

Original Research Article

School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment in Public Secondary Schools: Practices and Performance of Administrators

Peregrita J. Datahan

San Agustin National High School, DepEd-Division of Bohol, Philippines

Corresponding Author: Peregrita J. Datahan, E-mail: pernezd6577@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: May 21, 2020

Accepted: June 29, 2020

Volume: 2

Issue: 2

KEYWORDS

Key Words: practices, performance, school monitoring evaluation and adjustments

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify the practices and performance of secondary school principals in monitoring, evaluation and adjustments in the secondary schools of the Division of Bohol for the SY 2016-2017. The study described the practices of school principals in terms of outcome evaluation, on tracking intermediate results and on progress monitoring. It further aimed to identify the level of performance in schools monitoring, evaluation and adjustments in areas such as evaluating school performance; learner tracking; instructional supervision; tracking staff performance; managing resources; and monitoring SIP implementation. Moreover, this study also aimed to determine the difference of the performance of school principals in monitoring, evaluation and adjustments when categorized according to age, sex, years of experience as principal and educational attainment. The performance of the principals was gathered through a questionnaire and a structured interview to identify their practices. A weighted mean and One Way Analysis of Variance was used to determine the difference of performance when school principals are categorized according to their socio-demographic characteristics. The result revealed that the administrators have taken their initiatives to look into School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustments to determine whether the school was doing well. Results show that the secondary principals were outstanding in some areas of school monitoring and evaluation. Female principals tend to believe that they performed better. Moreover, the study revealed that age, years of experience as administrator and educational attainment are not factors in the assessment of their performance. The study recommends an enhancement program to enhance performance and improve school monitoring and evaluation practices in all the areas of school monitoring and evaluation.

Introduction

Better performance has always been the goal of every organization. With the demands of globalization, school administrators are grappling with internal and external demands and pressures for good governance, accountability and transparency, development effectiveness and delivery of tangible results. The institutionalization of school monitoring and evaluation plays a crucial function in determining whether the desired outcomes are met and are taking place. This has been the tool used by different sectors in the government to track progress in the achievement of a program's objective.

The main objective of School Monitoring and Evaluation System is to provide the necessary information and insights for the school head to perform school based management effectively and efficiently and for the teachers to manage based on standards the teaching and learning process. This will provide insights on learners' progress and achievement of desired learning competencies and potentials of learners to meet the requirements of the next learning level. This will also cover the status and effectiveness of curriculum implementation, school programs and projects and the overall progress of SIP/AIP

implementation. The school stakeholder's requirements and expectations are informed about the progress of the implementation of the SIP on a timely manner. Lastly, school monitoring and evaluation helps identify difficulties, problems, issues or risk that hinders efficient implementation of school based management.

The School Monitoring and Evaluation System will allow the school administrators to meet the information, reporting and documentation requirements of the Department of Education. This will also furnish key information to the Division Office adjusts or improve its technical assistance to schools. Moreover, this will also provide valuable inputs to the Regional Office and Central Office units improve its programs and policies.

School Monitoring and Evaluation is defined in the 3-year School Improvement Plan (SIP). This is the baseline information to track the effectiveness and efficiency of the school. Monitoring and evaluation will be done quarterly in each school year. This is termed as control point which is done in June, September and December to keep track the implementation of the school's progress and determine and solve difficulties or problems affecting the School Improvement Implementation

The implementation of programs and projects in schools can be very challenging. These challenges create gaps and tension in the identification of appropriate strategies and plans to follow, resources needed and support from stakeholders, preparation of reports and imbrication of schedules and programs of the department. Teddie and Reynolds, (2000 as cited by Kyriakides & Campbell, 2004), stated that the increased investment in education and the increased accountability demands by parents and society require schools to be involved in a continuous process of improvement and the growing interests in the fields of school effectiveness and school improvement.

The government seeks to align expenditure framework with policy outcomes, measuring every organization's performance in support of achieving outcomes. The efficiency of service delivery, the quality of program and policy implementation, and the effective management of resources are just a few examples. The Philippines is at the early stages of defining, organizational level indicators for major outcomes and every branch of the government are already implementing this to achieve quality and better performance. The Department of Education through the regional offices is adopting Regional Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment (RMEA) in the year 2013. This is cascaded down to the Division (DMEA), to District (DsMEA) and to the schools known as SMEA or School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustments in the same year to track the status and progress of implementation of projects and programs. The Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustments results from the schools, districts and schools division will be reported by the schools division offices in the regional level.

The implementation of this system has caught the attention of principals and even teachers who are directly involved in the preparation of reports. They contended that the SMEA is very tedious with this observation. Thus, the researcher is encouraged to conduct the study to identify the practices and performance of the public secondary school principals in monitoring and evaluation of schools in the Division of Bohol. The assessment of the implementation of SMEA and the identification of best practices may be used as benchmark in improving implementation.

Literature Review

Every organization desires for a high quality performance which requires quality inputs to achieve quality results. These desirable organizational outcomes are achieved when factors like careful planning and prioritization of activities, participative and collaborative decision processes and competent staff are met. Monitoring and evaluation of these enables an organization to understand where they are and habilitates them to continuously improve their practices and strategies. Kusek and Rist (2004), stresses that monitoring and evaluation gives decision- makers information on progress toward achieving stated targets and goals, and provides substantial evidence as the basis for any necessary midcourse corrections in policies, programs, or projects.

The Organization for European Co-operation and Development (OECD) as cited by Kusek and Rist (2004), defines monitoring and evaluation as follows: Monitoring is a continuous function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds while evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programs, or policy, including its design implementation, and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

The two definitions are distinct yet complementary. Monitoring gives the information on where a policy, program or project is at any given time relative to the respective targets and outcomes. Monitoring & Evaluation is designed to monitor the impact of a policy and progress of program activities. It also assesses the outcome relevance of an activity or effectiveness of a policy as well as efficiency and sustainability. On the other hand, evaluation answers whether targets and outcomes are achieved or not. This further seeks to address problems and issues relative to and the achievement of outcomes.

The School Monitoring Evaluation system includes the achievement of the school outcomes, the initial gains of the learners' progress and the efficiency of the school in managing programs and projects outlined in the SIP. This covers the outcomes, intermediate results and school progress.

The focus of School Monitoring and Evaluation system is primarily on the learners. The school's effectiveness depends on the performance of the learners in areas such as improvement in enrolment or learners' access or participation. This is also measured on the completion or the number of learners who are able to complete the requirements of the basic education system. This is also based on the retention or learners who stayed in school and on the improvement in learners' achievement.

The school monitoring and evaluation system tracks intermediate results. The quality of learning and teaching process, improvement in the access of learners to learning facilities and learning materials; learners' participation in the teaching and learning process and school activities; improvement in the school Based Management level of practice; and positive perception of school stakeholders are the leading indicators pertaining to improvement in the school's assistance to learners.

Moreover, the school progress as one of the types of monitoring and evaluation also monitors the school's implementation of programs and projects outlined in the SIP, the management and utilization of resources and handling of financial resources. This also measures how the school administrator manages fiscal versus the physical accomplishment.

The School Monitoring and Evaluation system is composed of six processes that will provide the school administrators with a holistic picture of the school's accomplishment and progress with regards to the implementation of the programs and projects as listed in the School Improvement Plan. These six processes include (1) Evaluating School Performance, (2) Learner Tracking Process, (3) Instructional Supervision, (4) Tracking Staff Performance, (5) Managing School Assets and (6) Monitoring SIP Implementation.

Monitoring school performance process involves tracking the school's performance on the four (4) main indicators: enrollment, retention, completion and achievement. The main objective of this process is to determine the effectiveness of school programs and projects and the effectiveness of the SIP. This process aims to generate information on the four main performance indicators, factors that facilitated and hindered school performance and the effective practices of the schools and its sustaining benefits. The result of this process will be used to design the next cycle of SIP.

Learner tracking is the second process which is designed to monitor the participation and progress of the learners. Information about the learner's performance will provide vital information on the relevance and responsiveness of the school programs and projects. Students' performance inside the classroom is determined. In this process, students at risk of dropping out are tracked. This also allows the learners to participate in the school-wide activities since both academic and social aspects of a learner are developed in this process. The monitoring of this process is done quarterly to provide a status report on learner's performance. The school head must maintain the consistency of this process to ensure comparable assessment of learner's progress.

Instructional supervision or curriculum implementation is the quality control mechanism of the school that will ensure correct and timely implementation of curriculum by the teaching staff. This process enables the school principal to track the progress of the curriculum implementation and assess the quality of inputs provided by the teachers to learners. This helps assure that the learners are receiving the quality inputs and develop competencies. This further provides information to the school administrator on the specific strategies for teachers to use and provide assistance to teachers according to the monitoring results.

Regular tracking of teachers and non-teaching staff performance enable the school head to reward good performers and help them grow professionally in the areas they need to improve. The main objective of this process is to maintain responsive

human resources that will deliver the school programs and projects efficiently and effectively. In order to achieve the objective of the process, performance appraisal of teachers and other activities must be undertaken

Managing school assets is a monitoring process which will allow the school manager to match the learner's learning needs and the teacher's requirement to deliver the lessons using the school resources. In this process, the school head is enabled to maximize the utilization of resources to meet the needs of learners. School resources include the facilities like classrooms, books and other supplementary materials. In order to achieve the objectives of this process, a regular inspection and inventory of facilities and materials must be conducted.

Lastly, monitoring SIP implementation keeps track of the status of the school programs and projects as stated in the SIP or the Annual Improvement Plan. This process provides the school manager to assess the macro level of his/her efficiency and a picture of the school in terms of programs and projects implemented. In this process, the school is able to compare the actual status and number of programs and projects implemented against the number and schedule of the same as targeted in the SIP. The Logical Framework Approach (Log frame) is an effective management tool to guide implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This helps to clarify objectives of any project, program or policy. This aids in the identification of the expected causal links -the "program logic" in the following results chain: inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes, and impact. This tool is a useful tool in the review of the progress and in taking corrective action and a vehicle for engaging partners in clarifying objectives and designing activities.

The scope of the schools monitoring and evaluation is found in the school improvement plan. The outcomes and resources outlined in it will be used as baseline information to track the effectiveness and efficiency of the school. The school monitoring system trails on the inputs on the management of school MOEE and other financial resources and processes on the implementation and progress of programs. Intermediate results especially on the quality of teaching and learning process and its impact to the whole system are also tracked.

The "Large Leaps" Theory of Change or Punctuated Equilibrium theory of Baumgartner and Jones (1993) posits that large-scale change can occur when an issue is defined differently or new dimensions of the issue gain attention. Believers of this theory recognize that when conditions are right, change can happen in a sudden large burst (Stachowiak, 2013). The school monitoring evaluation and adjustments enables the school principals to determine greater development of any dimensions in his/her management when all factors are set in the right track. When issues in school are properly addressed using good practices, greater performance is also expected.

In addition, the Messaging and Frameworks theory, also known as Prospect theory of Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman (1992) challenged a conventional school of thought that suggests people make rational decisions by weighing different options, cost and benefits and then choosing the one that will benefit them the most. This theory assumes that issues and choices can be framed in multiple ways and the frame is used to make decisions which are controlled partly by the way problems are presented and partly by the decision maker's norms and characteristics (Stachowiak, 2013). In school monitoring and evaluation, decision making is a very important function. Every implementer, from the school head, teachers and non-teaching staff will make decisions according to their own accountabilities.

Monitoring and Evaluation activities are undertaken to ensure that accountabilities and desired results are achieved. Essentially, the Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) is about adjustments that consist of tolerable deviation from the plan which can be counteracted by adjusting resources and activities, adaption of the plan if the strategy used does not yield the expected results and effects and changes in the strategy or termination of the plan if the target purpose turn out to be unachievable due to misconceptions and changes in frame conditions.

Edwin Locke (1968), in his Goal –Setting Theory of Motivation, states that the goal setting is essentially linked to task performance. In addition, this theory postulates that the specific and challenging goals along with appropriate feedback contribute to higher and better task performance. The programs and projects of the Department of Education are the desired goals the administrators are heading for. Through the implementation of the M & E, adjustments are made to improve organizational effectiveness, giving quality information to stakeholders and improve performance.

Shiver (2005) affirmed that the ability to motivate and guide toward a goal is the essence of leadership. McShane and Glinow (2005) revealed that there are fifty four (54) scholars from 38 countries reached a consensus that leadership is the ability to influence, motivate and enable others to contribute to the effectiveness and success of the organization. Maxwell (1993), exclaimed that the effectiveness of work will never rise above the ability to lead and influence others. When school principals are able to draw every member of the organization to work for the desired goals denotes his/her ability to lead everyone to success.

Goal Setting according to Gibson, Ivancevich, and Donnely (2000) is both specific and challenging leads to an increase in performance because it makes it clearer to the individual what he is supposed to do. This in turn may provide the members of the school community with a sense of achievement, recognition, and commitment and eventually compare how well they have performed than before. This conveys that specific goals help lead everyone in the department achieve higher outputs.

Fredrick Taylor's Scientific Management Theory asserts that organizations should identify the best way to do a job, train workers to handle each element in a pre-determined manner and set up an equitable system of rewards for improved productivity. Monitoring and Evaluation allows an organization to measure how far the school or the organization has reached the targets. Teachers then are trained and directed towards the organizational objectives and have the chance of improving strategies to attain better results. After the schools are monitored and evaluated, they will be classified into three categories according to their achieved outputs as high performing, intermediate performing and low performing schools.

Furthermore, Taylor believed that there is a best machine for each job, so there is a best working method by which people should undertake their jobs. He considered that all work processes could be analyzed into discrete task and that by scientific method it is possible to find 'the best way' to perform each task (Mullins, 1999). Along with every programs and projects initiated in school, there is an appropriate strategy and practices to be utilized to make it more satisfying and profitable for all concerned.

The identification of the expected causal links in the Logical Framework helps the administrators to identify performance indicators of school performance. Greater impact on performance will also be achieved as stressed by Baumgartner and Jones in their punctuated Equilibrium theory. The rational decisions as emphasized in the Messaging and Frameworks theory of the Prospect Theory enable the administrators to implement adjustments and strategies to achieve targets. The clear goals and appropriate feedback as highlighted in the theory of Locke enables the school administrator to improve his/her performance in the school monitoring and evaluation. Likewise, the best practices are his best working method to increase productivity in the provision of technical assistance in the delivery of curriculum and in the implementation of programs and projects in school as emphasized by Taylor in his scientific management theory.

Republic Act No. 9155 known as the Governance of the Basic Education act of 2001 defines the roles and responsibilities of school principals in governing the school to set standards and establish accountability and responsibility for achieving higher outcomes. Principals are given the authority to manage the school system to implement educational programs, projects and services take into account the interest of all the members of the community.

DepEd Order No. 39, s. 2016 or the Adoption of the Basic Education Research Agenda Monitoring and Evaluation falls under the theme on Governance that measures the development of effective and efficient implementation of programs and projects. The policy stresses out that the Department of Education should continue to conduct researches relating to governance since it is the largest sector with complex interrelationships in the department.

The Regional Memorandum Order No. 222 s. 2013 stated the Guidelines in the Conduct of School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment (SMEA), District Monitoring, Evaluation and Adjustment (DsMEA) and Division Monitoring, Evaluation and Adjustment (DMEA) for the second and third quarter of school year 2015-2016. The SMEA, DsMEA and DMEA are delegated to monitor and evaluate the status, programs, and results of the delivery of basic education services in schools in relation to access, quality, and governance. Being one of the four regions implementing Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustments, the regional office is strengthening its system to ensure efficient and effective fulfillment of the division mandate.

Outcome Evaluation. The primary focus of the School Monitoring and Evaluation is on the welfare of the learners. The schools' effectiveness is closely connected to the performance of the learners. When schools are able to improve learners'

access and participation, heighten the number of learners completing the requirements of the basic education system and increase their competencies, the school is able to meet the desired outcomes the department has set.

Performance according to the World Bank in 2004, are measures of inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impacts for development projects, programs, or strategies. High performing schools yield high productivity. This also denotes high incentives. The teachers, students, parents and all those who have contributed to the schools' performance will earn high regard. It is imperative for school principals to initiate strategies and utilize them to improve performance not only in the teaching and learning process but also in different areas to achieve a reminiscent achievement.

The dominant policies for improving schools that indicate the primary focus is on two of the major components (1) restructuring school governance; and (2) enhancing instruction and curriculum (Adelman and Taylor, 2006 as cited by Montelbon, 2013). It is the role of the principal as a curriculum manager to supervise (Pi Pacia and Hoy, 2008; Bilbao, et. al., 2008; Hoy and Hoy, 2009; as specified by Montelbon, 2013) and give technical assistance to improve learning outcomes. Giving technical assistance to teachers enables the principal to intensify his/her instructional supervision and improve performance in the delivery of curriculum.

Higher level of performance employs expertise. School principals who are high performing could be of help to other principals who are still in their initial years. High performing leaders may coach those who are new to help them become productive and better in their performance. Aguilar (2017) suggested that school principals need a neutral outsider with whom they can talk with the significant practices with which it can develop and improve performance. They need to identify good practices and utilize them in their respective schools. The best practices identified are then utilized and be applied in the low performing schools.

One of the main purposes of monitoring and evaluation in education is to ensure that equitable and quality education is being provided to all population and at all levels. Quality education is a multi-dimensional concept that takes into account the quality aspects on input (human, material, and financial), process (teaching-learning and effective management practices), and outputs and outcomes (the learning outcomes and quality of results) (IIEP:2007 in UNESCO, 2016).

The School Monitoring and Evaluation measures school effectiveness and efficiency on the access and quality of the delivery of programs and projects. This provides accurate picture of the results of accomplishments and achievements of the school. The necessity to measure school performance is to guide the school principal in making intelligent decisions and relevant adjustments of the realization for he programs and projects.

Tracking Intermediate Results. The capacity in the workforce is needed to develop, support, and sustain Monitoring and Evaluation system. Officials need to be trained in modern data collection, monitoring methods, and analysis. (Schacter, 2000 cited in UNESCO, 2016). In the Department of Education, the school principal is required to provide technical assistance to his subordinates. This is to ensure that teachers are performing efficiently and effectively in different areas to yield greater results.

Moreover, as stated by Biasong (2016), one of the objectives in support of the overall purpose of M & E is to provide the division information management information on the delivery of education as basis for technical assistance. The outcomes of the School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment becomes the benchmark of the principals what they need to do to improve the quaiy of instruction and organizational performance.

The School Monitoring and Evaluation system is an internal system set up for school administrators and teachers primarily and is designed to respond to the decision making requirements of its members. As stated in the DepEd School Monitoring & Evaluation manual and monitoring curriculum implementation is a quality control mechanism of the school that ensures appropriate and up to date implementation of the curriculum by the teaching staff. The process allows the school head to track its development of curriculum implementation and assess the quality of inputs that will develop the competencies of the learners.

Monitoring the curriculum implementation generates data for the school administrators to determine the responsiveness of the curriculum, the strengths and weaknesses of the teachers concerning curriculum delivery and progress of the learners' performance.

Furthermore, monitoring and evaluation enables the school principals to showcase their best practices to other schools. The best practices done by the high performing schools could be applied to other schools. UNESCO (2016) claims that M & E systems can help identify potentially promising programs or practices. They can also identify unintended—but perhaps useful— project, program, and policy results. Conversely, Monitoring and Evaluation systems can help managers identify program weaknesses and take action to correct them. A monitoring and evaluation strategy can be used to diminish fear within organizations and governments, and can instead devise ways of instilling an open atmosphere in which people can learn from mistakes, make improvements, and create knowledge along the way.

Good monitoring and evaluation systems are also a source of knowledge capital. They enable governments and organizations to develop knowledge based on the types of projects, programs, and policies that are successful, and, more generally, what works, what does not, and why. Monitoring & Evaluation systems can also provide continuous feedback in the management process of monitoring and evaluating progress toward a given goal. In this context, they promote organizational learning.

Monitoring and evaluation system can generally create impact on educational services leading to economic growth and development. Funnell and Rogers (2011) as cited by Tsui, Hearn & Young (2014), describe programs as combinations of simple, complicated and complex components with seven parameters: stability of objectives, governance, consistency of implementation; and how necessary it is to produce intended outcomes. The Department of Education has been strengthening the departments' objectives as clearly stated in the vision and mission. The school principals, on the other hand, must clearly define the objectives and nature of a program and project with greater transparency and accountability in the implementation and management of funds and resources. The awaited desirable outputs will then be of reach and greater outcomes will be attained.

The capacity of the school principal to build and develop support from stakeholders is necessary to sustain monitoring and evaluation system. Stakeholders are the organizational partners to achieve the realization of the schools objectives. In the implementation of programs and projects in school, the stakeholders particularly the parents are the shoulder of the institution. UNESCO (2016) emphasized that the lack of appropriate resources to implement the M & E system, particularly for qualitative activities that typically require high cost and weakness in communication and dissemination of information among stakeholders in the field to identify specific targets for development becomes a challenge when resources are not available.

Marriot and Goyder (2009) maintained that monitoring and evaluation do require resources and it is essential that sufficient budget is provided. According to them, monitoring and evaluation is expensive and time-consuming. Withal, if the system is not properly performed, the cost of an initiative will be much greater. School managers have to equip with appropriate management approach to save time and money since resources are very limited.

Moreover, the implementing schools (IUs) have a greater budget to implement programs and projects in the school. The school's MOOE (Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses), for example, is allocated for schools to sustain and bring out good education services and support for projects and programs to be implemented.

Human resource is the primary resource of an institution. The teaching force is the most important factor that the school principal needs in the implementation of programs and projects. The teachers are the fundamental pedagogy to measure and evaluate outcomes. Thus, committed and dedicated forces should be considered in the realization of the desired goals.

The school Monitoring & Evaluation System manual of the Department of Education has laid down the main objective of the school monitoring and evaluation system. This is to provide necessary information and insights for the school head to perform school-based management effectively and efficiently and for the teachers to manage based on standards of the teaching and learning process. Bartoletti (2013) postulated that great schools do not exist apart from great leaders. This means that high performing school is the effect of a high performing school leader.

Effective leadership enhances productivity (Butt, 2014 as cited by Paje, 2016). It was stated further that desirable practices lead to desirable outgrowth. School effectiveness is based on the efficiency of the leader and on the good practices on monitoring and evaluation.

Evaluations are ultimately about making an evidenced-based judgment about the merit, worth and performance of a program or intervention of the school (Tsui, Hearn & Young, 2014). However, Mendels (2017) stressed out that evaluation system is focused not on rating school leaders to determine who should be put on notice or let go, but instead on giving principals, especially those in their initial years on the job, guidance to help them grow and become better in their job. Another study of 12 principals of under-performing schools (Warren & Kelsein, 2013) found that when paired with experienced administrators, they improved their leadership abilities and saw significant performance gains in their schools (Goodwin, 2017). The desirable practices of school principals of high performing schools in terms of managing a school would help those principals who are still grappling to increase their school's performance.

The monitoring and evaluation is a crucial management tool that enables the school manager to achieve results and meet specific targets. This system can help managers identify program weaknesses and take action to correct them. This can also provide continuous feedback on the management process. In addition, Rue & Byars, (2004), stated that only after the actual performance has been determined and compared with the standard can proper corrective action be determined. All too often, however, school leaders set standards and monitor performance but do not follow up with appropriate actions. The information is significant to knowing whether the school system or the school leader is delivering good performance. Progress Monitoring. Goetsch (2002) contended that the best way to make change is to communicate with all stakeholders about the goals set including the accomplishments done by the school. They must have higher awareness on the targets of the school. The school principals on the other hand, must open a link among all stakeholders so that they too take a shared responsibility for the needs and development of the school.

Sanders (2005) in her research, building school-community partnership defines community involvement as "connections between schools and community individuals, organizations, and businesses that are forged to directly or indirectly promote students' social, emotional, physical, and intellectual development." This means that the community plays an increasingly prominent role in supporting school success.

Blank and Langford (2000), emphasized that community partnerships need to engage in a thoughtful process to define a vision and clear goals. Partnerships need to have effective governance and management structures to ensure that programs operate efficiently and the partnership is responsive to community needs. Community school partnerships also need to draw from a broad range of perspectives and expertise—from inside the school as well as from other organizations and individuals within the community. Finally, community school partnerships need to connect, coordinate, and leverage resources from a variety of sources to support and continue their work.

All educational institutions should establish and maintain satisfactory relations with the community (Pabalan, 2009). It is imperative for the school principals to establish a harmonious relationship with the community to develop and sustain organizational progress. The external stakeholders primarily refer to the parents and the individuals in the community who contribute to the school's progress.

A study of Ablay (2012) on the role of parents in the performance learning of students showed that there is a significant relationship between the roles of parents in the learners' performance. This is also confirmed in the study of Macalipay (2014), entitled "Parents' Involvement and Academic Performance of Grade III pupils". She revealed that there is both mutual responsibility and mutual benefit for schools and families. The bond between the community and the school creates an impact to its progress. She also conceded that parental involvement was linked to students' success. When parents or the community are involved in the children's education, the school's performance increases.

The study of Gabito (2013) proved that School-Based management projects can increase the involvement of parents and other local people in the affairs of the school. When the parents and the community members are recognized and are involved in the planning, transparency and accountability increase. Hence, school's performance will also be escalated.

Dander (2013), in his study "School-Based Management of Public Schools in the Municipality of Barili" on external stakeholders dimension declared that majority of the schools belong to the standard stage which fall under level 1; a great number were clustered under glaring-up stage on level 2; and almost 100% of the schools were grouped under practicing stage. Hence, school principals, the school community and stakeholders need to collaborate and start improving their management practices to address the gaps and attain continuous improvement.

In addition, Rebleza (2016) in her study stressed that practicing school community performance assessment improves monitoring and evaluation systems and got the highest mean response of 3.06 with a qualitative index of attained. This generally means that accountability and continuous improvement becomes greater and that school's performance would exceedingly become higher.

External and internal stakeholders should work together for the school's objectives to be realized. Community participation in school is recognized and improvements may spur action to remedy possible problems on the implementation of programs and projects. They should have a clearer sense of awareness on the status of projects, programs, and policies in school. The ability to demonstrate positive results can also help garner greater political and popular support. Communication and coordination within and between government agencies and departments and among donors are equally important.

The task performance in Locke's theory and the large scale change in Baumgartner and Jones were called to define the performance of school principals in school monitoring evaluation and adjustment. In addition, the techniques for improving the efficiency of work process in Taylor's theory and the concept on large scale change of Baumgartner and Jones' theory illustrated the variable practices in the current study.

Methodology

To achieve the purpose of this research, the researcher utilized the descriptive method which aims to identify the practices and performance of school principals in monitoring, evaluation and adjustments in the Division of Bohol. There are 114 principals who were purposely selected based on the criterion that these principals are managing big schools offering senior high school strands from the 137 high school principals of the high schools of the Division of Bohol. These 114 administrators were leading schools with greater population and greater MOEE. There were 28 principals from the Congressional District (CD) 1, 47 from CD 2 and 47 from CD 3.

To gather the needed information, a questionnaire was used to determine the background information of the respondents. It also contained items to determine the level of performance of the school principals in monitoring, evaluation and adjustment in in areas such as evaluating school performance; learner tracking; instructional supervision; tracking staff performance; managing resources; and monitoring SIP implementation and was measured in a 3-point Likert scale using the values 1 (needs improvement), 2 (satisfactory), and 3 (outstanding). The third section dealt with questions on the practices of school principals in monitoring evaluation and adjustments in terms of outcome evaluation; tracking intermediate results; and progress monitoring which was conducted in a structured interview. To achieve the validity and reliability, the instrument was pilot tested in Congressional Districts 1, 2 and 3.

To determine the profile of school principals' performance in school monitoring, evaluation and adjustment on areas such as evaluating school performance; learner tracking; progress monitoring; tracking staff performance; managing resources; and monitoring SIP implementation, the weighted mean ratings of the responses were used. To test the significance of the differences in the performance of principals categorized according to age, sex, years of experience as principal and educational attainment, the One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was utilized.

Results and Discussion

1. Practices of School Principals on School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustments

1.1. Outcome Evaluation

The findings shows that advertising and advocating the schools during assemblies and forum, campaigning to feeder schools in nearby barangays, and maintaining a good image of the school are practiced by the school principals to increase enrollment. Conducting a home visitation to learners-at-risk of dropping out; and Intensifying AGAK program implementation are the practices of the school principals to increase retention and completion rate. Similarly, the use of Management Information

System helps in the reduction of LARDOs (Learners at-risk of Dropping-Out) and was perceived to be a good practice to increase retention and completion rate.

On increasing attendance or decrease absenteeism, tying up with parents to monitor and track the identified LARDOs (Learner at-Risk-of Dropping Out); checking of students' attendance done by subject area. The utilization of call slips and the implementation of the swipe ID system ranks last was barely mentioned but may be considered a best practice to solve the problem on absenteeism.

Developing a remedial program; conducting observation of classes to increase time on task; conducting of the Learning Action Cell (LAC) are the practices of school principals to improve academic performance of learners. Nevertheless, the employment of the no noon-break-policy and the conduct of a feeding program are the least among the practices of school principals but were proven to contribute in improving academic performance of learners.

1.2. On Tracking Intermediate Results

According to the result, the principals believed sending teachers to trainings and seminars; enrolling in masteral or doctoral program; and providing technical assistance to teachers enhance teachers' competence. To achieve better students' performance in competitions, the principal maintained that rehearsing and reviewing of skills during off hours, Saturdays, Sundays or before the competition; recognizing outstanding performance both of teachers and students; and developing CIP or Continuous Improvement Plan are the best practices the secondary school principals are instituting.

Providing instructional materials purchased from MOEE (Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses); conducting a periodic evaluation of teachers and resources; and utilizing borrower slips to track the utilization of resources are the practices the school principals have to ensure that the teachers and learners maximize the utilization of resources.

Providing correct input of data in the Learners Information System (LIS) and Enhanced Basic Education Information System (EBEIS); and requesting cooperation from the local officials, alumni and other stakeholders are the identified practices to ensure that the school has adequate classroom.

Invigorating community partnership; coordinating with the division office for the request of equipment and facilities; and procuring equipment form MOOE are the practices used to ensure that the school has laboratory facilities.

To ensure that the school has adequate learning resources, the secondary school principals utilize the LRMS and LR portals for references and use the internet and download resources for references not found in the DepEd portals.

1.3. Progress Monitoring

Tapping PTA, Alumni, barangay and municipal officials, school organizations, sponsors and benefactors; Increasing stakeholders' participation from government, and non-government organizations are the identified best practices of the principals to increase school's physical accomplishment versus the planned programs in the SIP. The secondary school administrators believed forging linkages and communicate constantly with school partners; lobby sessions in the barangay and municipal levels to generate financial support; and submitting resolutions, solicitations and program of work to the barangay, municipal and/or provincial government to help in the generation of funds from stakeholders.

2. Performance of School Principals in School Monitoring Evaluation and adjustments

The result reveals that the principals in the Division of Bohol are outstanding in some of the areas in school monitoring Evaluation and Adjustments but are satisfactory in the area on tracking staff performance. This finding implies that this item was considered the respondents to be where improvement can be done. A school-based performance tracking committee helps facilitate in the tracking of performance both in the area of curriculum and in governance. Conversely, a significant number of principals maintained that the creation of committee is very doable. The problem was that those committees did not function effectively due to other work assignments. In this area of monitoring and evaluating performance of teaching and non-teaching staff vis-à-vis targets, the principals rated their performance satisfactory is indicated by the mean rating of 2.38. This mean is low compared to the other areas in school monitoring. The result suggests that principals believed that they could confidently say that they performed especially in the aspect of evaluating personnel performance based on target. The result further implies that there could be other bases for evaluating teachers aside from the targets set by the school.

3. Differences in Performance

There is a no significant difference in the performance of public secondary school administrators in school monitoring evaluation and adjustments when the participants were grouped according to age, years of experience as administrator and educational attainment. However, there is a significant difference when they are categorized according to sex.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study administrators have applied practices and have taken initiatives to look into School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustments to determine whether the school was doing well. Results show that the administrators were performing well. Female administrators tend to believe that they performed better.

References

- [1] Ablay, A. D. (2012). *Role of Parents' in the Performance of Intermediate Pupils with Difficulties in Mathematics in the Selected Schools of Sibunga District, Negros Oriental Division: Basis for an Intervention*. Negros Oriental: Villaflares College.
- [2] Aguilar, E. (2017, May). Leadership Coaching that Transforms. *EL Educational Leadership: Lifting School Leaders*. Vol.74. No. 8.
- [3] Bartoletti, J. and Connelly, G. (2013) *Leadership Matters: What the Research Says about the Importance of Principal Leadership*.NAESP,Virginia.
- [4] Biasong, J. S. (2013). *Division Monitoring and Evaluation Framework*.Retrieved from://www.slideshare.net/mobile/kenjoyb/division-monitoring-evaluation-framework-16617499.
- Blank, J. and Langford, B.H. (2000). *Strengthening Partnership: Community*. Retrieved fromHttps:// www.communitySchool.org/1/AssessmentManager/csassessment.pdf.
- Dander, P. P. (2013). *School- Based Management of Public Elementary Schools in the Municipality of Barili: Development Plan*. Cebu City: Cebu Technological University.
- [5] Department of Education Manual. *School Monitoring and Evaluation System*.Retrieved from://www.Docshare01.docshare.tips/files/30264/302648746.pdf.
- [6] Fisher,C.F.(2013).*Supervision of Instruction*. Retrieved from:www.stanswartz.com.
- [7] Gabito, D. R. (2013). *School- Based Management and Community Partnership Practices of Elementary Schools*. Tagbilaran City: Holy Name University.
- [8] Gibson, J.L., Ivancevich, J. M. and Donnely, J. H. Jr., (2000). *Organizations: Behavior Structure and Process*. 10th ed. Mc Graw Hill: NY.
- [9] Glinow, M. V. and McShane, S.L. (2005). *Oragnizational Behavior: Emerging Realities for the Workplace Revolution*. Mc.Graw-Hill:USA.
- [10] Goetsch, D. L. (2002). *Effective Supervision: A Guidebook for Supervisors, Team Leaders and Work Coaches*.Printice Hall: New Jersey.
- [11] Goodwin, B. (2017, May). Natural- Born Coached Leaders. *Educational Leadership.Lifting the School Leaders*.74(8), 83-84.
- [12] Gyrna. F.M. (2001). *Quality Planning and Analysis: From Product Development Through Use*. 4th ed. Mcgraw-Hill:USA
- [13] Jaafar, S. B. (2005) *Monitoring and Evaluation: Supporting School Improvement and effectiveness*. Retrieved from: Https://www.slideshare.net/soniab2005/monitoring-and-evaluation-supporting-school-improvement-and-effectiveness-5773491.
- [14] Kusek, J.Z. and Rist R. C. (2004) *Ten Steps To Results- Based Monitoring and Evaluation System: A Handbook for Developing Practitioner*. 1-3. World Bank: Washington DC. Retrieved from: Https://www.oec.org/dac/peer-reviews/World-steps_to_Results_Based_ME_System.pdf.
- [15] Kyriakides, L. and Campbell, R.J. (2004). *School Self- Evaluation and School Improvement: A Critique of Values and Procedures*.1.Retrieved from: Https://www.sciencedirect.com/sds/pdf.
- [16] Locke, E. (1968). *Goal Setting Theory of Motivation*. Retrieved from:https://www.mangementstudyhq.com/Edwin-locke-goal-setting-theory.html.
- Marriott, N. and Goyder, H. (2009). *Manual for Monitoring and Evaluating Education Partnerships*. International Institute for Educational Planning and UNESCO: UK.
- [17] Macalipay, L.A.(2014). *Parents' Involvement and Academic Performance of Grade III Pupils*. Cebu City: Southwestern University.
- [18] Maley, M. (2017). Best Practices for Technical Assistance: What does the Evidence Tell Us: Research Facts and Findings. Cornell University, University of Rockster & the Center for School Safety. Retrieved from: www.actforyouth.net.rf_ta_0416pdf
- [19] Maxwell, J. C. (1993). *Developing the Leader within You*. Thomas Nelson: NY
- [20] McKinsey (2007). *How the world's best Performing School Systems Come out on top*. Retrieved from: www.smhc-cpre.org.pdf.
- [21] McShane, S. L. and Glinow, M V. *Organizational Behavior: Emerging Realities for Workplace Revolution*.3rd ed.Mc Graw Hill: NY.
- [22] Mendels, P. (2017, May). Getting Intentional About Principal Evaluation.*Educational Leadership:Lifting School Leaders*.74(8),52-56.

- [23] Montelbon, M. R. (2013). *Instructional Leadership Practices Among Secondary School Administrators*. University of San Carlos: Cebu City.
- [24] Mullins, L. J. (1999). *Management and Organizational Behavior*. 5th ed. Printice Hall: NY. *Self- Rating Competency Tool for the School Heads*. National Competency- Based Standards for School Heads
- [25] Pabalan, A. P. (2009). *Assessment of Community Outreach Program: Basis for Enhancement*. Tagbilaran: Holy Name University.
- [26] Paje, J. C. (2016). *Leadership Practices and Productivity of Educational Institutions*. Holy Name University: Tagbilaran City.
- [27] Rebleza, J.C. (2016). *School- Based Management Program: Extent of Implementation, Problems and Impact*. Tagbilaran City: Holy Name University.
- [28] Rue, L. W. & Byars, L. L. (2004). *Supervision: A Key to Link Productivity*. 8th ed. NY: McGraw-Hill. Sanders, M. G.(2005). *Building Community Partnership: Collaboration for Student Success*. Corwin Press:California. Retrieved from: http://books.google.com.ph/books?hl=en&lr=&id=mjL_9s4c7rsC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dg=info:as7KQcZ-VTsJ:scholar.google.com.
- [29] Shiver, R. J. (2005). *Leadership in Organizational Setting. Organizational Behavior: Emerging Realities for Workplace Revolution*. Mc Graw Hill: NY.p 415.
- [30] Stachowiak, S. (2013). *Pathways for Change: Advocacy and Policy Change Efforts*. Center for innovation:ORS Impact.
- [31] Taylor, F. W. (1911). *Scientific management Theory*. Retrieved from:https://www.mindtools.com/pagearticle/newTMM_Taylor.html.
- [32] Ti burca, A. (2017). *Five Best Practices for a Successful Project Implementation*. Retrieved from: www.team.week.com.
- [33] Tsui, J., Hearn, S. and Young, J. (2014). *Monitoring and evaluation of Policy Influence and Advocacy*. odi.org
- [34] UNESCO (2016). *Designing Effective Monitoring and Evaluation of Education Systems for 2030: A Global Synthesis of Policies and Practices*. Retrieved from: <https://www.unesco.org/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/ED/pdf>.
- [35] World Bank (2004). *Monitoring & Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods & Approaches*. Washington, D.C.Retrieved from:<http://www.worldbank.org>.