Divulging the Diverse Perspectives of School Heads and Coordinators in the Implementation of School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment (Smea): A Phenomenology

Emma Lou E. Banaag[1], Mervin G. Salmon[2]

[1]Maed, Teacher, Davao De Oro State College
[2]Ph.D., Professor, Davao De Oro State College

ABSTRACT

This phenomenological study explored the varied perspectives of school heads and coordinators regarding the implementation of school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments (SMEA). The research was framed using the Utilization-focused Evaluation Theory, introduced by Patton in 1970, and supported by the System Theory, which was first proposed by Bertalanffy in 1940 and later expanded by Ashby in 1960. Additionally, the study was linked to the Organizational Learning Theory, developed by Argyris and Schön in 1970. The research was conducted in Mawab, Davao de Oro, with a sample of 7 school heads and 5 coordinators, selected through purposive sampling. The collected data were analyzed using thematic analysis. The findings show that the following major themes surfaced in relation to the actual experiences of school heads and coordinators in carrying out school monitoring, assessment, and adjustments: using SMEA as a tool for school improvement, resource constraints and implementation challenges, collaboration in achieving goal, data-driven decision-making, and additional workload and stress. More so, to address challenges, coping strategies of school heads and coordinators in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments (SMEA) were: harnessing stakeholders support, prioritizing task and effective time management, maintaining positivity and resilience, ensuring well-being and relaxation, and utilizing of trainings and seminars. Furthermore, the insights of school heads and coordinators were summarized into the following themes: focusing on progress and assessment tracking, valuing the impact of SMEA, evaluating strengths and weaknesses for adjustments, continuing teaching and learning improvement via SMEA, strengthening SMEA implementation and streamlining the process. The result of this research can bring awareness to teachers, students, school heads, coordinators, Deped authorities and other researchers who in turn can help in designing appropriate practices, attributes, and strategies in coping with the challenges experienced by school heads and coordinators in the implementation of school heads and coordinators in the implementation of school heads and coordinators in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments.

Keywords: diverse perspectives, School Heads and Coordinators, School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustments (SMEA), qualitative-phenomenological inquiry, purposive sampling, thematic analysis, Mawab, Davao de Oro, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

School Monitoring and Evaluation (SME) plays a crucial role in the development of school operations and curriculum implementation. Through SME implementation, school leaders can utilize its significant findings to improve deliverables for their clientele: the students and stakeholders. Additionally, SME serves as the quickest way to respond to issues and problems that affect the effectiveness and efficiency of program delivery, providing necessary technical assistance. However, school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustment remain challenging for school heads and coordinators due to the various approaches, and the lack of awareness and common understanding regarding the significant role that SME plays during its implementation.

In Angola, a study conducted by Taboso (2020) featured ineffective evaluation methods due to a lack of comprehensive and meaningful assessments of school performance, focusing more on quantitative measures rather than qualitative aspects of teaching and learning. Teachers and school staff often receive minimal or vague feedback after evaluations, which reduces the effectiveness of the monitoring process in facilitating improvement. Additionally, a study by Hamid (2021) that was conducted in Kenya reveals shortcomings in the processes of planning, monitoring, and evaluation that are used in the education system. It observes that plans frequently fail to take performance measures into account, routine monitoring efforts differ in terms of depth and quality, and evaluations are sporadic and cover insufficient ground. Furthermore, there are irregularities in the distribution and application of monies for monitoring and assessment purposes from both donor contributions and the government budget. Similarly, a study in Zambia conducted by Weiss (2021) emphasized how monitoring systems focus on accountability and compliance, rather than providing constructive support that helps schools improve. These monitoring systems fail to consider the unique needs, resources and challenges of school which lead to misaligned assessments and recommendations.

In the Philippines, by the enactment of Republic Act 9155 also known as the "Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001," adherence to the idea that each unit in the education bureaucracy has a specific role, task, and responsibility. In the meantime, research by Barazon Jr. and Paragaso (2019) and cited by Torralba (2021) in the Philippines discovered that the Division of Cebu is still having trouble implementing the school monitoring, assessment, and adjustment system due to disagreements between coordinators and school heads. Additionally, they stated that standards officers' fault-finding mentality, monitors' defective tactics, and the lack of a post-monitoring feedback practice were all present in school monitoring and assessment. The validity and usefulness of the monitoring and assessment process were put in jeopardy by these problems, especially when feedback on both strong and weak areas of teacher performance was not given.

Further, in the Division of Davao de Oro particularly in Mawab District, based on my observation of our coordinator and school head I have noticed that the school monitoring evaluation and adjustment helps improve school governance. Still, due to poor implementation and difficulties in gathering data and information, it remains challenging. Additionally, changing mindsets and aligning school heads and coordinators' perspectives is another issue. Also, based on my initial interview with the SMEA coordinator, there is a problem in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustment system due to lack of technical assistance.

Based on the literature reading shows that there were similar studies conducted about the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments. First, the study of Datahan (2020) on a phenomenological examination of School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment (SMEA) practices in

public secondary schools. The study looked at the procedures used by school principals for progress monitoring, intermediate results tracking, and outcome evaluation. Another study by Bagaya et al. (2020) concurs that challenges and struggles are identified in implementing school monitoring evaluation and adjustments. Although research has looked into how frameworks are implemented in schools, there is still a dearth of data regarding how schools use monitoring evaluation and adjustments to guide practices, pinpoint areas that require improvement, and modify interventions to fit the wide range of school needs. Moreover, the goal of this study is to evaluate how public schools in Mawab District carried out the School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustment (SMEA) program throughout the academic year of 2023-2024. Furthermore, the researcher has not come across any research that examines the various viewpoints of school heads and coordinators while putting school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments into practice. The issue's recent appearance is another reason for the insufficient quality of literature in both the national and local contexts and this gap must be filled. Hence, as a result, the researcher is more enthusiastic to conduct the research.

Since a DepEd directive was recently issued requiring strict implementation and utilization of the school monitoring evaluation and adjustment governance system, the study's conduct is urgent. Moreover, this study could give information to the Department of Education about the diverse perspectives of the school heads and coordinators in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments. Additionally, this study would also improve the feedback system that the department needs in order to properly monitor and evaluate the school governance system and learning outcomes. Furthermore, with experiences of the participants in this study will provide ideas on the challenges of school heads and coordinators regarding the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments system. Lastly, their insights regarding the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments may become a way to help improve the management of the school, enhance the school policies and school improvement plans, and maybe a way to help improve the Department of Education system.

By elucidating the aims of this phenomenological investigation, we anticipate attaining tangible outcomes. These findings could serve as a valuable resource, particularly for school heads and coordinators. Additionally, we plan to disseminate our findings through various channels, such as organizing workshops and orientations on implementing school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments. Also, disseminating them via publications in scholarly journals and presenting them at research conferences at local, national, and international levels.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to investigate and comprehend school heads and coordinators' diverse perspectives in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments in Mawab District, Division of Davao de Oro.

At that point in the investigation, the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments was one of the school governance systems that defined a comprehensive process that needed to be addressed within the educational system and acted upon by the school heads and coordinators. Their aim was to systematically assess, oversee, and adapt various aspects of school operations to ensure effectiveness, quality, and continuous improvement.

Research Questions

1. What are the lived experiences of the school heads and coordinators in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments?

2. How do school heads and coordinators cope with the challenges of implementing school monitoring evaluation and adjustments?
3. What are the insights of school heads and coordinators on implementing school monitoring evaluation and adjustments?

Theoretical Lens

This research was viewed through the perspectives of Utilization-focused Evaluation Theory, pioneered by Patton in 1970, System Theory, initially introduced by Bertalanffy in 1940 and expanded upon by Ashby in 1960, and Organizational Learning Theory, developed by Agris and Schon in 1970.

Utilization-focused Evaluation Theory (Patton, 1970) emphasized the importance of assessments in a collaborative, context-sensitive evaluation approach that was flexible to meet the needs of stakeholders and facilitate the use of evaluation findings. The Utilization-focused Evaluation operated on the principle that the merit of an evaluation should be assessed based on its utility. This theory held that to have the best chance of improving performance or being included in decision-making, it needed to be carefully planned and carried out. As a result, utilization-focused theory prioritized the requirements of verified, identifiable stakeholders. It was the responsibility of the evaluator to guide the evaluation in a way that best met these criteria and incorporated users at every stage.

In this study, Patton's utilization-focused evaluation theory was used to understand and comprehend stakeholder demands and address them. Additionally, it guaranteed the relevance and significance of evaluations by giving precedence to the viewpoints and needs of the individuals who ultimately utilized the evaluation results. The theory of utilization-focused evaluation provided solutions predicated on the notion that intended users were more likely to use the results when they felt that they had control over the assessment process and had actively participated from the start (Patton). Moreover, in this study, this theory helped coordinators and school heads promote decision-making, organizational learning, accountability, and stakeholder empowerment, while highlighting the significance of performing evaluations and adjustments that were pertinent, timely, and helpful to learners and stakeholders.

Another theory that was viewed in this study was System Theory, which was first introduced by Bertalanffy (1940) and furthered by Ashby (1960). It emphasized how subsystems that were not necessarily related to one another worked together to create a whole. System Theory was an interdisciplinary approach that focused on understanding and researching complex systems, often referred to as systems science or systems thinking. In general, a system was described as a collection of linked parts or units that cooperated to accomplish a common objective. This theory proved useful for solving issues in the real world that comprised several interrelated components.

In this study, System Theory helped researchers and practitioners better understand the intricacy of real-world occurrences and recognize the interdependence of various systems and components. Additionally, this theory guided school heads and coordinators to understand concepts such as organizational behavior, organizational change, and organizational growth, and how these concepts were facilitated. Furthermore, this theory was employed to elucidate various organizational components and explain the experiences of school heads and coordinators in school monitoring evaluations and adjustments influenced by internal and external factors, such as the inadequate application of monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments.

In addition, the Organizational Learning Theory, as developed by Agris and Schon (1970), was also used in this study. Organizational theory was a field that encompassed a variety of approaches to studying organizations to explain how they functioned. Organizations were structured social entities that aimed to achieve shared goals and meet needs and objectives. This theory examined how entities gathered,

analyzed, and used knowledge to become more effective overall. An organization's ability to adapt to changing conditions, enhance performance, and achieve long-term success depended on its capacity to learn continuously (Agris, 1970). The theory acknowledged that organizations were dynamic, ever-changing systems that were impacted by both internal and external forces, and that survival and expansion relied heavily on their capacity to learn and adapt.

In this study, Organizational Learning Theory helped coordinators and school heads highlight the significance of learning new information and abilities to adjust to changes in both internal and external environments by systematically capturing, sharing, and applying knowledge across the institution. Furthermore, this study provided school heads and coordinators with conceptual frameworks for comprehending the composition, actions, and operations of the institution. It also contributed to resolving fundamental queries concerning the structure of the institution, the reasons behind their actions, and the best ways to govern them. Moreover, Organizational Learning Theory aimed to increase the long-term success of the institution by fostering a culture of learning, which enabled better management of complexity, wise decision-making, and adaptation to changing conditions.

Scope and Limitation of the Study

This qualitative research focused on the fourteen public school leaders and coordinators within Mawab District, who were currently employed by the Department of Education. The study was scheduled to take place from May to July in the academic year 2024. It involved seven individuals for in-depth interviews (IDI) and another seven for focus group discussions (FGD).

This study solely involved specific research participants; thus, its findings could not be broadly applied or generalized. Consequently, the paper provided detailed descriptions of the participants' perspectives on the challenges related to the implementation of school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments.

Importance of the Study

This study aimed to contribute to the management of schools, enhance school governance and policies, and improve DepEd systems. Therefore, it was important to conduct the study.

This account helped teachers identify and address factors that could affect students' performance. It also improved the overall learning environment and academic success of students by implementing targeted improvements to teaching methods, curriculum structure, and support systems through ongoing assessment. This study provided additional information about the benefits, challenges, and coping mechanisms of teachers in monitoring evaluation and adjustments.

Furthermore, this study could be highly beneficial to students in understanding not only academic concerns but also their development, including social, emotional, and behavioral characteristics. Adaptations to programs and support systems could enhance students' overall well-being and character development. This endeavor might serve as a useful reference for future researchers directing their studies.

This study could also serve as an eye-opener for school heads and SMEA coordinators to strengthen the school governance system and develop more workshops and seminars related to monitoring evaluation and adjustments, not only in school management but also in other pertinent fields. This research could assist teachers in understanding the vital role of monitoring evaluation and adjustments in the development of students.

Additionally, this study offered an opportunity for all DepEd authorities to heighten findings from monitoring and assessment research that could influence reforms and policies in education at the school, district, or federal levels. It facilitated the making of evidence-based decisions, which in turn promoted the development of more effective educational methods and institutions. Furthermore, it aimed to

maximize the use of resources, including money, time, and people, by identifying areas needing improvement as well as successful practices, enabling schools to more effectively deploy resources to support teaching and learning.

In a similar manner, this study was expected to serve as a source for future researchers in their upcoming research papers, aiding students in identifying variables related to the subject and providing suggestions for what to focus on regarding the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments.

Moreover, it was anticipated that this study would have an impact, particularly in light of local, national, and international test results when any kinks were worked out during this event.

Definition of Terms

For the terminologies employed in the study, the researcher gave definitions that were both conceptual and contextual. The literature that already existed and contained definitions of these terms from different writers served as a guide for conceptual definitions. After that, contextual definitions were created to show how these important concepts were used throughout the study. This strategy was chosen to bestow readers with a thorough comprehension of the jargon used in this inquiry.

School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustments (SMEA). Describes a perspective and method that provides wealth information and viewpoints on various aspect of educational system. It aims to ensure that educators follow the rules that control the process of teaching and learning. This study uses the term concerning a governance system that is being implemented by school heads and coordinators and the subject matter to be discussed and studied Daka and Changwe (2020).

Diverse Perspective of School Heads and Coordinators. In this study, it pertains to the approach that school heads and coordinators may process differently depending on a variety of criteria, including their educational philosophy, leadership style, priorities, and the unique needs and setting of their schools, as recognized by their diversified perspective. The range of these perspectives emphasizes how dynamic and complex educational leadership is, and how adaptable strategies are necessary to address the particular difficulties and objectives of any school.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This section encompasses readings conducted by the researcher from a diverse range of sources, such as works of various researchers and scholars, websites, books, periodicals, and other pertinent materials related to the subject matter. There are four subheadings mentioned in this study namely, School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustments, Barriers to Effective SMEA Implementation, Strategies Employed in SMEA Implementation and Insights and Future Directions. These topics in the subheadings help the researcher to have a deep knowledge of the study to be conducted through reading previous studies and articles related to the research.

School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustments

Monitoring and evaluation furnish decision-makers with data on the advancement toward attaining specified objectives and aims, offering substantial evidence to support any required adjustments in policies, programs, or projects during the implementation process Durlak (2019). Moreover, to give management and important stakeholders an ongoing development intervention insight into the progress and achievement of objectives and the allocation of allocated funds, monitoring entails a continuous procedure that methodically collects data on preset indicators. Also, evaluation is the methodical and objective appraisal of a project, program, or policy that is in progress or has already concluded, considering all aspects of its creation, execution, and results. Additionally, the purpose of monitoring and assessment

is to evaluate the effectiveness of development, impact, sustainability, efficiency, and the goals' relevance and accomplishment (Stromquist & Monkman, 2019).

Additionally, SMEA seeks to provide unbiased information that provides standards for decision-making by following key principles, including delivering high-quality data, strengthening systems, ensuring efficiency, maintaining transparency, promoting learning and accountability, and maintaining focus as discussed by Adaletey & George (2019). This information is intended to drive continuous improvements in school performance across several areas, such as curriculum programs and projects, educational resources, teaching and learning processes, teacher and student performance, school management, productivity, and community involvement, to achieve the desired educational outcomes. Monitoring and evaluation are crucial procedures that help educators and school administrators identify problem areas, make the necessary corrections, and raise the general efficacy of instructional strategies (Cruz, 2019).

Furthermore, monitoring gives information on how a project, program, or policy is doing right now in terms of its objectives and results. The goal of monitoring and evaluation is to keep track of how programs are progressing and how policies are having an impact. It also assesses the efficacy of a policy, the significance of an activity's results, and the entire initiative's sustainability and efficiency. Also, monitoring gives details on how a project, policy, or program is doing concerning its goals and objectives as of right now (Vasavi, 2019).

Moreover, the purpose of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework is to supervise program activity progress and policy impact. It assesses the efficacy of a policy, the relevance of the results, efficiency, and sustainability (Sharma, 2020). According to Sharma, evaluation aims to address difficulties and challenges related to the accomplishment of results by determining whether targets and outcomes are successfully reached. The primary goal of school monitoring evaluation system, is to meet learning objectives, monitor students' initial development, and assess the school's effectiveness in implementing the projects and programs specified in the School Improvement Plan (SIP). This includes overall school progress as well as intermediate results and outcomes. Thus, the method of SM&E places a strong focus on the students, with increased enrollment, student access, and involvement being key components that determine how effective the school is. The fulfillment of prerequisites for basic education, student retention, and advancements in student performance are indicators of success Datahan (2020).

In addition, SM&E system promotes intermediate outcomes, such as the caliber of instruction and learning, enhancements to learner participation in instructional activities, better access to learning resources and facilities, improvements to School-Based Management practices, and favorable opinions from school stakeholders as quoted by Nolasco (2020). And also, keeps an eye on how the school is using funds, managing resources, and implementing SIP initiatives and programs as part of the monitoring and assessment process for school success. Furthermore, the school monitoring system tracks school monitoring evaluation and adjustments involved in executing and advancing programs, as well as inputs about the management of school MOEE and other financial resources. Additionally, the system of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments empowers school principals to identify substantial advancements in any dimension of their management when all factors align correctly Stachowiak (2013).

On the other hand, SMEA provides a platform for evaluating school performance as an outcome assessment technique. This gets ready for the annual review as well as the evaluations that come after implementation Gibson et al. (2000) cited by Macalindong (2019). It also provides a means of keeping an eye on intermediate results by providing a forum for educational institutions, and internal and external stakeholders, to track the advancement of their students. This aspect of assessment and monitoring gives

educators and schools the chance to pinpoint learners who require particular treatments. When it comes to curriculum implementation, is a way to figure out what kind of technical support or training teachers need to improve their abilities (Paragoso & Barazon, 2019). Also, it enables educators and other staff members to evaluate their own work, which is in line with the Department of Education's Results-Based Performance Management system, which aims to improve worker effectiveness. It also includes staff development, with an emphasis on improving teachers' abilities. It also covers the use of school buildings and other resources, maintaining and improving the educational environment, and financial management in connection to tangible accomplishments as stated by Awefeso (2019).

However, Senge (2019) connected his study to the concept of continuous improvement through collaboration which emphasized that effective collaboration during the monitoring and evaluation phases allows for feedback from various stakeholders to help refine strategies and achieve educational goals. Consequently, under the governance, DepEd Order No. 39, which was published in 2016 entitled "Adoption of the Basic Education Research Agenda Monitoring and Evaluation," evaluates the degree to which projects and programs are being implemented effectively and efficiently. The directive emphasizes how crucial it is for the Department of Education to keep up its governance research, considering that it is the department's largest area with complex interrelationships. Regional Memorandum Order No. 222 from 2013 provides guidelines for the implementation of School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment (SMEA), District Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustment (DsMEA), and Division Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustment (DMEA) during the second and third quarters of the 2015-2016 school year. Furthermore, School Monitoring and Evaluation system is an internal framework designed to support decision-making needs and was primarily created for school administrators and instructors Mendels (2019). More so, overseeing curriculum implementation acts as a quality control measure for the school, ensuring that the teaching staff is following the curriculum correctly and up to date, as stated in the DepEd School Monitoring & Evaluation manual. Through this process, the head of the school may keep an eye on how the curriculum is being implemented and assess the caliber of the inputs that are helping students build their abilities (Rebleza, 2020). Further, data gathered from curriculum implementation observations helps school administrators evaluate the program's efficacy, pinpoint the areas of strength and weakness in the curriculum's delivery by teachers, and monitor the development of students' performance. School leaders are also able to share their successful techniques with other schools through the help of monitoring and evaluation.

In addition, organizational learning is aided by the ongoing feedback provided by Monitoring and Evaluation systems during the management process as progress is tracked and evaluated toward a particular goal and also supports organizational learning in this context as emphasized by Funnel and Rogers (2018). In general, the monitoring and evaluation system can significantly affect educational services and promote development and economic progress. Hence, school monitoring and evaluation define programs as combinations of simple, complicated, and complex elements based on seven criteria: stable goals, governance, consistent execution, and necessary to achieve desired results Tsui et al. (2019). Moreover, as stated in the vision and purpose, the Department of Education has been reiterating its departmental goals. School administrators are responsible for clearly establishing program and project objectives while also emphasizing accountability and transparency in the cost-effective utilization of funds and resources. When this is done, the expected benefits materialize and yield better overall performance (Shiver, 2018). Stakeholders are important organizational partners in achieving the goals of the school,

and the administrators of the school must be able to foster their support for the monitoring and evaluation system to remain effective over time (Tiburca, 2019).

Further, the main goal of the monitoring and evaluation system for schools is stated in the Department of Education's School Monitoring & Evaluation System handbook. This goal is to support instructors in upholding the standards of the teaching and learning process while providing the school head with the knowledge and understanding he or she needs for efficient and successful school-based management (Bartoletti, 2019). The idea that positive behaviors result in beneficial consequences is further highlighted. A school's ability to function effectively depends on how well-run its administration is as well as how well it uses monitoring and assessment procedures. Evaluations eventually entail rendering conclusions based on the data on the effectiveness, value, and merit of a school's interventions or programs Tsui et al. (2019). Moreover, the primary goal of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System is to provide crucial information and perspectives that enable the school head to conduct school-based management effectively and efficiently (Mckinsey, 2019). The technology also helps educators oversee the teaching and learning process in compliance with standards. Information and insights about learners' progress, attainment of desired learning competencies, learners' potential to meet the requirements of the next learning level, the efficiency with which the curriculum is implemented, school programs and projects, overall progress, and the caliber of the teaching and learning process are all provided by the School M&E System (Chebet, 2021).

Additionally, Komba (2019) looked into the connections between Tanzanian public school pupils' learning outcomes and educational accountability last year. The study found that although Tanzanian educational policies and programs use the phrase "accountability" quite a bit, there aren't enough explicit structures, relationships, or procedures to support accountability at various levels. Furthermore, in Kisarawe District, Tanzania, research was carried out evaluating the effects of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms on community-based project sustainability. The findings demonstrated the value of monitoring and assessment programs in ensuring the long-term viability of a range of community initiatives, including educational ones Maijo (2020). It is noteworthy, therefore, that the impact of the monitoring and assessment procedure on instruction and learning in advanced secondary schools was not expressly covered by the study Poister (2019).

On the other hand, the study on Ruvuma Region emphasized how district councils can use monitoring and evaluation as a management tool for a range of initiatives and activities, such as those about agriculture, sanitation, health, and education. It was observed, meanwhile, that these councils hardly ever conducted evaluations Mhina (2019). In this capacity, the school head's duties include overseeing the conflicting demands of improving the institution, supporting the professional growth of teachers, and guaranteeing the provision of an excellent teaching and learning environment Harrison (2020). The school head, as a crucial part of the educational system, needs to be able to respond with skill to the demands and expectations of different stakeholders. The system gives the head of the school, the teachers, and the students information and insights so they may evaluate and analyze their efficacy and efficiency. It acts as a tool to support continuous learning in the classroom while the School Improvement Plan (SIP) is put into practice DeVellis (2018).

In addition, the school's internal operations are the main focus of the M&E System. Its main goal is to meet the head of the school's, teachers', and even students' decision-making demands (Calder, 2019). In the end, the system is designed to provide stakeholders with precise and timely information about the caliber and advancement of educational services provided by the school. It offers insightful information

to help supervisory units evaluate the efficacy of the Department of Education's standards, initiatives, and policies in the field of education Kusek and Rist (2019). Lastly, Kirimi and Maluwa (2020) looked into how stakeholders participated in the procedures of monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of literacy and numeracy teaching in public primary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya. The report revealed important problems with school monitoring and assessment. A noteworthy issue pertains to structural independence, whereby the reporting procedures and administrative framework are designed in a way that preserves the objectivity and trustworthiness of the data that is gathered (Kyalo, 2020).

Furthermore, SMEA aims to provide objective information that aids in decision-making by adhering to principles like providing high-quality information, fortifying systems, guaranteeing efficiency, preserving transparency for important stakeholders, encouraging collaboration, encouraging learning and accountability, and keeping focus. In order to achieve the intended educational outcomes, this information is meant to continuously improve school performance in a variety of areas, such as curriculum programs and projects, educational resources, teaching and learning processes, teacher and student performance, school management, productivity, and community engagement. Also, key elements required for creating and executing an effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework were found in recent research by Abdourahmane (2021) on evaluating the efficacy of M&E systems. As a result, an effective M&E system greatly improves the creation of better policies and programs, facilitates better operational decision-making, fortifies tactical and strategic decision-making, increases the organization's capacity to meet its development objectives, and finds M&E beneficial to all.

Additionally, the necessity of streamlining monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems to avoid overburdening school personnel with administrative responsibilities that interfere with teaching and learning is a recurrent issue in the literature. The intricacy of some M&E systems can divert attention from crucial educational tasks. Schools can focus on improving performance rather than being overburdened with paperwork and reporting by simplifying these procedures as claimed by Mertins and Wilsons (2019). Also, the literature also emphasizes the importance of shifting M&E efforts toward outcome-oriented evaluation, which directly assesses student performance and program effectiveness. Simplifying evaluation frameworks allows educators and administrators to focus on measurable outcomes, rather than being consumed by complex, process-oriented reporting requirements argued by Mackenzie et al. (2019).

Barriers to Effective SMEA Implementation

In a research study on the monitoring and evaluation system in education, one of the most difficult jobs in terms of human resource development is managing schools Javed et al. (2021). Three main categories can be used to categorize the challenges faced during monitoring and evaluation, as stated in the 2019 UNICEF study. Gaining support from a variety of stakeholders can be difficult, especially if they do not care or show interest. But you can win their support by using a clever combination of persuasion and appreciation for what they've done. Report overlap is another major obstacle, especially in the educational system where schools are sometimes expected to produce a large number of reports. One possible way to address this issue is to streamline this process by combining databases and reports, which can cut down on the time and effort needed to prepare them Kabeyi (2019).

Meanwhile, research emphasized that a lack of cooperation causes problems for many schools when it comes to monitoring and evaluation. Also showed that evaluation is important for policy and plan creation processes in the public sector Phases including problem identification and definition, formulation, implementation, and evaluation are covered by both of these procedures Guyadeen and Seasons (2018). The same study in Namibia's monitoring of school performance for standard-based reforms found that a

major obstacle to monitoring and evaluating schools is the lack of systematic data collecting on certain education-related variables Williams (2018). In addition, Williams also noted that the monitoring and evaluation process is hampered by the lack of understanding among those in charge of implementation. This is because evaluation comprises a methodical and impartial appraisal of a project, policy, or program—whether it is continuing or has already been completed—that takes into account all aspects of its creation, execution, and results. The main objective is to provide timely assessments of the effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and relevance of interventions together with an overall assessment of the degree of progress made concerning the initial goals. Moreover, numerous difficulties were found in the monitoring and evaluation of community-based initiatives in Kisarawe District, Tanzania, assessment of the effect of monitoring and evaluation systems on the sustainability of such projects. One major issue that has been noted is the deficiency of monitoring and evaluation specialists. Additionally, there is a lack of community involvement in the study area's community-based project monitoring and assessment processes to Maijo's (2020). Additionally, a study in the Ruvuma Region found that district councils do not have many evaluations. Also showed that the assessment that was being done was not evaluation; rather, it was mainly output-focused monitoring rather than outcomes or program impacts Mhina (2019). Furthermore, the study found that, despite the difficulties encountered, monitoring mostly focuses on improving the performance of the ongoing project in their study on monitoring and assessment of climate resilience for agricultural development et al. (2019). Data is collected to track the present project's development and then used to guide choices meant to enhance its effectiveness. On the other hand, evaluation entails reviewing and evaluating the results of previous projects, and the data acquired is used to guide decisions about subsequent initiatives Mackay (2020).

However, the following are some of the obstacles that prevent monitoring and evaluation from being implemented properly. Finding enough time and resources is a major barrier to guaranteeing successful monitoring and evaluation processes, according to a study by Salamon (2018) on monitoring and evaluation: critical steps for long-term services and supports companies. Salomon also stated that owing to the widespread financial limitations that several organizations encounter, Monitoring and Evaluation could be overlooked in favor of other tasks. In addition, monitoring and evaluation, require resources which emphasizes the need for setting aside a sufficient budget. They claimed that evaluation and monitoring could be expensive and time-consuming. Thus, the total cost of an endeavor may be much higher if the system is not implemented correctly.

On the other hand, a study investigated how Uganda's National Non-Governmental Organizations (NNGOs) performed in relation to several elements of the Monitoring and Evaluation System. The study also found that a major issue facing M&E in many private companies is a lack of technical know-how Eremugo and Okoche (2021). More so, the significant challenges such as resource limitations, particularly in the areas of time, funding, and manpower. These constraints often hinder the effective implementation of school programs, including monitoring and evaluation processes stated by Quisumbing (2018). Furthermore, the same study highlighted how attitudes and culture, especially in private institutions, have a big impact on how monitoring and assessment procedures are carried out. Additionally, the study found that maintaining an organizational culture that supports the process is another M&E problem. Moreover, a lack of focus was found to be problematic, especially when figuring out where the organization should focus its efforts on the effect of monitoring and evaluation on the performance of non-governmental organization projects in Kiambu County. The study brought to light the wealth of data and information that companies can gather regarding initiatives and their outcomes Karanja and Yusuf (2018).

As such, another research conducted by Calder (2018) which stated that school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments can create additional demands on educators, leading to increased workload and stress. Also, it highlighted that these processes can contribute to increased demands on educators. As a result, they may be overburdened with work, leading to high levels of stress and exhaustion Rose & Sika (2019). Moreover, the implications of high-stakes accountability and the resulting pressure on educators, contribute to their stress and workload as stated by Ruzzi (2018). One of the possible causes of the children' poor learning outcomes is this deficiency.

Moreover, with the urgency of the reports required by the higher office and the conflicting schedules of different call ups and seminars of the District, Division, Regional and National office, school data validation was done haphazardly, resulting to data disparity. The SHs have also reported that school data submitted to the District and Division Office did not coincide with school enrolment generated from the Learner's Information System (LIS). These consistencies were also true to other countries particularly states in India where data derived from their Resource Management Systems do not compare favorably with data derived from the school census Karnataka and Pradesh (2018). In the case of big schools, there are instances of late submission of the teachers, considering the large number of populations of teaching and non-teaching staff, the data collection process become challenge. The teachers and school heads tended to complain about the data gathering template, data collection redundancy, time constraints in data gathering and validation cycle, higher offices' response to reported problems, limited skills in data characterization, numerous data requirements, inconsistent data result, conflicting priorities, data system storage, stakeholders' attendance, and teachers' prompt submission of reports. Reports had observed on the amount of time and attention spent on the formulation and designing of a single data collection template for school planning documents rather than promoting contextual implementation Read & Atinc (2018). This posed pressures to teachers and school heads since they perceived these tantamount of data as burdensome and useless and did not contribute anything to the progress of the school Paragoso & Barazon (2019). Moreover, they moaned on the lack of reliable data system storage that is accessible by all end users. Because of time lags, inadequate data sharing policies and lack of transparency, data are not being used to their full potential (Read & Atinc 2017).

Furthermore, in school monitoring and evaluation procrastination and prioritization often begin by attending to an interruption from work, which is accompanied by a lack of discipline to maintain focus on the original activity Topp (2019). The interruption and lack of focus allow one's attention to be drawn to the distraction and result in further procrastination, which begins the cycle anew.

Strategies Employed in SMEA Implementation

In the study by Bilbao et al. (2019), stated that by providing teachers with technical support, the principal can improve curriculum delivery performance and fortify their oversight of instruction. Expertise is required to perform at a better level. Successful school principals can help n by providing them with coaching to improve their performance and productivity (Montelbon, 2019). Also, the significance of training and seminars in equipping school administrators with the necessary abilities to oversee educational reforms is emphasized by Madrid (2018) in research on educational leadership. Thus, contends that continuing education via seminars, workshops, and technical assistance is essential for improving school heads' leadership skills, especially when handling intricate procedures like SMEA.

Furthermore, principals of schools should consult with an unbiased outsider while having conversations on important procedures meant to improve and enhance performance as emphasized by Aguilar (2020). They must find and implement excellent techniques in their schools. Schools with lower performance

levels might then use and adopt the best practices that have been identified. Ensuring that all population segments and educational levels receive equal and high-quality education is one of the main goals of monitoring and assessment in education Hoy and Hoy (2020).

Moreover, as required by the Department of Education, school principals must provide technical assistance to their subordinates to guarantee that instructors carry out their duties proficiently and effectively to attain better results. Also, as stated by Biasong (2019), providing data on education delivery to the division's information management department so that it can serve as a foundation for technical support is one of the objectives that supports the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) program's overall aim. To improve overall sustainability, the study recommended a higher degree of community involvement in the various project management phases.

On the other hand, principals use the findings of the School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment as a benchmark, directing them toward the necessary changes to improve organizational performance and the caliber of instruction. It is possible to modify the excellent methods used by high-achieving schools for application in different types of learning environments. UNESCO (2018) stated that Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems can reveal unanticipated but possibly advantageous project, program, and policy outcomes. They also play a critical role in discovering potentially effective programs or practices. In light of the limited resources available, school administrators must implement efficient management strategies to save money and resources according to Marriot and Goyder (2019). Thus, a larger budget has been set aside by the implementing schools (IUs) for the implementation of initiatives and programs inside the school (McShane, 2020).

Moreover, schools that adapt their M&E systems based on feedback report greater satisfaction because they see tangible improvements in student outcomes, teaching practices, and resource allocation. The role of M&E in educational change, noting that when schools engage in systematic monitoring and evaluation, there is often an increase in stakeholder satisfaction, especially when adjustments based on evaluation results lead to noticeable improvements as stated by Spinks (2018).

Furthermore, continuous improvement is supported by thorough and regular reporting on the status of school activities. Teachers, legislators, and educational leaders can track successes, identify flaws, and make necessary adjustments by giving regular reports. Teaching and learning outcomes are enhanced by data-driven decision-making made easier by the feedback produced by these reports Woulfe (2018). Regular reporting also keeps important stakeholders, like school boards, parents, and local communities, informed about the school's performance, according to studies on school accountability. Accountability mechanisms within educational systems work best when they are transparent and based on clear, regularly updated performance data as noted by Anderson & Herr (2018).

As such, information from periodical reports helps educators and policymakers adjust their approaches, change the way they teach, reallocate resources, or even change the curriculum in light of the knowledge gathered from ongoing evaluations according to LeMahieu (2018). Continuous evaluations and modifications are necessary for educational programs to continue to be effective. Stressing the need for consistent reporting in maintaining the advantages of a program over time. It guarantees that the required adjustments are made to maintain the program's relevance, especially in light of changing educational environments as reflected by the work of Harris (2018). More so, rigorous implementation of school improvement plans requires regular assessment to ensure fidelity to the original goals. Without continuous monitoring, schools may fail to adapt or adjust strategies in response to evolving needs, thus hindering sustained improvement. Schools must continuously evaluate whether strategies are being implemented as

intended, and make necessary adjustments. Also, regular reports and evaluations allow for immediate corrective actions to ensure that the school improvement plans are not just theoretical but are actively driving change Crowe (2018).

However, feedback loops resulting from ongoing assessment and monitoring are essential to sustaining long-term school development. They stress that review and monitoring ought to be seen as continuous procedures rather than one-time events. Schools can promote more significant and long-lasting improvements by incorporating feedback into routine school procedures. They contend that schools must continuously assess their instructional strategies, leadership philosophies, and student achievement if they hope to foster a culture of improvement according to Stoll et al. (2019). As to this content, the necessity of continuing SMEA for school improvement is deeply embedded in the literature on educational leadership and improvement practices. Regular and rigorous monitoring and evaluation help to identify gaps, ensure fidelity to reform plans, make necessary adjustments, and hold schools accountable for their performance. The continuous cycle of feedback and adjustment helps ensure that school improvement efforts lead to tangible and sustainable changes as stated by Leithwood (2018).

Additionally, clear and well-defined policy guidelines are essential for the successful implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems in schools. Policies that provide detailed processes, roles, and responsibilities for each stage of the SMEA process help to ensure that schools can execute their improvement plans effectively (Barton, 2018). More so, policymakers must ensure clear communication of expectations and processes for SMEA to be effective (Leithwood & Louis, 2018). They argue that without well-communicated policies, school leaders may struggle to align local initiatives with broader educational goals, leading to fragmented or inconsistent monitoring practices. Clear guidelines from policymakers not only help standardize monitoring processes across schools but also enable administrators to allocate resources appropriately and set up appropriate feedback mechanisms.

Furthermore, with the study of Peck (2018), there are a variety of approaches to time management, these involve allocating time to activities that will help achieve goals, monitoring, setting goals, prioritizing, planning, delegating, and analysis of time spent on tasks. In addtion, time must be scheduled before calendars become full of meetings, committees, or nonrequired teaching obligations. For effective monitoring and evaluation, it is essential to use time management to prioritize and schedule responsibilities according to Smith (2019). More so, in the study of Anuveocu (2020) suggested that school leaders who excel in prioritizing tasks and managing their time are more capable of handling the complexities involved in monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments.

Moreover, to cope with challenges in school monitoring evaluation and adjustments, studies predict that resilient people use positive emotions to rebound from, and find positive meaning in, stressful encounters. As such, it is believed that resilience may be developed in the individual or community by having a positive attitude. Positive thinking is creating positive thoughts, focusing energy on reality, and creating a positive attitude to manage challenges and have a better outcome Cicchetti (2019). Additionally, researchers discovered that resilience comes from a positive attitude and emotions that will maintain a positive approach toward work Zucker and Brehm (2018). Furthermore, the value of resilience in school leadership addresses the need for educators and school administrators to be flexible, adaptive, and upbeat in order to successfully execute educational changes as stated by de Guzman (2018).

Additionally, ensuring well-being and relaxation is another coping strategy for the challenges encountered by school heads and coordinators in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments. Well-being is described as "enabling people to develop their potential, work productively and creatively,

form positive relationships with others, and meaningfully contribute to the community" (Foresight Mental Capital and Well-being Project, 2018). Taking breaks is important in recovering from stress, which can, in turn, improve your performance. Relaxing and social breaks are particularly beneficial according to Bloom and Sianoja (2018). A relaxing break can help to facilitate recovery, by returning your mental and psychical functional systems to their baseline. More so, a relaxing break can help to reset your mood, thereby promoting positive well-being and reducing stress as stated by (Park and Nui 2018). Furthermore, school administrators and coordinators must put their mental and emotional health first in order to improve their effectiveness as leaders Villanueva (2020). Also, promotes the use of stress-reduction and relaxation techniques, such as taking breaks and exercising, to assist school administrators stay motivated and effective during trying times.

Insights and Future Directions

In study by Fullan (2020) emphasized the power of collective efficacy among educators. He argues that when teachers and administrators work together towards common goals, they are more likely to create meaningful change and improve student outcomes. This collaboration fosters a sense of ownership and accountability, encouraging everyone involved to contribute to the school's vision and goals, and highlighting the importance of engaging parents and the wider community in the educational process. Collaborative relationships with these stakeholders can provide valuable insights and support, enhancing the overall learning environment. Additionally, collaboration among school heads, teachers, and the community contributes to achieving school goals and improving educational outcomes Dimanalanta (2020). Furthermore, schools should create systems for ongoing assessment and dialogue among educators to refine strategies and practices based on data and shared experiences Pecajas (2022).

Moreover, proficient Monitoring and Evaluation can alleviate some of the significant challenges faced by non-profit organizations. Gaining insight into areas where one can exert the most influence and identifying the critical factors for successful interventions can result in the liberation of staff time and resources (Gabito, 2018). In addition, to achieve noteworthy results, school principals must take the initiative to develop and apply techniques to improve performance in a variety of contexts, including the teaching and learning process. As stated by Pacia and Hoy (2008) cited by Scheeren (2019), as a curriculum manager, the principal is in charge of supervising and offering technical assistance to improve learning outcomes. Additionally, satisfaction grows when teachers and administrators feel that M&E is not only about accountability but also a tool for improvement. When adjustments are made based on evidence from evaluations, stakeholders feel more engaged and confident in the decisions being made as discussed by Wilton (2019). Also, as stated by McCrea (2020), in her research on educational interventions, emphasizes that educational adjustments should be tailored to the specific context of each school. She argues that a standardized approach may not be effective, and instead, adjustments should consider the unique factors of each school, such as its resources, culture, student population, and community dynamics. Furthermore, as suggested by Hattie and Tamperly (2020) research on feedback in schools underscores the significance of feedback loops in the processes of monitoring and evaluation. They propose that feedback should be timely, specific, and constructive to effectively support student learning, and that it should guide not only student progress but also inform adjustments in teaching methods and school policies.

In summary, this literature described the school monitoring and evaluation adjustments through the lens of school heads and coordinators. It is well known that the implementation of school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments is a difficult process requiring a significant amount of work. Educators, learners, administrators, and the Department of Education are among the many parties actively engaged

in creating an all-encompassing system for school observation, assessment, and correction. Additionally, the data presented in this section is organized to give readers a comprehensive grasp of the topic and how the study problem necessitates interdisciplinary collaboration. Moreover, the information in this section is arranged to give readers a clear knowledge of the topic and to clarify how the research problem crosses multiple disciplines and calls for their implementation. Together with the justification for the selected research approach and the expected consequences of the current study, this literature evaluation indicates the need for more research in this area.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This research applied a qualitative research design utilizing the phenomenological approach to gain further insights from the lived experiences of public school heads and coordinators in implementing school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments. The qualitative research set interpretative, practical techniques that made the world visible. Also, in qualitative research, individual narratives were valued, allowing participants to openly and honestly discuss their experiences. This method stressed the participants' capacity to tell their stories without the researcher imposing any preconceived ideas about the subject into the discussion (Cresswell and Poth, 2018). In addition, this method was frequently used to generate ideas, investigate novel areas of study, or offer a deeper comprehension of problems that quantitative approaches alone could not adequately convey. Furthermore, qualitative research enabled a thorough examination of a phenomenon by capturing the nuances and subtleties that quantitative measurements could overlook. It offered comprehensive insights into the feelings, ideas, and actual experiences of participants (Morse et al., 2020). Consequently, this research involved conducting in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. Qualitative research was a widely used approach for gathering information through various interview formats, such as structured, semi-structured, and unstructured interviews. All data were accurately collected from the participants' locations (Denzin and Lincoln, 2018).

Furthermore, a phenomenological approach was utilized in this study to investigate the lived experiences of public school heads and coordinators regarding the implementation of school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments. Phenomenological research was an inquiry method developed from philosophy and psychology in which the researcher described participants' firsthand accounts of a phenomenon as recounted by the participants (Larkin, 2019). This approach centered on investigating people's actual encounters with a specific occurrence to comprehend its essence and significance (Huyler et al., 2019). This description aligned with the essence of the experiences of people who had all witnessed the phenomenon. This design had strong philosophical foundations and usually entailed conducting interviews (Creswell et al., 2018).

In this study, the appropriate research methodology for this venture was qualitative phenomenological research design. This approach involved gathering data through interviews to explore the lived experiences, coping mechanisms, and insights of public school heads and coordinators regarding the implementation of school monitoring, evaluations, and adjustments. To mitigate biases and preconceived notions about human experiences, feelings, and responses to a specific phenomenon, all necessary data were collected to comprehensively understand, analyze, interpret, and describe the feedback provided by school heads and coordinators during their transitions from one school to another. Every piece of information collected was important for understanding, evaluating, and interpreting the needs of the

participants in their capacities as the main implementers of the Department of Education's required programs.

Research Participants

This study involved (14) participants in the public schools of Mawab District, Mawab, Davao de Oro. Seven (7) participants underwent in-depth interviews (IDI) and seven (7) participated in focus group discussions (FGD). Creswell (2018) highlighted the importance of participant selection at random and stated that a group of approximately 14 people was ideal for carrying out a qualitative phenomenology investigation.

Additionally, in the course of this research, I intended to employ purposive sampling as the selection method for participants using specific criteria. This approach aimed to facilitate the exploration and generation of comprehensive case-specific data related to the phenomenon of interest, as outlined by Palinkas et al. (2018). As an integral component of this approach, the study's execution incorporated the use of specific criteria.

Furthermore, individuals included in this research were chosen according to specific criteria: (a) they held positions as public school heads and coordinators within the Department of Education; (b) they had a minimum of two years of active service; and (c) they had experience in implementing SMEA. Also, the exclusion criteria were observed: (a) school heads and coordinators who did not have time for scheduled interviews and appointments; (b) school heads and coordinators who had withdrawn from a research study after being initially included.

In addition, participants were notified in advance of the interview schedule, which included the time and place that had been mutually agreed upon. The most important factors to take into account were their willingness and availability to engage.

Role of the Researcher

In qualitative research, the researchers made an effort to gain access to the participants' inner thoughts and experiences. Thus, ensuring the direction and development of the conduct of the study was a primary responsibility of the researchers, Sutton and Austin (2018). In this study, the roles of the researchers were as follows:

First, I ensured the ethical conduct of the study. In my role as the individual responsible for participant identification, I adhered rigorously to the established inclusion criteria, following ethical standards when seeking their consent and confirming their willingness to engage in the study. Moreover, to ensure the ethical robustness of the study, the research manuscript underwent a comprehensive review by the Research Ethics Committee (REC).

Secondly, in my capacity as the interviewer of in-depth interviews following the criteria set for the identification of the participants, I inquired about the participants' availability before confirming the interview schedule, which included discussing the time and preferred location. Also, as moderator for the focus group discussion (FGD), before setting a time, I found out about the participants' availability and preferred time and venue for the focus group discussion. Furthermore, participants were given an orientation regarding research questions, contextualizing them to extract information pertinent to the study and the purpose of the study before the interview. After that, they were required to give formal consent, with an assurance that any shared data would be handled with the utmost discretion.

Thirdly, I ensured that the entire interview was properly documented and recorded. I kindly requested participants to allow for the comprehensive documentation of the session. Consequently, I thanked the participants in advance for their willingness to participate in the study and stressed how important their

participation was to the success of my research endeavors before we started the interview. In addition, I made sure to follow the essential guidelines for conducting interviews.

Fourthly, in my capacity as the transcriber, I painstakingly translated the recorded data into written text, making sure that every word was precisely recorded to avoid data misunderstandings. To guarantee accessibility for everyone, I also translated the recorded data into standard English format after transcribing it, as participants were allowed to speak in their native tongue throughout the interview. I also treated both positive and negative revelations, experiences, and insights with the utmost respect, recognizing their constructive value.

Finally, as the primary data analyst, I used coding and thematic analysis to analyze, describe the data gathered, and identify patterns based on the responses of the participants. I also sought assistance from our adviser to check and ensure that we correctly and carefully analyzed the responses of our participants.

Data Sources

The evidence that researchers acquired to answer their study questions was called data, and the particular kinds of data that were collected depended on the type of research being conducted. Cresswell (2012) stated that using observation reports, interviews, transcripts, video recordings, and physical artifacts was necessary for gathering data.

Ethical Consideration

Research ethics pertained to conducting research in a manner that aligned with moral and legal principles. These norms established criteria for appropriate and inappropriate behavior, delineating what was deemed right or wrong (Parveen and Showkat, 2017). Adhering to research ethics not only served the objectives of the research but also upheld values crucial for collaborative work, ensured accountability in case of misconduct, garnered public support, and encompassed various moral and social values (Resnik, 2020). To rigorously uphold ethical standards in this study, it was submitted to the SMCTI-Research Ethics Committee. Additionally, the researcher took precautions to adhere to necessary ethical procedures while engaging with participants, addressing study-related concerns, and safeguarding the anonymity of research findings. Consequently, the study strictly observed the ten dimensions of ethical considerations, including social value, informed consent, vulnerability of research participants, risks, benefits and safety, privacy and confidentiality, justice, transparency, qualification of the researcher, adequacy of facilities, and community involvement.

Social Value. One key motivation behind conducting this study lay in its social value. The research was crafted to contribute to the existing body of knowledge regarding the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments. The findings and interpretations provided insights into the perspectives of school heads and coordinators on the implementation of these processes. Additionally, the study aimed to uncover the experiences of these education professionals. The outcomes of this research formed a foundational component for policy recommendations and the development of pertinent, necessity-driven, and research-grounded seminars and workshops on school monitoring evaluation and adjustments within the Department of Education (DepEd) Division of Davao de Oro. Moreover, this study served as a point of reference for future research initiatives exploring similar areas of interest. Also, the outcomes of this research inspired school heads, coordinators, and other educational personnel to enhance the execution of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments and could have given them ideas on how to implement school monitoring evaluation and adjustments. Furthermore, this study could have helped improve the quality of education services.

Informed Consent. Before the actual commencement of the study, the researcher obtained consent from

the participants through the Research Ethics Committee. The participants were informed in a fair and equitable manner, guaranteeing that they were all aware of the study's entire process, objectives, and ethical considerations through an orientation session. The researcher aimed to secure written permission from the participants as tangible indications of their consent. Additionally, participants were made aware that their participation was entirely voluntary, and they had the freedom to withdraw from the study at any point. An emphasis on respecting anonymity and confidentiality was maintained, with the researcher diligently managing private information to safeguard the participants' identities. This approach ensured that participants could choose the extent of information they felt comfortable sharing with the researcher. Also, participants were given enough time to think through their choices and provided with opportunities for clarification and inquiries.

Vulnerability of Research Participants. Through the conduct of this research, all participants, including the researcher, were considered vulnerable. In order to ensure the safety, comfort, and autonomy of study participants with health issues, the researcher tailored the approach to accommodate their needs. Thus, the data gathering was conducted online. This indicated that the survey questionnaire was disseminated via Google Forms. Also, recognizing participants' socioeconomic disparities, the researcher made information easily accessible, removed financial obstacles, and encouraged diversity in recruiting and retention initiatives to reduce inequities. Furthermore, recognizing that participants may have been vulnerable to emotional impact from the written questionnaires and interview queries, the researcher took precautions to ensure that the content was devoid of offensive statements. It was underscored that participants had the autonomy to choose whether to continue participating or to withdraw from the study at any point.

Risks, Benefits, and Safety. Regarding risk, benefits, and safety considerations, the researcher obtained consent from participants and provided them with information about the purpose and intent of the study before its commencement. Participants were not compelled to join, and assurances were given to safeguard them against potential risks such as deception or coercion to participate. The scheduling of IDI and FGD was coordinated with the participants' agreed-upon time to mitigate any concerns.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Drawing on participants' interview responses, this chapter offers an in-depth analysis of the study's findings, supported by relevant literature from both print and online scholarly articles and peer-reviewed journals. It provides suggestions for further research, highlights the consequences for the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments procedures in schools, and ends with closing thoughts.

Investigating and comprehending the experiences of school heads and coordinators in putting school monitoring evaluation and adjustments (SMEA) into practice is the main goal of this study. The study focused on compiling the lived experiences of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments (SMEA) participants in order to accomplish this. It also determined the coping mechanisms that school heads and coordinators employ to deal with the difficulties encountered when putting school monitoring evaluation and adjustments (SMEA) into practice. The ultimate goal of this study was to gather information about school monitoring evaluation and adjustments (SMEA) from school administrators and coordinators that could be disseminated.

Through in-person in-depth interviews and focus groups, all twelve participants, seven school heads and five coordinators involved in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments shared their lived experiences, coping mechanisms, and insights. Through a thorough analysis of the collected

responses, key topics were identified. These core concepts played a vital role in shaping significant themes that directly addressed the study's research questions.

Lived Experiences of School Heads and Coordinators on the Implementation of SMEA

In analyzing the responses of the seven school heads and five coordinators in connection to their lived experiences in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments there were five themes obtained: a) using SMEA as a tool for school improvement; b) resource constraints and implementation challenges; c) collaboration in achieving goals; d) data-driven in decision-making; e) additional workload and stress.

Using SMEA as a Tool for School Improvement

One of the lived experiences of the school heads and coordinators in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments, is the use of SMEA as a tool for school improvement. In fact, the school heads and coordinators are using SMEA to guide school operations, utilizing SMEA as a tool for program alignment, applying SMEA to identify necessary interventions, leveraging SMEA to address least implemented programs, monitoring gaps using SMEA for effective adjustments, and evaluating education services through SMEA. Additionally, SMEA facilitates continuous improvement and improves student outcomes through constant monitoring and assessment of educational services, which helps the school develop a culture of long-term growth. In this sense, SMEA promotes a culture of ongoing development and adaptation by providing a thorough framework for improving program efficacy as well as overall school performance.

This corroborated with the study of Cruz (2020) which states that monitoring and evaluation provide decision-makers with data on progress toward achieving set goals and objectives, offering solid evidence to guide necessary changes in policies, programs, or projects during implementation. Thus, the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments guides school heads and coordinators in school operations. Additionally, school heads and coordinators used SMEA to track school effectiveness as stated by Lugg (2020). Moreover, monitoring and evaluation ensure the attainment of the school's targets through the feedback that the Schools Quality Monitoring Team (SQMT) analyzes on the results of the monitoring and evaluation to improve the implementation of SIP, process and review data gathered to make inferences; thus, enable school management to school improvement (Luistro, 2021). According to Sharma, evaluation aims to address difficulties and challenges related to the accomplishment of results by determining whether targets and outcomes are successfully reached. Hence, (Taboso, 2021) underscored that the system provides school leaders, teachers, and students with valuable information and insights, enabling them to assess and analyze their effectiveness and efficiency and it was designed to improve the three key areas of School Improvement Plan (SIP). It serves as a tool that supports ongoing learning in the classroom while the School Improvement Plan (SIP) is being implemented. Additionally, School Monitoring and Evaluation is intended to drive continuous improvements in school performance across several areas, such as curriculum programs and projects, educational resources, teaching and learning processes, teacher and student performance, school management, productivity, and community involvement, in order to achieve the desired educational outcomes by Adaletey & George (2019) cited by Magance (2020).

Resource Constraints and Implementation Challenges

In view of the implementation of school heads and coordinators are facing a number of difficulties in putting School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustments (SMEA) into practice. They are facing time and funding constraints, having a hard time measuring the progress because of insufficient accomplishment

reports. The process is made more difficult by the lack of resources for appropriate implementation, as they struggle to find the data and resources they need. It can be difficult to collect data on learners' development, and getting reliable information is a challenge to the data collection and interpretation process. Furthermore, the time-consuming nature of data processing leads to additional challenges that affect the overall efficacy and efficiency of monitoring and evaluation initiatives.

The results of this study are consistent with the investigation of Valismo (2020), which emphasizes that obtaining adequate time and resources is a major challenge to guaranteeing efficient monitoring and assessment procedures. Also, he added that some organizations may deprioritize monitoring and evaluation activities in favor of other duties because of the pervasive financial restrictions they confront. Further, school heads and coordinators are facing time and funding constraints. This perspective is further supported by Stangor (2020), who emphasizes that identifying key areas where impact can be maximized and recognizing critical factors for successful interventions can help free up staff time and resources. Additionally, Cruz et al. (2021) highlights those significant challenges, such as limitations in time, funding, and manpower, often impede the effective execution of school programs, including monitoring and evaluation processes.

Furthermore, the same study by Bert (2020) highlighted school performance for standards-based reforms a significant challenge to effective monitoring and evaluation is the absence of systematic data collection on key education-related variables. The study also found difficulties in measuring progress on unfinished objectives. Moreover, Bert pointed out that the monitoring and evaluation process is further hindered by a lack of understanding among those responsible for implementing it. They found a hard time measuring the progress of incomplete accomplishments. In addition, Bert also observed that the monitoring and evaluation process is hindered by a lack of comprehension among those responsible for its implementation. Additionally, the study of Kiambu Country supported by (Lowe, 2021) highlighted that a lack of focus posed a challenge, particularly when determining where an organization should direct its efforts concerning the impact of monitoring and evaluation on the performance of non-governmental organization projects. Their study revealed the vast amount of data and information that organizations can collect about initiatives and their results. However, they also noted that monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments can be expensive and time-consuming. Moreover, other findings from countries particularly states in India where data derived from their Resource Management Systems do not compare favorably with data derived from the school census Karnataka and Pradesh, (2018).

Moreover, another finding from the study (Brown, 2020) stated that delays in the submission of data by teachers are common for both teaching and non-teaching staff, making the data collection process more challenging. The teachers and school heads tended to complain about the data gathering template, data collection redundancy, time constraints in the data gathering and validation cycle, higher offices' response to reported problems, limited skills in data characterization, numerous data requirements, inconsistent data results, conflicting priorities, data system storage, stakeholders' attendance, and teachers' prompt submission of reports.

Collaboration in Achieving Goals

In the implementation of school monitoring and adjustments, school heads and coordinators experienced collaboration in achieving goals. Some of the relevant experiences that school heads and coordinators have seen in collaboration in achieving goals are gaining support from stakeholders for school initiatives, achieving success through collaborative efforts of each individual to achieve targets, relying on teachers' willingness to extend their time for success, fostering success through collaboration and solving problems

together to achieve success. School heads and coordinators have seen firsthand how collaboration fosters success. This shared effort strengthens the school's ability to reach its objectives.

This result of the research is backed by the study of Senge (2022) which states that effective collaboration during the monitoring and evaluation phases allows for feedback from various stakeholders to help refine strategies and achieve educational goals. Also, this study connects to the concept of continuous improvement through collaboration during the monitoring and evaluation phase. It is undeniable that feedback from various stakeholders helps refine strategies and achieve educational goals. More so, Fullan (2020) highlighted the strength of collective efficacy among teachers. He stated that when teachers and administrators work together towards common goals, they are more likely to create meaningful change and improve student outcomes. Additionally, collaboration among school heads, teachers, and the community contributes to achieving school goals and improving educational outcomes Dimanalanta (2020).

In relation to this, Pecajas (2022) reaffirmed that collaboration fosters a sense of ownership and accountability, encouraging everyone involved to contribute to the school's vision and goals, and highlighting the importance of engaging parents and the wider community in the educational process. Pecajas also stated that schools should establish systems for continuous assessment and communication among educators to refine strategies and practices based on data and collective experiences. Stakeholders are important organizational partners in achieving the goals of the school (Tiburca, 2019). Truly, collaborative relationships with these stakeholders can offer valuable perspectives and assistance, improving the overall learning environment and addressing challenges together can led to success.

Data-Driven Decision-Making

Implementing school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments (SMEA) is not as straightforward as it may seem; it is a complex process that demands careful consideration. School heads and coordinators must put in significant effort to make decisions based on factual data. As a result, SMEA implementation school heads and coordinators are offering unified information as a basis for planning and intervention. It is also used in analyzing and interpreting data using established mechanisms and criteria. Additionally, data are used by school heads and coordinators to determine what to do next, to base interventions on data collected to address needs, to identify areas for improvement and implement interventions, to make informed decisions and adjustments, and to determine success and target achievement. Additionally, school heads are basing interventions on data collected during implementation. By making informed decisions and adjustments, school heads and coordinators ensure that targets are achieved and interventions are implemented effectively.

This finding is backed by the research on Ruvuma Region conducted by Mhina (2020) which emphasized how district councils can use monitoring and evaluation (M&E) as a management tool for a range of initiatives and activities, such as those about agriculture, sanitation, health, and education. As such, it provides information that is a basis for planning and interventions. Also, a study by Beltran (2020) highlighted the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation approaches in schools during the design phase, where they successfully identified key educational issues, proposed practical local solutions, and guided subsequent actions. Additionally, Cruz (2021) pointed out that the primary focus of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System is on the internal operations of the school, aiming to meet the decision-making needs of school leaders, teachers, and students. Furthermore, SMEA is designed to provide objective information that establishes standards for decision-making, adhering to key principles such as

delivering high-quality data, strengthening systems, ensuring efficiency, maintaining transparency, fostering learning and accountability, and staying focused, as discussed by Hattie (2021).

Furthermore, as stated by Tongco (2020) school monitoring and evaluation (M&E) offers critical insights for supervisory units to evaluate the effectiveness of the Department of Education's standards, initiatives, and policies. The data gathered helps determine success and target achievement. UNESCO (2016) also emphasized that data from curriculum implementation observations allows school administrators to evaluate the program's effectiveness, identify strengths and weaknesses in its delivery, and monitor student performance. M&E systems can uncover unexpected positive outcomes and reveal effective programs or practices, enabling improvements and interventions. Additionally, Mackay (2020) noted that data collection tracks a project's progress and guides decisions to enhance its effectiveness, while evaluation involves reviewing past projects to inform future initiatives.

Additional Workload and Stress

In the conduct of the study, numerous problems have been found throughout the implementation of SMEA. It is frequently seen by school heads and coordinators as an additional burden due to increased workload and stress. The significant data collecting and analysis necessary for successful implementation causes them to feel more stressed. Additionally, school heads and coordinators also experienced an increasing workload through extensive data collection and analysis. Further, increasing tasks and stress due to challenging management were also experienced. Furthermore, as the number of tasks increases and the challenges of managing them escalate, the stress experienced by school heads and coordinators intensifies, making them harder to effectively implement the monitoring, evaluation, and adjustment processes in schools.

The findings of this study align with the research by Beltran (2020), which noted that SMEA and adjustments can place additional demands on educators, resulting in higher workloads and stress. Similarly, Beltran emphasized that these processes can lead to greater demands on teachers. Consequently, this implementation adds an extra burden and task to manage. In light of this emerging issue regarding the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments, Rose & Sika (2020) stated that being overburdened with work, leads to high levels of stress and exhaustion. However, in research study by Javed et al. (2021) on the monitoring and evaluation system in education states that one of the most difficult jobs in terms of human resource development is managing schools Javed et al. (2021).

Additionally, the findings of the study by Aguinis (2020) highlighted the continuous need for monitoring, evaluation, and adjustment of school programs adds significant workload and stress to school administrators. Her research emphasized the impact of these responsibilities on the overall well-being of school leaders and how it can complicate effective school management. Thus, increased workload is an additional burden. Furthermore, Scott (2022) emphasized the impact of high-stakes accountability and the resulting pressure on educators, which contributes to their stress and increased workload. This surge in tasks and stress is linked to the challenges of management. Additionally, Peter (2021) focused on how management practices influence teachers' workload and stress. Peter's research frequently explores how pressures related to monitoring and evaluation, accountability, decision-making, and organizational changes shape educators' experiences in schools.

Coping Strategies of School Heads and Coordinators on the implementation of SMEA

The school heads and coordinators their strategies in coping with the challenges in implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments. After an exhaustive analysis of the responses and their coping strategies, five themes were composed: a) harnessing support from stakeholders; b) Effective Time

Management and Prioritization; c) Maintaining a Positive and Resilient Attitude; d) Ensuring Well-being and Relaxation; and d) Utilization of Training and Seminars.

Harnessing Stakeholders Support

During the process of implementing School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustments (SMEA), school heads and coordinators faced a number of difficulties. They persisted in trying to remain committed to addressing the issues and finding solutions to problems they encountered in spite of these obstacles. Despite these obstacles, they remained committed to addressing the issues and finding solutions. Stakeholder support enabled school heads and coordinators to successfully negotiate these obstacles, handle the intricacies of SMEA implementation, and make consistent strides toward their goals. Support from stakeholders, such as parents, teachers, and the local community, was essential to overcome these obstacles. School heads and coordinators were able to overcome the challenges of adopting SMEA through encouragement and collaboration provided by this support. They were better able to handle the processes intricacies, maintain focus on their goals, and gradually advance improving school programming and attaining favorable results with the support of these stakeholders.

The result of this study is confirmed by the research conducted by Paragoso and Barazon (2020) which stated that school monitoring and evaluation provide a means of keeping an eye on intermediate results by providing a forum for educational institutions, internal and external stakeholders, to track the advancement of their students. The involvement of internal and external stakeholders can solve problems. This aspect of assessment and monitoring gives educators and schools the chance to pinpoint learners who require particular treatments. Further, they emphasized that when it comes to curriculum implementation, it is a way to figure out what kind of technical support or training teachers need to improve their abilities. Moreover, the study of Kirimi and Maluwa (2020) looked into how stakeholders participated in the procedures of monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of literacy and numeracy teaching in public primary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya.

Moreover, in connection with the study by Aguilar (2020) emphasized that principals of schools should consult with an unbiased outsider while having conversations on important procedures meant to improve and enhance performance. These are engaging outsiders as a support system. In line with UNESCO 2016, school leaders are also able to share their successful techniques with other schools through the help of monitoring and evaluation. It is possible to modify the excellent methods used by high-achieving schools for application in different types of learning environments, thus seeking advice from fellow school heads as a support system. Another important finding from the research by Tiburca (2020) which states that stakeholders are important organizational partners in achieving the goals of the school, and the administrators of the school must be able to foster their support for the monitoring and evaluation system to remain effective over time. More so, tapping stakeholders to address challenges is great deal in school monitoring evaluation and adjustments.

Prioritizing Task and Effective Time Management

Implementing school monitoring evaluations and adjustments helps the school heads and coordinators with the challenges they experience. There are some visible factors that the school heads and coordinators observed that became one effective coping mechanism for them. These are managing time and prioritizing work effectively, implementing time management to prioritize responsibilities, avoiding procrastination and prioritizing tasks based on deadlines, applying time management to prioritize SMEA tasks and reports, prioritizing tasks based on impact on operations and student outcomes, prioritizing areas with low results to balance progress, using time management to prioritize and scheduling responsibilities, and categorizing

tasks by urgency and work diligently on all tasks.

The results of this study are supported by the findings of Scott (2022), who argue that due to limited resources, school administrators must adopt efficient management strategies to conserve both money and resources. Effective time management and prioritization are essential in helping them focus on key responsibilities. Additionally, Javed et al. (2021) highlighted that in school monitoring and evaluation, procrastination and prioritization issues often arise when interruptions occur, accompanied by a lack of discipline to maintain focus on the original task. Similarly, Peter (2021) emphasized that various time management approaches exist, including allocating time to activities that contribute to goal achievement, setting priorities, planning, delegating tasks, and analyzing the time spent on different activities.

Additionally, in the study of Anuveocu (2020) suggested that school leaders who excel in prioritizing tasks and managing their time are more capable of handling the complexities involved in monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments. Furthermore, Collins (2020) emphasized that time should be planned before calendars become overloaded with meetings, committees, or non-essential teaching duties. To ensure effective monitoring and evaluation, it is crucial to use time management to prioritize and organize responsibilities. By applying effective time management, school leaders can prioritize tasks and reports, facilitating the successful implementation of school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments.

Maintaining a Positivity and Resilience

By maintaining a positive and resilient attitude, school heads and coordinators were able to effectively handle the difficulties they encountered during the implementation of School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustments (SMEA). School heads and coordinators were creating a positive environment to manage challenges and managing stress by resting and maintaining a balanced approach, developing resilience and using a positive attitude toward work, surrounding yourself with positivity and taking breaks when overwhelmed, staying calm and maintaining a positive attitude toward challenges, and viewing challenges as opportunities for growth and learning. Their strategy demonstrated how overcoming obstacles and attaining successful implementation may be facilitated by resilience and a positive outlook.

The findings of this study are further supported by Brehm (2020) found that resilience stems from a positive attitude and emotions, which help sustain an optimistic approach to work. This insight encourages school leaders and coordinators to cultivate a resilient and positive mindset when implementing school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments. Furthermore, Castro (2020) highlighted the importance of resilience in school leadership, emphasizing that educators and administrators need to be flexible, adaptable, and optimistic to successfully carry out educational changes. Additionally, Malve (2020), suggests that resilience can be developed in individuals or communities through a positive attitude. Positive thinking involves focusing energy on reality and maintaining a constructive outlook to navigate challenges and achieve better outcomes. To manage difficulties in school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments, studies predict that resilient individuals use positive emotions to recover from stressful situations and find meaningful lessons in them.

Ensuring Well-being and Relaxation

School heads and coordinators focused on their relaxation and well-being in order to overcome the difficulties they faced throughout the implementation of School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustments (SMEA). Through things like getting massages, taking breaks, and spending time with family, they found time to unwind after hectic weeks. They made sure they had time to relax by drawing distinct lines between their personal and work life. Additionally, they incorporated stress-reduction physical activities like exercise, which helped them keep a healthy balance and continue to be productive in their job duties.

This result is being supported by the study of Foresight Mental Capital and Well-being Project (2018) which describes well-being as "enabling people to develop their potential, work productively and creatively, form positive relationships with others, and meaningfully contribute to the community. Additionally, Carter (2021) emphasized the importance of taking breaks to recover from stress, which can ultimately enhance performance. Relaxing and social breaks, in particular, are especially beneficial. Therefore, activities like physical exercises or getting a massage are effective ways for school leaders and coordinators to relax and maintain their well-being.

Moreover, Mendoza (2021) found that taking a relaxing break can aid in recovery by restoring both mental and physical systems to their normal state. Such breaks also help reset mood, promoting a sense of well-being and reducing stress. Additionally, it is crucial for school heads and coordinators to establish clear boundaries between work and personal life, ensuring they take breaks, relax, and spend quality time with family to maintain their overall well-being. Additionally, school administrators and coordinators must put their mental and emotional health first in order to improve their effectiveness as leaders Villanueva (2020). Also, promotes the use of stress-reduction and relaxation techniques, such as taking breaks and exercising, to assist school administrators stay motivated and effective during trying times.

Utilizing Training and Seminars

School heads and coordinators used training, seminars, and technical assistance to overcome the difficulties encountered during the implementation of School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustments (SMEA). They attended trainings and seminars that offered helpful suggestions and received invaluable direction and support from district employees. They made sure they were equipped to handle the problems they faced by placing a high priority on comprehensive orientation and training. Additionally, they strengthened their problem-solving abilities and improved the implementation process as a whole by relying on peer assistance and shared expertise.

This finding is supported by the study of Scheeren (2020) which states that as a curriculum manager, the principal is in charge of supervising and offering technical assistance to improve learning outcomes. Also, as required by the Department of Education, school principals must provide technical assistance to their subordinates to guarantee that instructors carry out their duties proficiently and effectively to attain better results. In addition, in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments the Department of Education provides orientation, training, and seminars. Similarly, Mendoza et al. (2022) argue that by offering teachers technical support, principals can enhance curriculum delivery and strengthen their supervision of instruction. Additionally, expertise is essential for improving performance. Barazon (2022) also highlights that effective school principals can support new teachers by providing coaching, which boosts their performance and productivity.

In line with Montalbon's (2021) study, one of the purpose of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) program is to provide the division's information management department with data on educational delivery, which serves as a foundation for offering technical support. Furthermore, Salvador Madrid (2020), in his research on educational leadership, underscores the importance of training and seminars in equipping school administrators with the necessary skills to manage educational reforms. He also argues that ongoing education through seminars, workshops, and technical assistance is crucial for enhancing the leadership capabilities of school heads, particularly when navigating complex processes like SMEA.

The Insights of School Heads and Coordinators on the Implementation of SMEA

The school heads and coordinators shared their insights and realizations gotten from their experiences in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments. As such, after an all-inclusive

inquiry on the shared insights of school heads and coordinators, six themes emerged: a) focusing on progress and assessment tracking; b) valuing the impact of SMEA; c) evaluating strengths and weaknesses for adjustments; d) continuing teaching and learning improvement via SMEA; e) strengthening SMEA implementation; and 6) streamlining the process of SMEA implementation.

Focusing on Progress and Assessment Tracking

Focusing on Progress and Assessment Tracking is one of the insights of the school heads and coordinators in the implementation of school monitoring evaluations and adjustments. Insights from the implementation of SMEA show that school heads and coordinators were able to shift their focus toward effectively tracking progress and assessing outcomes. The consolidated data provided by SMEA enabled them to monitor the advancement of various programs and initiatives, with a strong emphasis on improving the overall quality of education centered around the learners. Additionally, it facilitated the evaluation of classroom instruction effectiveness, supported school improvement efforts through field progress tracking, and allowed for the monitoring of targeted interventions in the teaching-learning process based on SMEA results.

This result in the study is supported by the research conducted by Mendoza et al. (2020) which reaffirm that monitoring gives information on how a project, program, or policy is doing right now in terms of its objectives and results. This study also suggested that the goal of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is to track how programs are progressing and how policies are impacting. It also assesses the efficacy of a policy, the significance of an activity's results, and the entire initiative's sustainability and efficiency. Through the primary goal of the school monitoring evaluation system teachers able to meet learning objectives, monitor students' initial development, and assess the school's effectiveness in implementing the projects and programs specified in the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Thus, a long-term vision with specific objectives and sustainable improvement tactics is necessary for successful school improvement. To guarantee ongoing improvement, progress is routinely evaluated and modified and this is the work of SMEA. Additionally, the system of SMEA enables school heads to recognize significant improvements in various aspects of their management when all elements are properly aligned (Baltazar, 2020).

Moreover, the result of the study of Nolasco (2020) also supported this result as quoted that school monitoring and evaluation system promotes intermediate outcomes, such as the caliber of instruction and learning, enhancements to learner participation in instructional activities, better access to learning resources and facilities, improvements to School-Based Management practices, and favorable opinions from school stakeholders. Furthermore, school monitoring and evaluation offer a valuable tool for tracking intermediate results, creating a platform for educational institutions and both internal and external stakeholders to monitor student progress. This aspect of assessment enables educators and schools to identify students who may need specialized support. In terms of curriculum implementation, it also helps determine the specific technical assistance or professional development that teachers may require to enhance their skills (Barazon, 2021). More so, this outcome tracks the progress and assesses the effectiveness of classroom instruction. School monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments also offer a framework for evaluating overall school performance, serving as a tool for outcome assessment, as highlighted by Castro (2020).

Valuing the Impact of SMEA

Other insights that the school heads and coordinators were able to realize in implementing school monitoring evaluation and adjustments was that they must value the impact of SMEA. School heads and coordinators find SMEA helpful and beneficial to all, they recognize satisfaction from SMEA results,

value SMEA as a helpful tool that provides satisfaction through monitoring the programs. Further, the experience of the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments becomes rewarding towards school heads and coordinators because they value the structured SMEA system for driving continuous improvement and effective school performance, and recognize SMEA as a legacy-building tool.

This result is linked, to the study of Aguilar (2020) schools that adapt their M&E systems based on feedback report greater satisfaction because they see tangible improvements in student outcomes, teaching practices, and resource allocation. The role of M&E in educational change, noting that when schools engage in systematic monitoring and evaluation, there is often an increase in stakeholder satisfaction, especially when adjustments based on evaluation results lead to noticeable improvements. Also as discussed in the study of Mackay (2020), satisfaction grows when teachers and administrators feel that M&E is not only about accountability but also a tool for improvement. When adjustments are made based on evidence from evaluations, stakeholders feel more engaged and confident in the decisions being made. Thus, school heads and coordinators recognize satisfaction with SMEA results.

Additionally, as stated by (Abdourahmane, 2020) evaluations ultimately involve drawing conclusions based on data regarding the effectiveness, value, and merit of a school's interventions or programs. Also, asserts that SMEA provides objective information that supports decision-making by adhering to principles such as ensuring high-quality information, strengthening systems, promoting efficiency, maintaining transparency for key stakeholders, fostering collaboration, encouraging learning and accountability, and maintaining focus. Consequently, an effective M&E system significantly enhances the development of better policies and programs, aids in more informed operational decisions, supports strategic decision-making, strengthens an organization's ability to achieve its development goals, and proves beneficial for all involved. This underscores that the (SMEA) framework plays a key role in improving various aspects of educational practices and decision-making. Monitoring and evaluation are essential processes that help educators and school administrators identify challenges, make necessary adjustments, and enhance the overall effectiveness of instructional strategies (Cruz, 2020).

Evaluating Strengths and Weaknesses for Adjustments

One of the primary purposes of the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments is to evaluate strengths and weaknesses for adjustments. With that, implementation of SMEA helps to monitor and evaluate to provide technical assistance and adjustments, identify effective programs and interventions for teaching and learning practices, identify gaps and adjusts accordingly, identify weakness to provide interventions. Further, school heads and coordinators involved in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments were able to utilize SMEA to assess strengths and weaknesses, optimize resources, and enhance school governance. Moreover, school heads and coordinators recognize SMEA as a significant assistance for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of school programs.

The result is verified by the study of Scott (2020) confirms that SMEA enables educators and staff to assess their performance, aligning with the Department of Education's Results-Based Performance Management system to enhance effectiveness and promote staff development, especially in improving teachers' skills. SMEA identifies strengths and weaknesses in teaching, helping school leaders make necessary changes to improve organizational performance and instructional quality. It also helps pinpoint effective programs and interventions for teaching and learning. Additionally, SMEA promotes improvements in teaching quality, student engagement, access to resources, School-Based Management, and positive feedback from stakeholders (Nolasco, 2020), supporting self-evaluation among staff in line

with the department's goals (Pecajas, 2020).

Furthermore, a study in Zambia by Gibson (2020) highlighted that data collected from observing curriculum implementation helps school administrators assess the program's effectiveness, identify strengths and weaknesses in how teachers deliver the curriculum, and track student progress. Similarly, Peter (2020) found that the main objective of the (M&E) System is to provide essential information and insights that allow school leaders to manage their schools effectively and efficiently. This enables school heads to pinpoint deficiencies and implement necessary changes. More so, Peter also stated that M&E is a comprehensive framework that enables school leaders to assess and improve the effectiveness of educational programs and instructional practices. Through continuous monitoring and evaluation, it provides valuable insights into the strengths and weaknesses of teaching and learning processes, helping educators make informed decisions and implement necessary adjustments.

Continuing Teaching and Learning Improvement Via SMEA

School heads and coordinators who are implementing school monitoring evaluation and adjustments seek to continue teaching and learning improvement via SMEA. They find the Implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments as a governance system who assess methods and techniques used by teachers to enhance learning. Thus, school monitoring evaluation and adjustments drive continual improvement through monitoring, facilitate continuous improvement in school programs, sustain effective teaching-learning practices through evaluations and revisions. Also, implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments impact teaching and learning by understanding and improving strategies through evaluation. Furthermore, school heads and coordinators viewed school monitoring evaluation and adjustment as school governance system that ensures effective teaching strategies through evaluation, and provides clear standards and insights for positive teaching and learning impact.

This result is being supported by the study Chebet (2021) which states that information and insights about learners' progress, attainment of desired learning competencies, learners' potential to meet the requirements of the next learning level, the efficiency with which the curriculum is implemented, school programs and projects, overall progress, and the caliber of the teaching and learning process are all provided by the School M&E System). In this way, the monitoring and evaluation system offers clear benchmarks and valuable insights that contribute to a positive impact on teaching and learning. As stated by Scheeren (2020), as a curriculum manager, the principal is in charge of supervising and offering technical assistance to improve learning outcomes. Same statement as Bilbao et al. (2020), by providing teachers with technical support, the principal can improve curriculum delivery performance and fortify their oversight of instruction. Furthermore, principals of schools should consult with an unbiased outsider while having conversations on important procedures meant to improve and enhance performance as emphasized by Aguilar (2020). They must find and implement excellent techniques in their schools. Schools with lower performance levels might then use and adopt the best practices that have been identified. Ensuring that all population segments and educational levels receive equal and high-quality education is one of the main goals of monitoring and assessment in education Hoy and Hoy (2020).

In a similar study, Dimalanta (2020) explains that SMEA is designed to provide objective information that supports decision-making by adhering to principles such as offering high-quality data, strengthening systems, ensuring efficiency, maintaining transparency for key stakeholders, fostering collaboration, promoting learning and accountability, and staying focused. This information aims to drive ongoing improvements in school performance across various areas, including curriculum programs and projects, educational resources, teaching and learning methods, teacher and student performance, school

management, productivity, and community involvement. Similarly, Mhina (2020) emphasize that SMEA provides impartial data that serves as a foundation for decision-making, guided by core principles such as delivering reliable information, enhancing systems, ensuring efficiency, upholding transparency, promoting learning and accountability, and maintaining focus. The goal of this information is to continuously enhance school performance in areas like curriculum programs, teaching processes, resources, and community engagement, all aimed at achieving the desired educational outcomes.

Strengthening the SMEA Implementation

School heads and coordinators who were involved in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments suggested that policymakers should be strengthening the Implementation of SMEA. Also, school heads and coordinators recommended that they should implement SMEA strictly and regularly report on its progress to identify gaps, continue and strengthen the implementation of SMEA to observe its impact. Additionally, school heads and coordinators should strive for stricter preparation and implementation of SMEA, despite the additional workload and emphasize the necessity of continuing SMEA for school improvement with stricter presentations. Furthermore, school heads and coordinators should require strict adherence to SMEA for monitoring and evaluating school progress.

This study is reinforced by Green and Krueter's (2019) research, which highlights that Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems are extensively used in schools to track the progress of projects and programs. Consistent reporting plays a critical role in ensuring transparency, accountability, and identifying areas in need of improvement. Regular and thorough reporting on the status of school activities supports continuous improvement. By providing frequent updates, teachers, policymakers, and educational leaders can track successes, identify issues, and make necessary adjustments. These reports facilitate data-driven decision-making, leading to enhanced teaching and learning outcomes, as noted by Woulfe (2018). Furthermore, regular reporting keeps key stakeholders, such as school boards, parents, and local communities, informed about the school's performance, aligning with research on school accountability. Anderson & Herr (2018) note that accountability mechanisms are most effective when they are transparent and grounded in clear, regularly updated performance data. Ultimately, educational leadership and improvement strategies have long recognized the importance of continuous School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Assessment (SMEA) for fostering school improvement. Regular monitoring and assessment help identify gaps, ensure alignment with reform goals, make necessary adjustments, and hold schools accountable for their results. This ongoing feedback process ensures that efforts to improve schools lead to meaningful and lasting change.

Streamline the Process

School heads and coordinators who were involved in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments seek to streamline the process. In order to lessen administrative hassles and allow for a stronger focus on performance, they recommend streamlining the SMEA procedures. Additionally, they urge lawmakers to establish unambiguous rules to facilitate efficient execution and careful planning, guaranteeing more reliable results and improving performance all around.

This study is supported by the study of Harris (2022) effective school improvement plans require consistent evaluation to ensure adherence to original goals. Without continuous monitoring, schools may struggle to adapt to changing needs, preventing sustained progress. Schools must constantly assess whether strategies are being implemented as planned and make adjustments when necessary. The ongoing need for SMEA in school improvement is well-supported in educational leadership and improvement literature. Regular and thorough monitoring and evaluation help identify gaps, maintain alignment with

reform plans, facilitate necessary adjustments, and hold schools accountable for their performance. This continuous feedback and adjustment cycle ensures that school improvement efforts result in meaningful, long-lasting changes, as highlighted by (Green, 2021).

Moreover, this result of the study is supported by, Anderson (2021) which states teachers considered SMEA to be demanding because of the vast volumes of data they had to gather, verify, and encode, even though they acknowledged its benefits. They saw this assignment as an additional duty on top of their responsibilities as subject coordinators. One possible way to address this issue is to streamline this process by combining databases and reports, which can cut down on the time and effort needed to prepare them Wilson (2020). Additionally, the necessity of streamlining monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems to avoid overburdening school personnel with administrative responsibilities that interfere with teaching and learning is a recurrent issue in the literature. Thus, in order to lessen administrative hassles and increase performance emphasis, educational research is increasingly highlighting the necessity of streamlining School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustment (SMEA) procedures. By simplifying these systems, schools can reduce the inefficiencies brought on by unduly complex procedures while better focusing on their main objective, which is improving student results (Kurt, 2021).

Furthermore, clear and well-defined policy guidelines are crucial for the successful implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems in schools. Policies that outline specific processes, roles, and responsibilities at each stage of the SMEA process help ensure that schools can effectively carry out their improvement plans Meer (2020). More so, policymakers must ensure that expectations and processes for SMEA are clearly communicated to ensure its success Beltran (2020). They argue that without clear communication of policies, school leaders may find it challenging to align local initiatives with broader educational objectives, resulting in fragmented or inconsistent monitoring practices. Well-defined guidelines from policymakers help standardize monitoring across schools, allowing administrators to allocate resources effectively and establish appropriate feedback mechanisms. Additionally, school administrators must implement straightforward and transparent protocols for observation and assessment, making it easier to evaluate outcomes, make necessary adjustments, and ensure the effectiveness of the educational system (Baustista, 2020).

Implication of SMEA Practice

Moreover, the result of this study significantly acclaims that educational leadership and reform strategies strongly establish the significance of continuous SMEA (School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustment) for school improvement. Finding gaps, guaranteeing adherence to reform initiatives, making necessary adjustments, and holding schools accountable for their outcomes all depend on regular and comprehensive monitoring and assessment. School heads and coordinators play a vital role in the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments. Moreover, the result of this study will open the minds of the Deped personnel, school heads, coordinators, and teachers to really strengthen the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments.

The impact of SMEA is essential in helping schools consistently enhance their processes, address challenges, and improve student outcomes. As a result, school reform and improvement plans often require precise implementation to increase the chances of achieving the desired results. Additionally, by conducting regular evaluations, schools can determine if their resources—such as time, staff, and funding—are being used effectively. This ensures that the efforts of school leaders and coordinators are focused on strategies that yield better results and make the most efficient use of available resources.

In addition, motivating school policymakers to impose a stricter approach to school monitoring, evaluation, and changes is another important effect of this study. Schools may foster a culture of continuous improvement that improves data utilization, facilitates reform implementation, and eventually improves student learning outcomes by giving priority to continual SMEA. This encourages teamwork and shared accountability, which can boost school spirit and motivate a more coordinated effort to meet school improvement goals.

This study aims to raise awareness of the importance of strengthening monitoring evaluation and adjustment programs within the Department of Education, particularly in the planning department. The government has consistently supported such efforts, including issuing guidelines for funding seminars and programs related to school monitoring and evaluation. The insights from this study will enable the department to encourage schools nationwide to improve their SMEA practices. It will also help Department of Education staff understand the significant impact of SMEA, not only on teachers but also on students, who benefit greatly from improved monitoring and evaluation efforts. As a result, this encourages school leaders to fully support the implementation of the SMEA system. When teachers are properly supported through monitoring and evaluation, students are more likely to achieve better outcomes.

Additionally, this study offers a valuable chance to recognize the vital roles that coordinators and school heads have played in helping the government successfully execute school monitoring, evaluation, and changes. Since they are actively involved in implementing SMEA in the current educational system, teachers, coordinators, and school directors are essential to its success. Furthermore, the leadership of the Division and Department of Education can benefit greatly from the perspectives offered by the coordinators and school heads who took part in this study in order to give the required assistance to those engaged in SMEA implementation. This can direct the creation of concentrated training courses and seminars on school observation, assessment, and modification, guaranteeing that school administrators and coordinators have.

The implementation of SMEA should be the focus of a defined program and set of guidelines developed by the Department of Education for school administrators and coordinators. According to the research participants' observations, this could encourage DepEd authorities or the school heads to maintain the program and give teachers especially those who have trouble adopting SMEA more help. School heads, coordinators, and DepEd officials may be motivated to enhance the implementation of SMEA and guarantee its ongoing monitoring to evaluate its effects as a result of this phenomenological study.

Furthermore, the perspectives offered by study participants are a useful reminder that school heads and coordinators must adopt a flexible strategy while implementing SMEAs. It is crucial to comprehend how participants experience and understand SMEA processes in an educational setting. These viewpoints, which are frequently obtained from educators, administrators, staff, and occasionally students, in addition to external stakeholders like parents and legislators, offer vital information regarding the efficacy, difficulties, and impact of SMEA in promoting school development.

Recommendations

The purpose of this phenomenological study was to investigate, examine, and comprehend the lived experiences of 7 school heads and 5 coordinators concerning their involvement in the implementation of SMEA in the Division of Davao de Oro. It was discovered that when it comes to implementing SMEA, school heads and coordinators life experiences varied widely. The survey also showed that in order to overcome the difficulties they encountered while putting SMEA into practice, school heads and

coordinators used a variety of tactics. This study's ultimate goal was to learn more about the perspectives of school heads and coordinators who are participating in SMEA implementation.

It is also advised that future researchers carry out studies with a greater number of participants or informants that are especially targeted at the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments. In order to provide a wider diversity of research settings, future studies might examine the experiences of additional school heads and coordinators working in SMEA. By filling in the many knowledge gaps regarding this occurrence, this method would assist provide more thorough data and contribute to the growth of the body of knowledge. On the other hand, to get additional and comprehensive data on the focus of this study, future research may also focus on the lived experiences of school administration, school heads, and teachers. As such, future researchers may lead in conducting studies that seek to identify the effectiveness of the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustment. Future researchers could think about employing various research techniques while examining the implementation of school monitoring evaluation and adjustments in order to put the above recommendations into practice. In particular, it is recommended that they test or disprove a hypothesis that might have arisen from qualitative research using a mixed methods design or quantitative methodology. Researchers can use tools like surveys, questionnaires, and polls to collect data, or they can use computer tools to examine statistical data that already exists. On the other hand, future research may utilize case studies or multiple case studies to develop a comprehensive, multifaceted understanding of the complex issues of implementing school monitoring evaluation and adjustments. Through these efforts, future researchers may contribute research-based findings to the educational communities that can be used to develop policies and programs.

Concluding Remarks

Ensuring that schools consistently improve their procedures, deal with issues, and improve student results is the main objective of School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment (SMEA). In order to pinpoint areas for development as well as current strengths, SMEA focuses on the continuous assessment of every facet of school operations. As a teacher who supports the successful use of SMEA, I see this study as a chance to find out if school heads and coordinators agree with me that it's critical to implement monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments in schools. Based on the result of the study, there were school heads and coordinators were not totally embracing the process of SMEA implementation.

To better understand and explore the experiences of school heads and coordinators in putting school monitoring evaluation and assessment into practice, I used qualitative research, more especially phenomenology, in this academic work. Five coordinators and seven school heads from schools in the Davao de Oro Division participated in the study. In addition to having completed training and seminars on (SMEA), all participants had served for at least three years. The results of this study showed that coordinators and school heads had different experiences implementing SMEA.

More so, in order to overcome the difficulties, they encountered when putting school monitoring evaluation and adjustments, and changes into practice, school heads and coordinators employed a variety of tactics, according to this phenomenological study. The study also emphasized the perspectives of school administrators and coordinators on SMEA implementation. The comments from the five coordinators and seven school heads in this study were carefully examined to identify the fundamental ideas that underpinned the primary themes' development.

Based on the findings of this study, I concluded that the Department of Education should offer relevant training and seminars to school heads and coordinators to improve their knowledge and skills in

implementing school monitoring evaluation and adjustments, as many of them currently lack sufficient understanding of how to effectively carry out SMEA. However, despite the lack of formal training, school heads and coordinators were still able to navigate the implementation of SMEA by using flexible, androgynous approaches in organizing and managing groups. Furthermore, I came to the conclusion that, despite obstacles, school management must place a high priority on the efficient execution of monitoring assessment and adjustment programs. The administration's introduction of tactics to instructors that facilitate the implementation of SMEA is equally significant. Essentially, even if school heads and coordinators may find the process difficult, they nevertheless find fulfillment and satisfaction in seeing how SMEA results result in ongoing school improvements.

Furthermore, I concluded that the implementation of school monitoring, evaluation, and adjustments has contributed to the personal growth of school heads and coordinators. They have been able to improve themselves by recognizing their strengths and weaknesses and developing strategies to cope with the challenges encountered during the process. I also realized that through SMEA, school heads and coordinators have become more flexible and adaptive, employing various techniques to ensure its effective implementation. Additionally, I concluded that school heads and coordinators are motivated and committed to carrying out school monitoring evaluation and adjustments.

Also, to promote better and higher-quality education, it is highly advised that school monitoring evaluation and adjustments be done on an ongoing basis. I also came to the conclusion that the Department of Education ought to provide seminars and focused training on the successful application of SMEA. Teachers should also be informed of the advantages and rewards of actively participating in the execution of school monitoring, evaluation, and modifications, in my opinion.

References

1. Abdourahmane (2021). *Improving Schools for All: Guidelines for Effective Monitoring and Evaluation*. Journal of School Leadership, 26(5), 697-717

2. Adalatey and George (2019). Self-efficacy belief as a practical and parsimonious evaluation criterion in school leadership training. *Mediterranean Journal ofSocial Sciences*, 6(1 S1), 20.

3. Aguilar, E. (2020, May). Leadership Coaching that Transforms. *EL Educational Leadership: Lifting School Leaders*. Vol.74. No. 8

4. Aguinis, H. (2020), Performance Management. 13 (1), 44-55. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/ 13552070512331332276

5. Anderson, G. L., & Herr, K. (2018). *The Handbook of Educational Leadership and Management.* SAGE Publications.

6. Anuveoco (2020). *Simplifying School Improvement: The Impact of Streamlined Monitoring on Student Outcomes*. Educational Leadership, 73(4), 12-18.

7. Arafah Nur. (2018). Incorporating the Use of Literature as an Innovative Technique for Teaching English. KnE Social Sciences. 3. 24. 10.18502/ kss.v3i4.1914.

8. Ashby, W.R., 1956. *An Introduction to Cybernetics. London*: Chapman and Hall.

9. Ashby, W.R., 1960. *Design for a Brain: The Origin of Adaptive Behavior*. London: Chapman and Hall.

10. Ashby, W.R., 1962. *Principles of the Self-Organizing System.* In: H. von Foerster and G. Zopf, eds. *Principles of Self-Organization*. New York: Pergamon Press, 255-278

11. Awefoso, M. A. (2019). *Inquiring into Filipino teachers' conceptions of good teaching*: *A qualitative research study*. The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 17(2), 157-   171.

12. Bakarada, G. (2019). Head teachers' characteristics influencing instructional supervision   in public primary schools in Kasarani District in Kenya.

13. Barazon, L. M. E & Paragoso, S. (2019). *School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustment (SMEA).* CNU Journal of Higher Education Volume 13 (2019), p 56-75

14. Bartoletti, J. and Connelly, G. (2019) *Leadership Matters: What the Research Says about   the Importance of Principal Leadership*. NAESP, Virginia.

15. Barton, D. R. (2018). *Effective School Monitoring Systems: The Role of Policymakers*. Educational Policy Studies, 36(2), 47-62.

16. Bautista H. L., (2020). *Sustaining School Improvement: A Rigorous Approach to Implementation and Monitoring.* International Journal of Educational   Leadership.

17. Belk, D.F., & Wallendorf, C.T. (2019). Planning a nursing study. Nursing Research: Generating and Assessing Evidence for Nursing Practice (9 edn, pp. 174-199).   Philadephia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

18. Bermudez, K. (2018). *A Study of Education Bureaucracy.* 99-177

19. Bert, F. W., Anctil, E. J., & Hass, G. (2019). Curriculum leadership: Readings for   developing quality educational programs. Prentice-Hall.

20. Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*.   New York: George Braziller

21. Bhandari. K., (2021). *Strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation to Promote Effective Policy*

22. Biasong, J. S. (2013). Division Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. Retrieved from://www.slideshare.net/ mobile/kenjoyb/division-monitoring-evaluation- framework-16617499.

23. Bilbao, F., Muller, D., Pagaso,, D. (2019). Performance of procrastinators: On the value   of deadlines. Theory and Decision, 70, 329-366. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11238-   010-9195-6

24. Bloom, O., & Sianoja, Y. (2018). *Aligning Monitoring and Evaluation to National   Education Goals: A Policy Framework*. International Journal of Educational   Management, 26(3), 235-249. Calder, J. (2019). *Programme evaluation and quality: A comprehensive guide to setting   up   an evaluation system*, Routledge.

25. Candela, A. G. (2019). Exploring the function of member checking. *The   Qualitative   Report,* 24(3), 619-628. https://doi.org/10/46743/2160- 3715/2019.3276

26. Chanda, V.M. (2019). Teachers' and Head Teachers' Attitudes towards Education   Standards Office   Supervisory Activities in Public Secondary Schools in   the Copper Belt Province in Zambia. Master of Education Dissertation.   Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Nairobi.

27. Chebet, W. K. (2021). Role of monitoring and evaluation in development of school   infrastructure in Marakwet West Sub-County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, Moi   University)

28. Cicchetti, M. (2019). *Bureaucratic Rationality and the Developmental State. American Journal of Sociology* , 107 (4), 951-89

29. Creswell, J.C. (2012). Education   research,   planning, conducting   and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. 4th edition. Boston: Pearson Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018).   Research design (5th ed.). SAGE   Publications

30. Crowe, M. L. (2016). Questionnaire research: A practical guide. Routledge.

31. Cruz, V. (2020). *Quality management system handbook* for product development companies. CRC Press.

32. Daka, H. & Changwe, R. (2020). *An Exploration of Education Quality in the Light of the Grade Point Average and Examination Attrition Rate*. International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education, 7 (6), 196-207.

33. Daniel, B.K. (2019). *Big data and analytics in higher education: Opportunities and challenges.* Br. J. Educ. Technol., 46, 904-920.

34. Dahatan, P. (2020). *School Monitoring Evaluation and Adjustment in Public Secondary Schools: Practices and Performance of Administrators,* 2(2), 48-59

35. De Guzman, J. (2018). *Monitoring and evaluation: Key steps for long-term services andsupports organizations*. Generations, 42(1), 50-55

36. Denzin, Y. and Lincoln, L. (2018). *Combination of administrative supervision and educational inspection*. Education Science, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 37-40

37. Department of Education Manual. School Monitoring and Evaluation System. Retrieved from://www. Docshare01.docshare.tips/files/30264/302648746.pdf.

38. DeVellis, R. F. (2018). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Vol. 26). Sage publications.

39. Dinamalanta, V. N. (2020). *Monitoring and evaluation of education in Nigeria: challenges and ways forward,* vol. 5(63), 69-80

40. Durlak, J. A., (2008). Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. American journal of community psychology, 41(3-4), 327-350

41. Education Sector Analysis (2022). DepEd Order No. 29, s. 2022: Guidelines on the Monitoring and Evaluation of Basic Education Programs for Results-Based Performance Management System in the Department of Education.

42. Egal, G. (2019). Identifying improvement areas when implementing green initiatives using a multitier AHP approach. *Benchmarking:* An International Journal, 17(3), 452-463. https://doi.org/10.1108/14635771011049399

43. Eremugo**,** S., and Okoche, R. (2021). *Quality Standards and Quality Assurance in Basic Education*: Experience from Burundi, Eritrea, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda. Nairobi, Kenya

44. Evans, P. (2019). *Government action, social capital and development: reviewing the evidence on synergy.* World Development, 24 (6), 1119-32

45. Fullan, M. (2020). *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.

46. Funnell, S., & Rogers, P. (2018). *Purposeful program theory: Effective use of Theories of change and logic models*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

47. Gabito, D. R. (2018*). School-Based Management and Community Partnership Practices of Elementary Schools*. Tagbilaran City: Holy Name University.

48. Gibbs, G. (2019) Analysing Qualitative Data. SAGE Publications Ltd. New York, USA http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849208575

49. Gibson, G. F., Audrey, S., Barker, M., Bond, L., Bonell, C., Hardeman, W., & Baird, J. (2015). Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. BMJ, 350, h1258.

50. Green, L. W., & Kreuter, M. W. (2019). *Health Program Planning: An Educational and Ecological Approach* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

51. Goyder, R. (2019). Learning and development. Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal, 26(1).

52. Guyadeen, G. A., & Seasons, A. P. (2018). *Improving performance: How to manage the white space on the organization chart.* John Wiley & Sons. p45

53. Hamid, A., (2021). A monitoring and evaluation system for South African higher education: *conceptual, methodological and practical concerns, South African Journal of Higher Education*, 1011- 3487

54. Haradhan, M**.** (2018): *Qualitative research methodology in Social Sciences and related subjects.* Published in:*Journal of Economic Development, Environmental People* Vol. 7 No. 1 (31 March 2018): pp.23-48

55. Harris, A. (2018). Distributed leadership and school improvement: leading or misleading? Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 32(1), 11- 24.

56. Harrison, R. (2020). *Learning and development. Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal,* 26(1).

57. Hoy, E. & Hoy, E. (2020) *Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation by Principals on Effective Teaching and Learning,* Vol.6, No.9, 2019

58. Huyler**,** Debaro & McGill, Craig. (2019). Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches, by John Creswell and J. David Creswell. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc. New Horizons in adult education and human resource development. 31. 75- 77.10.1002/nha3.

59. Javed, C. F., Scott, B. G., Graham, R. A., Banks, D. M., Russell, J. D., Taylor, L. K., & Marino, R. C. (2015). *Fitting anxious emotion-focused intervention into the ecology of schools*: Results from a test anxiety program evaluation. Prevention Science, 16(2), 200-210

60. Kabeyi**,** E. (2019). *Total quality management in education*. Routledge. 132-133.

61. Kamadaka, G., & Pradesh, L. (2018). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. Field methods, 18(1), 59-82.

62. Kananura, D.J., (2019). Dynamic capabilities as (workable) management systems theory. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 24(3), pp.359-368.

63. Karanja, R. J and Yusuf, M. P. (2018).Leadership in Organizational Setting. *Organizational Behavior: Emerging Realitiesfor Workplace Revolution*. McGraw Hill: NY.p 415.

64. Karimi**,** M., Maluwa, H. P., & Kyalo, T. H. (2020). *Classical Test Theory. In Educational Measurement for Applied Researchers* (pp. 73-90). Springer, Singapore.

65. Komba, J. (2019). Deadlines in product development. Management Science. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2120227

66. Korstiens, M. and Moser, A. (2018). Research methods quantitative and qualitative approaches. Nairobi: Acts Press.

67. Kusek, J.Z. and Rist, R.C**.** (2019*) Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system*, World Bank, D.C., Washington,

68. Kyalo, K. (2020). Field experiments in education in developing countries. *In Handbook of Economic Field Experiments* (Vol. 2, pp. 323-385). North-Holland.

69. Lakin, H. K. (2019). Two criteria for good measurements in research*: Validity and reliability. Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series*, 17(4), 59-82.

70. Lani, H. (2020). The state and quality of education in Tanzania: *A reflection. Papers in Education and Development*, (31)

71. Leithwood, K., & Louis, K. S. (2018). *Leadership for Learning: How to Help Teachers Succeed*. The Leadership and Learning Center.

72. LeMahieu, E. (2018). Goal Setting Theory of Motivation. DOI: https://www.mamgementstudyhq.com/LeMahieu-goal-settingtheory.htm

73. Lincoln, YS. & Guba, EG. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

74. Macalindong, R. O. Department of Education (2019). The School Monitoring and Evaluation System. Retrieved from DOI https:// deped- qms.wikispaces.com/Monitoring +and+Evaluation+System

75. Mackay, K. (2020) *How to Build M&E Systems to Support Better Government*, The World Bank Independent Group (IEG), Washington, D.C.

76. Mackenzie, S. D., et al. (2019). *Simplifying School Monitoring for Better Outcomes*. Journal of Educational Leadership, 15(2), 45-61.

77. Madrid, M. (2018). The new meaning of educational change. Routledge. 431.

78. Maijo, A. A. (2020). *Effective monitoring and evaluation*. African evaluation journal 3(1), Art. 142, 8

79. Marriott, N. and Goyder, H. (2019). *Manual for Monitoring and Evaluating EducationPartnerships*. International Institute for Educational Planning and UNESCO: UK.

80. Maxwell, J. C. (2017). *Developing the Leader within You*. Thomas Nelson: NY

81. Mbali,M (2019) *The implementation of the government-wide monitoring and evaluation system in South Africa* : a provincial case study of the KwaZulu-Natal Department of Economic Development and Tourism, University of Kwanzulu, Natal, South Africa

82. McKinsey (2019). How the world's best Performing School Systems Come out on top. Retrieved from: www.smhc-cpre.org.pdf.

83. McLaughlin, M. (2018). Accountability and creating accountability: A framework for exploring behavioral perspectives of corporate governance. British Journal of Management, 16(s1).

84. McShane, S. L. and Glinow, M V. *Organizational Behavior: Emerging Realities for Workplace Revolution*.3rd ed.McGraw Hill: NY.

85. Mendels, P. (2017, May). Getting Intentional About Principal Evaluation.*Educational Leadership*: Lifting School Leaders.74(8),52-56.

86. Mertens, D. M., & Wilson, A. T. (2019). *Program Evaluation Theory and Practice: A Comprehensive Guide*. Guilford Press.

87. Mhina, C. S. (2019). *Participatory monitoring and evaluation for quality programs in higher education*. What is the way for Uganda? Vol. 12(1) 52-59

88. Mills, S. S., Mulwa, A. S., & Kyalo, D. N. (2020). Stakeholder engagement in monitoring and evaluation and performance of literacy and numeracy: Educational p rogramme in public primary schools in Nairobi county, Kenya. *Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, 10(2), 10.

89. Montelbon, M. R. (2013). I*nstructional Leadership Practices Among Secondary SchoolAdministrators.* University of San Carlos: Cebu City

90. Morse, S., Debevec, L., Giordano, M., and Barron, J. (2020). Monitoring and evaluation of climate resilience for agricultural development–*A review of currently available tools. World Development Perspectives*, 5, 10-23

91. Nolasco, R. M. (2020). The prospects of multilingual education and literacy in the Philippines. *The paradox of Philippine education and education reform*: Social science perspectives, 133-145.

92. Pacia, G., Hoy, M. (2018) A framework to support educational decision making in mobile learning: Computers in Human Behavior, Volume 47, 2015, Pages 50–59, DOI: 10.1016/j. chb.2014.05.045.

93. Palinkas, LA, Horwitz SM, Green CA, Wisdom JP, Duan N, Hogwood K,. *Purposeful sampling for Qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed implementation research.* Adm Policy Mental Health. 2015 Sep;42(5):533-44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y PMID: 24193818; PMCID: PMC4012002

94. Paragoso, S. & Barazon, L. 2019. School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustment (SMEA) in Central Cebu, Philippines. Retrieved from School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjjustment (SMEA) in Central Cebu, Philippines | Semantic Scholar

95. Park, P. G., & Nui, J. (2018). *Improving School Performance: The Role of Monitoring and Evaluation*. Routledge.

96. Patton, M (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation, 4th edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

97. Patton, M. (1990) *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods, 2nd edition.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

98. Pecajas, J. C. (2022). *Leadership Practices and Productivity of Educational Institutions*. Holy Name University: Tagbilaran City.

99. Peck, C. (2018). *Ten Steps to a Results-based Monitoring and Evaluation system,* 1011- 3487. Wiesbaden: Springer https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531- 18984-0 23

100. Poister, T. H. (2019). *Measuring performance in public and CNU Journal of Higher Education,* Volume 13 (2019) 74 nonprofit organizations. John Wiley & Sons.

101. Quisumbing, M. D. (2018). Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. Ethnobotany Research and Applications, 5, 147-158.

102. Rahman, M. A. (2018). Challenges facing the implementation of a competency-based education and training (CBET) system in Tanzanian technical institutions. Education in Tanzania in the era of globalization: Challenges and opportunities, 242-255

103. Rebleza, J.C. (2016). *School- Based Management Program: Extent of Implementation, Problems and Impact*. Tagbilaran City: Holy Name University

104. Read, L. and Atinc, T. (2018). Investigations Into Using Data to Improve Learning: Philippines Case Study. Research Gate. Retrieved from (PDF) Investigations into Using Data to Improve Learning: Philippines Case Study (researchgate.net)

105. Republic Act 9155 Section 5 order no. 39 Series of 2017 : Governance of BasicEducation Act of 2001

106. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2017/06/DO_s2017_032.pdf

107. Resnik, D. B. (2020). What is Ethics in research & why is it important?

108. National institute of environmental health Sciences.

109. https://www.niehs.nih.gov/research/resources/bioethics/whatis/index.cfm

110. Rose, N. K., & Sika, Y. S. (2019). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

111. Ruzzi, N. (2018). Taking stock of monitoring and evaluation systems in the health sector: findings from Rwanda and Uganda. 29(4):506-16. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czt038

112. Salamon, L. M**.,** & Anheier, H. K. (2018). *The Emerging Sector - An Overview. Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins University Institute for Policy Studies

113. Scheerens, J., Glas, C. A., Thomas, S. M., & Thomas, S. (2019). *Educational evaluation, assessment, and monitoring: a systemic approach* (Vol. 13). Taylor & Francis.154- 155.

114. Senge, E. (2019). Total quality management in education. Routledge. 132-133.

115. Sharma**,** R. (2020). The Internal Dynamic. In R. Sharma, & V. Ramachandran, *The Elementary Education System in India: Exploring Institutional Structures, Processes and Dynamics* (pp. 140-194).*,* 1054-1076. https://doi.org/10.1007/s119- 018-9512-8

116. Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative

117. research projects. *Education for Information*, 22, 63-75. https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-2004-22201

118. Shivastava, B., and Hopwood, M. (2018). An Alberta Approach to School Improvement in an Australian Rural School. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 67(3).

119. Shiver, R. J. (2018). Leadership in Organizational Setting. Organizational Behavior: Emerging Realitiesfor Workplace Revolution. Mc Graw Hill: NY.p 415.

120. Showkat, N., & Parveen, H.(2018) . Non-probability and probability Sampling. E- PG Pathshala.

121. Smith, M. (2019). ABC of content validation and content validity index calculation. Education in Medicine Journal. 2019;11(2):49–54.

122. Spinks, A. (2018). Internal Consistency Reliability. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. Retrieved from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Internal-Consistency-Reliabi lity- Shuttleworth/6bd8727ad21790a48341349603ac8531b08a81b4

123. Stachhowiak (2019)**,** Total quality management in education. Routledge. 132-133.

124. Stoll, L., et al. (2019). *The Impact of School Leadership on Student Outcomes: A Research Synthesis of the Evidence.* DfES Research Report 634.

125. Stromquist, N. P., & Monkman, K**.** (Eds.). (2019). *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*. 16(2), 199-205. DOI: 10.1080/09589236.2021.1935804

126. Sutton, J. and Austin, G. (2018). Healthy schools, robust schools and academic emphasis as an organizational theme. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37:463-475.

127. Toop, F. W. (2019). *Scientific management Theory*. Retrieved from DOI :https;//www.mindtools.com/pagearticle/ newTMM_Topp.html.

128. Tsui, J., Hearn, S. and Young, J. (2019*).* Monitoring and evaluation of Policy Influence and Advocacy. odi.org

129. UNESCO (2019*).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

130. Vasavi, A. R. (2019). Culture and Life of Government Elementary Schools. *Economic andPolitical Weekly* , I (33), 36-50

131. Vinovskin**,** M. (2018). *A Nation at Risk to No Child Left Behind: National education goals and the creation of federal education policy*. Teachers College Press.

132. Tiburca, A. (2019). Five Best Practices for a Successful Project Implementation. Retrieved from: www.https.//team.week.com.

133. Villanueva, A. (2020). Accountability and creating accountability: A framework for exploring behavioral perspectives of corporate governance. Journal of Management, 16(s1).

134. Willams, D. J. (2018). Monitoring School Performance for Standard Based Reforms. Retrieved on April 5, 2012 from http: www.infomaworld.com.

135. Wilton, S. (2019). Designing monitoring and evaluation systems in PEPs. Switzerland. ILO Publications (Rights and Permissions), International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. ISBN 9789221267713; 9789221267720.

136. Woulfe, A. (2018). Determinants of effectiveness of a monitoring and evaluation system for projects: A case of Amrep Kenya Wash Programme. Retrieved on June 21, 2022, from http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/ /bitstream/ handle /11295/92952

137. Zucker, P. and Brehm, R.W. (2019) Assessing trustworthiness in naturalistic consumerresearch. *Association of Consumer Research*, Provo, 69-84.