dy. DEOs. Data shows that some of the teachers (ranging from 13-56 in numbers) have replied 'No' or 'Don't know' in response to these items. This might be due to the reason that teachers are not directly the part of that system of data reporting.

It was also found with reference to the mean scores of MEAs (M=4.13, SD=1.074), HT (M=3.47, SD=1.107), Teachers (M=3.48, SD=1.124) that almost all the respondents agreed with the statement that MEAs were well trained in their work to monitor education sector. With reference to the mean scores of MEAs (M=4.47, SD=.819), HT (M=3.19, SD=1.256), Teachers (M=3.36, SD=1.266), all three groups that they were satisfied with the performance of this monitoring system. It was found that MEAs (M=4.23, SD=1.040), HT (M=3.34, SD=1.285), Teachers (M=3.31, SD=1.283) that MEAs used to visit classrooms to record learning level of the students at secondary level. It was found that MEAs (M=4.03, SD=1.299), HT (M=3.78, SD=0.906), Teachers

($M=3.45$, $SD=1.176$) that MEAs reports were helpful in provision of missing facilities in school.

Analysis of open ended questions showed that most of the stakeholders reported strong areas of this monitoring and evaluation system as quick reporting to higher authorities, use of ICT in monitoring, improvement in students and teachers' physical attendance, improvement in functioning of facilities, improvement utilization of funds, increased frequency of visits of school administration officers and helping in achieving targets of Chief Minister's Roadmap.

The respondents of the research also indicated some areas of this monitoring and evaluation system that need improvement i.e., authoritative attitude of MEAs towards male and female teaches (very rare), undue stress on teachers, less coordination between education department and DMO office, un-changeable information. Once the data is reported, it cannot be changed/altered/corrected later on and overloaded MEAs.

MEAs enlisted some problems and difficulties they face during performing their duties. These include threat by different personnel on reporting absence of staff, low salaries of MEAs, comparatively a larger number of schools to be monitored, long drive, network problem in far flung areas, no daily allowance for MEAs as they have to travel throughout the day and no provision of budget for motorcycle repair.

Findings of Students' Group Interviews

Group interviews of students were conducted in 32 sampled schools. Students of 30 schools replied that they knew that officers visit their schools. 6.3% (2 of 32 schools) groups replied that they do not know any of officers who visited their school. It means the students of majority schools were aware of inspection by officers in their schools. Majority of students (30 out of 32 schools) answered that they knew it when the monitoring teams/officer entered in the classrooms. It shows that arrival of monitoring officer (MEAs) is kept so confidential that they come to know the presence of visiting teams when he enters inside the premises of their schools.

In reply to the question what does a monitoring officer do in your classes? Students mentioned that monitoring teams/officers used to ask the questions related to following areas:

- a) Homework copies.
- b) Cleanliness in the classrooms.
- c) Physical presence of the students (Heads counts).

- d) Question about collection of illegal funds from students.
- e) Uniform of the students.
- f) Whether students were provided free textbooks or not?
- g) Whether students were using any other helping book/material instead of books provided by the government?

Amazingly, these replies were from every student. It means MEAs visit classrooms and get information related to some indicators from students directly. These questions are related to both academic and non-academic aspects. However, students from 15 schools replied that they saw some punctuality, start of activity of cleanliness in the school, discipline in the students on arrival of monitoring team. Here the attitude of staff is reflected from the answers of students. Showing good image of the school during visits of inspection teams is priority of school administration. It shows that somehow on visit day, reflection is comparatively better than normal routine of the school.

Discussion

This study was conducted to analyze policy and practices of monitoring and evaluation system in Punjab education department. Findings showed that all the stakeholders i.e. MEAs, Teachers, Head Teachers are well aware of the practices that information is recorded during the visit of MEAs about the different aspects of basic facilities and other performance indicators. Results showed that all the respondents were confident in the performance of MEAs during visits. A research in same area was conducted by Mahmood, Anwar & Khan (2012) which revealed that monitoring and evaluation system under PMIU Khyber Pakhtunkhwa has reduced teachers' absenteeism. Kiyani, Begum, Kiyani & Naureen (2011) found that this Monitoring and Evaluation system has improved the performance of primary schools in Punjab. Present study revealed that attendance and physical presence of staff has improved due to this system. Research conducted with same theme by Saeed, Dilshad & Nasir (2013) recommended that academically expert and professional competent principals should be appointed for better monitoring. They have further recommended that monitoring of school should be on scientific basis. Monitoring officers were performing their duties in a better way. Present study showed that teachers, head teachers and MEAs were satisfied with the performance of this monitoring system. Many students replied that they got some facilities on the basis of reports of these monitoring teams. MEAs used

digital tablets for online tests of students of primary level. It is concluded that almost all these groups agreed that academic performance of students has improved after launching test system by MEAs. When teachers and head teachers discussed generally, they were a bit reluctant about this system. But during research when their opinion was accorded as per indicators and specific information, they responded in its favour. Bari, Raza, Aslam, Khan & Maqsood (2013) reported that “the system of monitoring has largely been mechanized with the MEAs and AEOs marking teacher attendance that allows the monitor to take a picture of the teacher with his or her class. Although it has increased the accountability of teachers and hence has led to reduced absenteeism, teachers have raised concerns about the monitoring staff being badgering and intrusive. The respondents of present study indicated some areas in which improvement was desired including authoritative attitude of MEAs towards teachers, undue stress on teachers, un-changeable information and overloaded MEAs. MEAs enlisted some of the problems and difficulties they face during performing their duties. These difficulties include, threat by different personnel on reporting absent of some staff during visit, low salaries of MEAs, comparatively a larger number of schools to be monitored, long drive, network problem in far flung areas, no daily allowance for MEAs as they have to travel throughout the day and no provision of budget for motorcycle repair. If these problems are addressed, their motivation will be higher and the performance will be increased.

Recommendations

- (i) The present system of monitoring and evaluation in Punjab Education department is effective and doing well according to its objectives. It may be continued.
- (ii) Just one visit of MEA is insufficient. Surprise visit of MEAs after first visit in school can make a difference in performance in schools. Follow up visits of MEAs or DMOs may be ensured in schools after the visits of MEAs.
- (iii) Documentation of reports of MEAs should be maintained and future plans for improvement should base on these reports.
- (iv) Some respondents from teachers and head teachers mentioned a factor of less coordination between education department and DMO office. It is recommended that quarterly joint meetings of DMO, MEAs, DEO, and Head Teachers may be arranged for awareness about progress, future plans, targets and mode of actions.
- (v) MEAs were neither paid TA/DA nor provided budget for motorcycle repair and maintenance for performing assignments or meetings at district level. To compensate their financial burden, monthly allowance is recommended for MEAs.
- (vi) Monitoring and mentoring systems are working separately at primary level, while mentoring system at secondary level is missing. It should be launched at this level also and coordinated with monitoring system to ensure the quality of education.

References

- Designing effective monitoring and evaluation of education systems for 2030: A global synthesis of policies and practices (2016), retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/ED/pdf/me-report.pdf>
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2015). *Assuring Quality in Education: Policies and Approaches to School Evaluation in Europe*. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Eurydice (2007). *School Autonomy in Europe. Policies and Measures*. Brussels: Eurydice.
- Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. (1996), *Monitoring Education Indicators, Quality and Effectiveness*, London, New York: Cassell.
- Government of Pakistan, (1998), *National Education Policy 1998-2010*, Islamabad: Ministry of Education
- Government of Pakistan. (2009). *National Education Policy*. Islamabad: Ministry of Education.
- Harris, D. N. & Herrington, C. D., (2006). Accountability, Standards, and the Growing Achievement Gap: Lessons from the Past Half-Century. *American Journal of Education*, 112(2), 209-238.
- Kiyani, M. M., Begum, N., Kiyani, A. & Naureen, S., (2011) Effectiveness Of Monitoring System At Primary Level In Pakistan, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(19),
- Mtetesha, N., (2012) *Monitoring and Evaluation in Education*, Retrieved from the website http://www.academia.edu/4942025/Monitoring_and_Evaluation_in_Education

- OFSTED (1999) *Handbook for Inspecting Secondary Schools*. London: Stationary Office.
- Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating Programmes and Projects (2000) retrieved from http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/pme_concepts_terms_00.pdf
- Saeed, A., Dilshad, M., & Nasir, M. (2013) The Role Of Monitoring And Evaluation In Improving The Effectiveness Of Elementary Education In District Bela, Baluchistan, Pakistan, *The Sindh University Journal of Education*, 42(2013) ,55-61
- Sammons, P., Hillman Mortimore, P. (1995). *Key Characteristics of Effective Schools*. OFSTED/ university of London, institute of Education.
- Shah, D. (2009). Monitoring the Quality of Secondary Education in Context of Decentralization in Pakistan. Lahore: *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 31(1), 1-25. IER, University of the Punjab.
- Willms, J. D. (2003). *Monitoring School Performance: A Guide for Educators*. Washington: The Flamer Press.
- World Bank (2007) *Manual of Monitoring & Evaluation*, Retrieved from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTBELARUS/Resources/M & E.pdf>