Impact of Independent Monitoring Unit (IMU) on Public Sector Secondary Schools Performances in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

Assad -us- Samad[*] , Arshad Ali[†]

Abstract

This study is to investigate the impact of Independent Monitoring Unit on public sector secondary school performance in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan. Objectives of the study were to identify the impact of an Independent Monitoring Unit on the student academic achievements and the basic facilities of schools. Research is quantitative and descriptive in nature. A sample of 20 secondary schools with 200 participants (100 male and 100 female) randomly selected through multi stages cluster sampling techniques from two districts. The data was analyzed using SPSS, chi-square and T-test. On the basis of results, it is recommended that the governments and policy maker revised the mechanism of the new monitoring unit, and introduced sustainable training to the newly monitoring staffs for the betterments of schools.

Keywords: independents monitoring units, school's performance, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

Introduction:

Monitoring functions as a systematic assortment of information about the performance of any institutions on the bases of a particular indicator (Curkovic, Scannell, Wagner, & Vitek, 2013). It identifies the solution of problems with the help of collected data in multi-dimensional agreements (Kiesler & Sproull, 1982).Therefore monitoring generates information about an institution wrong or right direction by connecting its past, present and future ((Micek et al., 2010) :(Kahaleh et al., 2006). Moreover, it identifies the shot fall of the system for making effective and timely measure to the better performance (Shivastava, 2008). As, this system is used by the advance and developed countries to evaluate their institution performance. The system was introduced for the first time in history by the united kingdom (UK), called as an independent monitoring board (IBM) with a constitution structure based the prison act 1952 ,which was previously took care the prisoner in the United Kingdom(Raffan & Ruthen, 2003). In this way, a considerable number of staff was recruited

[*]Ph.D. Scholar, Institute of Education and Research (IER) University of Peshawar, Email: assad.scholar@gmail.com

[†]Prof.Director, Institute of Education and Research (IER) University of Peshawar, Email: arshad-ali@uop.edu.pk

to evaluate the situation of justices and other serious problem related to the prisoners like, health, food etc. Besides, a literature was also produced to promote the basic concept of monitoring and its effect on the institution .Later on, the effect of this literature fascinates to the other institutions, like education and health departments etc. it is used in the education circle to monitor and inspection of schools to increase the performance of both the students and teachers. (Scheerens, Glas, Thomas, & Thomas, 2003).The system is used to collect data for addressing the issues hindered in effective performances in schools(Goetz et al., 2011);(Scheerens et al., 2003). According to (Halverson, Prichett, Grigg, & Thomas, 2005) the measure of external accountability is a need of a day it provides basis for making decision and stress ongoing information. Besides,(Murphy, Greaney, Lockheed, & Rojas, 1996) stated that monitoring works to develop various domain of achievement, and to ensure the enactment of the students in academic circle. (Donahue, Selden, & Ingraham, 2000) believe that the monitoring system also evaluates the academic achievements as well as teacher's absenteeism. In educational institution the standard can be same, which is on average value and predefine goal (Shavelson, 1988). Monitoring and inspection has positively impacted on the performance of school has been mentioned in different research study (Dean & Kiu, 2002) ;(Børsting et al., 2008). It has been, for the first time, lunched by the Punjab government in Pakistan since 2005, known as smart monitoring system (SMS) to monitor various institutions.

For this purpose, departments of education recruited 950 field offices known as monitoring and evaluation assistant (MEAS). Across Punjab they visit 52675 schools every month to collect data regarding enrollments of students, presence of teachers and basic facilities of schools. Later on in education policy, 2009 Para number 8 mentioned that provisional and district governments would introduce monitoring and inspection system to ensure the quality of education service delivery in all the institutions. After that in 2013 election Pakistan Tehrik -Insaaf (PTI) came in to power in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan with other parties like; Jamaat- Islami (JI) and Qawmi Watan Party (QWP). It is the responsibilities of the government to enhance quality of education and to ensure, the government of KP established new independent monitoring unit (IMU) in March 2014.The ultimate purpose of this monitoring and inspection system is to check absenteeism and regularity of teachers, drop- out rate of the students and the basic facilities of schools (Raza, 2017).

Education minister and secretary, Elementary secondary education (E&SE) told to the employees of the department, that United Kingdom agency, which is known as department for the International development (DFID) basically, introduced the project of IMU. Education Secretary

further added, in school's area the monitors put the data in the smart phone, so the head office of the monitoring unit will assess the data in each district. The head of the monitoring unit be the district monitoring officer (DMO) will be recruited the provincial management services (PMS). The monitoring staff has been given transport facilities i.e.; Motorcycle plus 10000 as per fuel allowance per month. Schools had been divided into different groups and each group consists of 50-60 schools. Every month each group is responsible to monitors 50-60 schools. In order to prevent close relation of the monitoring assistant with the teachers, who may directly affect the performance of monitor as well as the performance of schools (Ashfaq, 2014). Regionally, it is a new study in KP Pakistan. So, researcher has taken present study about the impact of an independent monitoring unit on the performance of secondary schools in KP Pakistan.

Objectives of the Study

The following are the objectives of the study.

1. Identify the impact of Independent Monitoring Unit on the academic achievements of the students**.**
2**.** To explore the Impact of an Independent Monitoring Unit (IMU) on the basic facilities of schools.

Hypothesis

H_1-There is no significant impact of Independent Monitoring Unit on the academic achievements of the students.

H_2- There is no significant impact of independent monitoring unit on the basic facilities of schools.

Research Design

Research study was quantitative and descriptive in nature.

Data Collection Instrument

Nature of the study was quantitative, so Likert five point scales closed ended questionnaires were used for dada collection. The questionnaires deal the data regarding the impact of independent monitoring unit on the academic achievements of students and the basic facilities of schools.

Validity and Reliability of the Tools

Questionnaires were validated with the help of supervisor and three PhD scholars, after validation pilot test was conducted. The Cronbach's alpha was 0.8 (0.5-0.9), which means that the questionnaires were valid for data collection.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed through SPSS (Statistical package for Social Sciences) version 21, using chi-square and T-test**:** both are inferential statistics (Gay, 2009). Because the natures of the data were nominal (dichotomous), Chi-square test is used for testing the hypotheses between categorical variables, and T-test are used to analysis the primary data i.e; annuals examination result, to check where there is a significant different between the mean of two groups.

Population and Sample

According to Education Management Information System (2016-2017) there were 2108 secondary schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, out of these 1386 boys and 722 girls and 674461 students (443166 males, 231295 female) in secondary level. There are seven (7) Divisions and twenty-five (26) Districts in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. All the 200 (100 male and 100 female) secondary schools in Hazara and Malakand division of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa were the Population of the study.

Sample of 20 (10 males, 10 Female) secondary schools with 200 (100 males, 10 female) respondents randomly selected through multi stage cluster sampling techniques from the two divisions Hazara and Malakand) and one district (Chitral, Mansehra) from each. For large and geographically scattered area cluster sampling is the best option for the study(Castro, Kellison, Boyd, & Kopak, 2010).There were 73(54 male,19 female) secondary schools in district Chiral , and in Mansehra district 127(82 male,45 female) secondary schools. From each district ten (10) secondary schools (5 boys, 5 girls) and (5 urban, 5 rural) be selected, and from each school one (1) head, five (5) teachers, seven (4) students be selected for the data collection.

Results and Discussions

Table: 1- Showing the Basic Facilities of Schools

Statements	SDA	DA	UN	AG	SA	Chi-Value	P
1-Basic Facilities	56 11.2%	87 11.2%	54 10.8%	185 37.0%	118 23.6%	117.7	.000
2-Meagre of basic facilities	66 13.2%	111 22.2%	61 12.2%	174 34.8%	8 17.6%	84.180	.000

3-Basic facilities were improved	59 11.8%	98 19.6%	65 13.0%	171 34.2%	107 21.4%	80.0	.000
4-Check non availability of water	42 8.4%	66 13.2%	50 10.0%	171 34.2%	107 21.4%	80.000	.000
5-Cleanness of Schools	80 16.0%	115 23.0%	67 13.4%	113 26.6%	105 21.0%	28.280	.000
6-You are Satisfied	51 10.2%	70 14.0%	48 9.6%	200 40.0%	131 26.2%	169.66	.000

Table 1 No item 1 identifies that 28.6% of the respondent disagree that the independent monitoring unit, monitors the availability and non-availability of basic facilities and 60.6% of the respondents were agree upon the statement whereas 10.8% of the respondent are undecided. Value of the chi-square is 117.700 and value of P is .000. The findings were statistically significant, on the application of chi-square test. Item 2 illustrates that 31.4% of the respondent disagree that after the commencement of IMU the non-availability of basic facility is improved and 55.6% of the respondents were agree upon the statement whereas 13.0% of the respondent are undecided. Value is 80.000 and value of P is .000. The findings were statistically significant on the application of chi-square test. Item 3 illustrates 39% of the respondent disagree that the monitoring system checks cleanness of the school, and 47.6% of the respondents were agree upon the statement whereas 13.4% of the respondent are undecided. Value is 28.280 and value of P is .000. The findings were statistically significant. Item 4 illustrates that 35.4% of the respondent disagree that before IMU there were a meager of basic facility in school, and 52.4% of the respondents were agree upon the statement whereas 12.2% of the respondent are undecided. Value is 84.180 with df-4 and value of P is .000. The findings were statistically significant. Item 5 illustrates that 21.6% of the respondent disagree that, data collection and monitoring assistant checks the non-availability of water in schools, and 68.4% of the respondents were agree upon the statement whereas 10% of the respondent are undecided. Value is 179.840 and value of P is .000. The findings were statistically significant on the application of chi-square test.

Item 6 demonstrates that 24.2% of the respondents disagree, before IMU there was a water problem in the school, and 66.2% of the respondents were agreed upon the statement whereas 9.6% of the respondents are undecided. Value of chi-square is 169.660 and value of P is .000. The findings were statistically significant on the application of the chi-square test.

Academic Achievements, Four years before IMU and Four years after IMU. Over All Annual Result Class 9th and 10th (2010-2017)

Table -2 Peshawar Board Annual Results: (2010-2017)

Groups	Years -	Mean	SD	Df	F	P
Before(2010 -2013)	4	66.4950	11.4035	6	.300	.604
After (2014-2017)	4	71.2594	8.99950	5.621		

Not-Significant

Table 2 demonstrates that the data analysis of the result, four years before monitoring and inspection, and four years after monitoring and inspection. No significant difference showed between the mean scores (M = 66.4950, S= 11.74035 and (M=71.2594, S= 8.99950), t (6) =.300, p= .604>0.05. Therefore, it is safe to accept the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the means. It represented, that the year of monitoring and inspection is not significant different between the academic achievement of the students. This difference was not statically significant at the level 0.604 ($P \geq 0.05$). However, the above result indicates; that the Independent Monitoring Unit has no impact on the academic achievements of the students.

Table -3 Abbottabad Board Annual Results: (2010-2017)

Groups	Years	Mean	SD	Df	F	P
Before(2010-2013)	4	70.7263	2.18676	6	14.06	.010
After (2014-2017)	4	71.7713	4.96762	4.103		

Not-Significant

Table 3 shows the data analysis of the result four years before IMU and four years after IMU. There is a significant difference in the mean scores (M =70.7263, S= 2.18676and (M=71.7713, S=4.96762), t (6) = 14.06, p= 0.10> 0.05 Therefore, it is safe to accepted the null hypothesis (H_2) that there is no difference between the means of two groups.

Findings

Before independent monitoring unit (IMU) meager of basic facilities were at schools. 52.4% of the principal agreed, 35.4% disagreed and12.2% undecided. 50% teachers agreed, 31.3% disagreed and 18.8% undecided, while 44.8% students agreed, 34.4% disagreed and 20.8% undecided. Data collection and monitoring assistant checks the basic facilities of schools.60.6% principal agreed, 28.6% disagreed and 10.8% undecided. 60.6% teachers agreed, 28.6% disagreed and 10.8% teachers undecided, while in this regard students were no responses. Independents Monitoring Unit (IMU) improved the basic facilities in schools.55.6% principals agreed, 31.4% disagreed and 13% undecided.66.6% teachers agreed, 17.7% disagree and 11.5% undecided. Majority of the respondents were satisfied to the monitoring system.66.2% principal agreed, 24.2% disagreed and 9.6% undecided. 70.6% teachers agreed, 22% disagreed and 7.4% undecided, while 83.5% agreed, 12% disagreed and 4.5% undecided.

Conclusions and Discussion

On the bases of objectives and the main findings of the study following conclusions and discussion were drawn.Majority of the respondents (Principals, Teachers, and Students) agreed that before the monitoring unit, there were meagre of basic facilities at the schools like; Water, Electricity, Toilets, Boundary wall. After IMU basic facilities has been improved. The above results indicate that the independent monitoring unit has no impact on academic achievement of students. The null hypothesis H_1 of the study was, there is no significant impact of IMU on the basic facilities of schools. But conclusion of the study related to the particular hypothesis shows that before IMU there were as meagre of basic facilities in schools, and after IMU the basic facilities were improved. So there is a significant impact of IMU on the basic facilities of schools. Hence on the basis of evidences, researcher rejected the null hypothesis H_1.The null hypothesis H_1 of the study was, there is no significant impact of IMU on the student's academic achievements, but conclusion of the study shows, there is no significant impact of IMU on student academic

achievements of the students. Researcher findings were closely related to many famous research studies regarding monitoring and inspection of schools like (Luginbuhl, Webbink, & De Wolf, 2009) found the program in far below and above average English schools improves after monitoring and inspection, it is mentioned that monitoring and inspection did not improve the academic achievement of the students in the year of monitoring and inspection at secondary level (Myles et al., 2004). Researcher mentioned the teaching learning process that takes energy and time in lower level especially in primary level. Moreover, reports presented by (Allen & Burgess, 2012) based on separate, large, longitudinal data sets in England with a sophisticated process for analysis. Findings are related to monitoring found that the judgments of negative inspection about the report of monitoring and students result are accelerating to improve the performance of the students (Day, Gu, & Sammons, 2016). Hence on the basis of hypothesis and the conclusion, researcher accepted the null hypothesis H_2.

Recommendation

The monitors should be given proper training for the effective monitoring, and improvement of the mechanism of the new independent monitoring unit. Because untrained monitoring staff do not check the schools properly. Untrained and low-qualified monitoring staffs do not monitor the teaching learning process of the teachers. They directly affect the annual Examination results. Moreover, management cadre should be given proper training for monitoring and inspection. The data collection and monitoring assistant (DCMA) must visit the schools thrice a month randomly to check the overall system, specially the teaching learning process. They must have the basic knowledge about teaching learning process to give suggestion and feed back to the teachers on the spot. Besides, this the study recommends for future research regarding monitoring and inspection in other institutions like; Health, Education and other private institutions performance in Pakistan.

References

Allen, R., & Burgess, S. (2012). *How should we treat under-performing schools?: a regression discontinuity analysis of school inspections in England*: CMPO Bristol, UK.

Ashfaq. (2014, 4 January). Role of Independent Monitorning Unit, *Dawn*, p. 9.

Børsting, C., Sanchez, J. J., Hansen, H. E., Hansen, A. J., Bruun, H. Q., & Morling, N. (2008). Performance of the SNPforID 52 SNP-plex assay in paternity testing. *Forensic Science International: Genetics, 2*(4), 292-300.

Castro, F. G., Kellison, J. G., Boyd, S. J., & Kopak, A. (2010). A methodology for conducting integrative mixed methods research and data analyses. *Journal of mixed methods research, 4*(4), 342-360.

Curkovic, S., Scannell, T., Wagner, B., & Vitek, M. (2013). A longitudinal study of supply chain risk management relative to COSO's enterprise risk management framework. *Modern Management Science & Engineering, 1*(1), 13-36.

Day, C., Gu, Q., & Sammons, P. (2016). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: How successful school leaders use transformational and instructional strategies to make a difference. *Educational administration quarterly, 52*(2), 221-258.

Dean, A. M., & Kiu, C. (2002). Performance monitoring and quality outcomes in contracted services. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*.

Goetz, K., Campbell, S. M., Steinhaeuser, J., Broge, B., Willms, S., & Szecsenyi, J. (2011). Evaluation of job satisfaction of practice staff and general practitioners: an exploratory study. *BMC Family Practice, 12*(1), 137.

Halverson, R., Prichett, R., Grigg, J., & Thomas, C. (2005). The New Instructional Leadership: Creating Data-Driven Instructional Systems in Schools. WCER Working Paper No. 2005-9. *Wisconsin Center for Education Research (NJ1)*.

Kahaleh, M., Hernandez, A. J., Tokar, J., Adams, R. B., Shami, V. M., & Yeaton, P. (2006). Interventional EUS-guided cholangiography: evaluation of a technique in evolution. *Gastrointestinal endoscopy, 64*(1), 52-59.

Kiesler, S., & Sproull, L. (1982). Managerial response to changing environments: Perspectives on problem sensing from social cognition. *Administrative science quarterly*, 548-570.

Luginbuhl, R., Webbink, D., & De Wolf, I. (2009). Do inspections improve primary school performance? *Educational evaluation and policy analysis, 31*(3), 221-237.

Micek, S. T., Welch, E. C., Khan, J., Pervez, M., Doherty, J. A., Reichley, R. M., & Kollef, M. H. (2010). Empiric combination antibiotic therapy is associated with improved outcome against sepsis due to

Gram-negative bacteria: a retrospective analysis. *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy, 54*(5), 1742-1748.

Murphy, P., Greaney, V., Lockheed, M. E., & Rojas, C. (1996). National Assessments. *Testing the system*.

Myles, P. S., Leslie, K., McNeil, J., Forbes, A., Chan, M., & Group, B.-A. T. (2004). Bispectral index monitoring to prevent awareness during anaesthesia: the B-Aware randomised controlled trial. *The lancet, 363*(9423), 1757-1763.

Raffan, J., & Ruthen, K. (2003). Monitoring and assessment. *Key issues in secondary education: Introductory readings*, 28-40.

Raza, S. (2017). Teacher absenteeism is a major problem, *The News*, p. 12.

Scheerens, J., Glas, C. A., Thomas, S. M., & Thomas, S. (2003). *Educational evaluation, assessment, and monitoring: A systemic approach* (Vol. 13): Taylor & Francis.

Shavelson, R. J. (1988). The 1988 Presidential Address Contributions of Educational Research to Policy and Practice: Constructing, Challenging, Changing Cognition. *Educational Researcher, 17*(7), 4-11.