International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Monitoring and Evaluation Practices of Philippine Schools: Insights from the Pisa 2022 Data

Stephan Jade D. Navarro[1], Ruel T. Bonganciso[2], Gemma F. Gadian[3]

[1,2]PhD in Education – Research and Evaluation Student, College of Education, University of the Philippines – Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines
[3]PhD in Education – Physics Education, College of Education, University of the Philippines – Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines

Abstract
Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are essential for improving educational quality, accountability, and instructional practices. The Department of Education's Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (BEMEF) aims to institutionalize M&E across schools in the Philippines. However, ongoing disparities in student outcomes, as reflected in the 2018 and 2022 PISA assessments, raise concerns about M&E practices. This study examined the M&E profiles of public and private schools using publicly available data from the 2022 PISA School Questionnaire, completed by 188 school heads. Employing causal-comparative and correlational designs, the study examined M&E practices of the schools. Findings show that public schools tend to comply with mandated M&E requirements, while private schools display more initiative in conducting M&E practices. Both sectors report using external evaluations to inform instruction, though private schools apply them more consistently. Chi-square analysis reveals significant differences in initiative-driven practices, with private schools adopting more proactive approaches. Furthermore, correlations indicate that internal evaluations are closely linked to student feedback practices and parent-teacher communication, suggesting that M&E functions can reinforce one another. The study underscores the importance of context-sensitive policies and capacity-building efforts to maximize the impact of M&E on educational outcomes.

Keywords: monitoring and evaluation, public and private schools, PISA 2022, BEMEF

1. INTRODUCTION

The need for monitoring and evaluation in education to raise the standard of instruction is a universally recognized fact. Its inception can be traced back to the early days of public education, when emerging nations utilized education to create a shared language and culture (De Grauwe, 2007). Since then, most countries that do not have a well-defined evaluation of their educational system have started implementing policies and guidelines for school monitoring. Particularly in Asia, there has been a resurgence of interest in tracking the caliber and performance of schools. Despite school monitoring mainly assessing the quality of education, no standard of quality exists in educational practices.

School monitoring constitutes activities when the school community is assessed and evaluated as a place of learning. It is viewed as a tool for ensuring accountability in education and serving as a means to achieve

desired outcomes. By regularly assessing school performance, policies, and teaching effectiveness, educational institutions can be held responsible for delivering quality education. Accountability ensures that schools meet expected standards and continuously improve (Wilcox, 2000; Hoyle & Wallace, 2005; Learmont, 2000). However, before it can enhance the quality of education, authorities must utilize the findings of these evaluations and constantly improve the monitoring process (De Grauwe, 2007).

Interestingly, while school monitoring helps suggest ways and means to enhance school practices, Latif et al. (2022) found that school monitoring does not directly contribute to improving school quality as effectively as expected, challenging the claims made in previous studies. Conversely, teachers have mixed perceptions of school monitoring, viewing it positively and negatively. These perceptions shape their attitudes and interactions with the monitoring team. Since teachers do not fully embrace the monitoring process, maintaining quality education remains challenging in any educational system. For instance, studies on school supervision in Africa have revealed that teachers and supervisors are dissatisfied with its effectiveness in the classroom (Garforth, 2004; Lugaz et al., 2006).

School-based management is increasingly promoted as a quick solution for enhancing efficiency and improving the quality of education (De Grauwe, 2005). Schools are increasingly encouraged to self-evaluate; however, in many countries, this has merely involved a directive from ministries to draft a plan without support or guidance, leading to varying degrees of success. In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) uses a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system to track and assess the performance of schools and programs, ensuring quality and continuous improvement in basic education services through the Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (BEMEF). To this, Schools Division Offices (SDOs) are required to offer technical support to schools. The implementation of the BEMEF covers both public and private sectors. However, because BEMEF is newly introduced, there was no baseline data on the school's level of compliance with it. A study by Race (2023) revealed that most of the selected schools in San Pablo City, Laguna, partially complied with the indicators of BEMEF before the intervention was provided. Even before the implementation of BEMEF, the country's school monitoring has faced challenges, including inadequate data, limited accessibility, outdated technology, and a lack of resources for effective implementation and sustainability.

The many problems and difficulties faced by the Philippine education system make evaluating its success difficult. As such, it was unsurprising that Filipino students performed poorly in international assessments, especially in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). In both editions of the assessment, 2018 and 2022, the country has shown a dismal ranking (Congressional Policy and Budget Research Department, 2024). The same report showed that private school students outperformed their public school counterparts in all competency areas, significantly improving from the 2018 scores—11 points in Mathematics, 21 in Science, and 29 in Reading. Several factors have been identified in the literature to account for the stark disparity in the performance of public and private schools. Bernardo et al. (2022) identified internet access, parents' occupational status, expected job, motivation and persistence, emotional support from parents, perception of school cooperation, and available ICT resources as identifiers of poor performance in Mathematics.

Since private and public schools are regulated and monitored by the DepEd, little literature has examined how evaluation practices differ between types of schools. This study addresses this by examining the profiles of public and private schools that participated in PISA 2022 as to their monitoring and evaluation practices. Comparing evaluation and monitoring practices in private and public schools is important for understanding how private schools achieved better outcomes in the PISA 2022 assessment. Beyond the

context of PISA 2022, by comparing both sectors, gaps in monitoring and evaluation implementation may be identified that may contribute to differences in student outcomes. Lastly, understanding the differences or similarities can lead to strategies that bridge performance gaps or foster existing monitoring and evaluation strategies.

Related Literature and Theoretical Underpinnings

Global education assessments have increasingly focused on evaluating students' knowledge acquisition and ability to apply that knowledge in real-world contexts. One prominent initiative is the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), conducted by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). PISA assesses whether 15-year-old students nearing the end of their compulsory education possess the essential skills and competencies required for effective participation in modern society. The assessment framework goes beyond measuring rote memorization, emphasizing the application of knowledge in unfamiliar, practical situations both within and outside the school environment. This reflects a broader shift in educational priorities, where the capacity to utilize knowledge meaningfully is valued more than simple content recall (OECD, 2019).

The School Questionnaire belongs to the Context Questionnaire Framework of the Assessment. The theoretical foundation of the 2012 overarching framework is based on Purves' (1987) Context-Input-Process-Outcome (CIPO) model, which was reformed in the succeeding versions. In the CIPO model, contextual variables for understanding education systems are conceptualized as a series of inputs (student background), processes (teaching and learning, school policies, governance), and outcomes (performance and non-cognitive outcomes) shaped at the student, classroom, school, and country levels (OECD, 2019). Domain-general modules represent the constructs important for understanding differences in achievement that are not tied to a specific subject area. In the 2022 edition, these constructs were further distinguished into five categories of educational policy: governance, system-level policies, and practices. This is in response to the need to address issues related to the system level (Hanushek & Woesmann, 2011). For instance, assessment and evaluation are fundamental processes that policy makers or school administrators use to control school quality and monitor and foster school improvement. Prior PISA cycles have covered assessment, evaluation, and accountability aspects in the School Questionnaire (SCQ) by identifying various purposes for assessing students. In the PISA 2022 framework, the items chosen to be analyzed in the present study belong to the policy focus on a) school practices, policies, and infrastructures, and b) governance, system-level policies, and practices under Module 18: Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability. The dissemination and reporting of assessment and evaluation data to various stakeholders offer significant opportunities for systematic monitoring, constructive feedback, and continuous improvement. In recent years, there has been a marked increase in the recognition of the strategic use of assessment and evaluation outcomes, particularly through feedback provided to students, parents or guardians, educators, and educational institutions, as a highly effective mechanism for quality assurance and enhancement (OECD, 2010, p. 76). Evaluation processes may be classified as either internal or external. These evaluations can be carried out by members within the school community or by external institutions engaged by the school. Diverse evaluation practices often coexist and can be mutually reinforcing (Ryan, Chandler, and Samuels, 2007). For example, external evaluations can broaden the perspective of internal assessments, as well as serve to validate findings and support the implementation of established standards or objectives. Conversely, internal evaluations can enhance the interpretation and practical application of results derived from external evaluations.

The Department of Education adopted the Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in the

Philippines through its department order (DO) number 29 in 2022. The framework aims to guide DepEd operating units across governance levels in monitoring and evaluation. Aligned with Republic Act (RA) 9155, the Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001, and RA 10533, the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, DepEd implements a range of programs, projects, and strategic initiatives aimed at enhancing both access to and the quality of basic education. These efforts are supported by clearly defined roles and responsibilities across all governance levels, with each operational unit held accountable for contributing to the overarching educational objectives. In its ongoing efforts to enhance the provision of basic education services, the Department of Education (DepEd) is also implementing reforms to refine its internal systems and processes to promote greater accountability and transparency. A key aspect of these reforms is the strengthening of evidence-based decision-making practices.

Policy Statement IVb on page 3 of DO 29 states that monitoring should be development-oriented. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) results should be applied "to improve organizational and individual performance and to contribute to continuous learning and improvement towards better delivery of education services." Furthermore, the order specified key points under School M&E that schools should ensure the periodic conduct of M&E in all school operations and processes following existing standards; formalize interface between and among school head, teachers, and non-teaching staff to discuss operational issues and challenges; facilitate participation of learners, communities, and other stakeholders in the exchange of information, practices, insights, lessons, and issues; maintain records of M&E results and integrate such in the preparation of the School Improvement Plan (SIP), Child Protection Committee Functionality Assessment (CPCRF), and other school projects and programs; and link M&E results to the organizational and individual performance. These policy statements were used to formulate the questions addressed in the study.

Statement of the Problem

This research aimed to compare the profile of public and private schools in terms of their monitoring and evaluation practices. Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

- How are the monitoring and evaluation practices of public and private schools described in terms of:
- existence of internal evaluation
- existence of external evaluation
- usage of external evaluation results for changes in school policies
- putting the results of the external evaluation into action for improving teaching
- putting measures derived from the results of external evaluations into practice
- teacher monitoring through assessment of student achievement
- teacher monitoring through peer review
- teacher monitoring by the principal or senior school staff
- teacher monitoring by observation of classes by external inspectors
- feedbacking to teachers by the school management team
- feedbacking to parents or guardians with information on the school and student performance
- seeking written feedback from students
- regular consultation with experts
- Is there a significant difference in the proportion of public and private schools that observe the M&E practices mentioned above?
- Is there a significant association between the following pairs of monitoring and evaluation practices

- existence of internal evaluation and existence of external evaluation
- existence of external evaluation and usage of external evaluation results for changes in school policies
- existence of external evaluation and putting the results of the external evaluation into action for improving teaching
- existence of external evaluation and putting measures derived from the results of external evaluations into practice
- existence of internal evaluation and teacher monitoring by peer review
- existence of internal evaluation and seeking written feedback from students
- existence of external evaluation and regular consultation with experts
- feedback to parents or guardians with information on the school and student performance and feedback to teachers by the school management team

2. Methodology

Research Design

This study made use of descriptive, causal-comparative, and correlational research designs. The descriptive aspect aimed to profile the monitoring practices of public and private schools to get a general picture of the implementation of both schools. On the other hand, a causal-comparative research is a type of non-experimental research wherein the investigator compares two or more groups regarding a cause that has already happened (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). This study's cause is the type of school, whether public or private. Furthermore, this study is also correlational because a correlational statistic was used to describe and measure the degree of association between two variables (Creswell & Guetterman, 2019). These designs are the most appropriate for comparing and analyzing public and private schools' monitoring and evaluation practices extracted from PISA 2022.

Participants

The data used in this study were extracted from the 2022 edition of PISA, specifically from the School Questionnaire. The 188 participating school heads answered the School Questionnaire (SQ). In PISA 2022, schools were chosen through a stratified sampling process, reflecting a school size, location, type, and socioeconomic composition mix, ensuring the sample represents each participating country's population and educational contexts (Educational Research Centre, n.d). Principals from the participating schools were requested to complete the SQ questionnaire about school management, resources, policies, and practices. One participant did not provide valid answers to most of the items. Hence, it was removed from the dataset. Table 1 below shows the school heads' distribution according to their school type.

Type of School	f	Percentage
Private School	34	18.2 %
Public School	153	81.8 %
Total	187	100.0 %

Table 1. Distribution of School Heads According to School Type

Research Instrument

The School Questionnaire asked for information about school background, school management, teaching

staff, assessment and evaluation, targeted groups, and school climate (The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2022). This information helped illustrate the similarities and differences between groups of schools, better establishing the context for students' test results. There were a total of seventy (70) items from the questionnaire. The validity of PISA 2022 questionnaires was ensured through rigorous procedures, including international expert development, collaboration with experienced test centers, and adherence to PISA's technical standards, to provide valid estimates of student achievement and characteristics (OECD, 2023).

Data Collection Procedures

The following were the procedures followed to conduct the study.

Securing Permission. After consulting with the current director of the Department of Education Bureau of Education Assessment, permission was not needed since the data is publicly available.

Data Extraction and Cleaning. The data were downloaded and extracted from the database. Below are the specific data extracted from the database.

- Region and School Type. The school heads encoded the data for region and school type. Items for regions were chosen from a list of codes corresponding to the country's regions. For school type, choices were private government-dependent, private independent, and public.
- SC037Q01TA. This item asked for the existence of internal or self-evaluation in the school. Choices for this item were: a) Yes, this is mandatory, b) Yes, based on school initiative, and c) No.
- SC037Q02TA. This item asked for the existence of an external evaluation in the school. Choices for this item were: a) Yes, this is mandatory, b) Yes, based on school initiative, and c) No.
- SC200Q01JA. This item asked whether the results of the external evaluation led to changes in school policies. Choices for this item were "Yes", "No", and "Not Applicable".
- SC200Q03JA. This item asked whether the data from the external evaluation was used to plan specific actions for the improvement of teaching. Choices for this item were "Yes", "No", and "Not Applicable".
- SC200Q04JA. This item asked whether measures derived from the results of external evaluations were put into practice. Choices for this item were "Yes", "No", and "Not Applicable".
- SC032Q01TA. This item asked if teachers were monitored in the last school year by tests or assessments of student achievement. Answers were recorded as either "Yes" or "No".
- SC032Q02TA. This item asked if teachers were monitored in the last school year by teacher peer review (of lesson plans, assessment instruments, lessons). Answers were recorded as either "Yes" or "No".
- SC032Q03TA. This item asked if teachers were monitored in the last school year by the principal or senior staff through observations of lessons. Answers were recorded as either "Yes" or "No".
- SC032Q04TA. This item asked if teachers were monitored in the last school year by observation of classes by inspectors or other persons external to the school. Answers were recorded as either "Yes" or "No".
- SC201Q03JA. This item asked the school head how often s/he or others in the school management team provide feedback to teachers based on classroom instruction observations. Answers were categorized as: a) never or almost never, b) about once or twice a year, c) about once or twice a month, d) about once or twice a week, and e) every day or almost every day.

- SC201Q07JA. This item asked the school head how often s/he or others in the school management team provide parents or guardians with school and student performance information. Answers were categorized as: a) never or almost never, b) about once or twice a year, c) about once or twice a month, d) about once or twice a week, and e) every day or almost every day.
- SC037Q07TA. This item asked whether seeking written feedback from students (e.g., regarding lessons, teachers, or resources) existed in the school. Choices for this item were: a) Yes, this is mandatory, b) Yes, based on school initiative, and c) No.
- SC037Q09TA. This item asked whether regular consultation aimed at school improvement with one or more experts over at least six months existed in the school. Choices for this item are: a) Yes, this is mandatory, b) Yes, based on school initiative, and c) No.

After extraction, all data gathered were cleaned and organized before data analysis commenced. All 188 responses were retrieved. However, one school head's answers to the questions were removed altogether since most of their answers were inconclusive.

Data Analysis

The following data analysis tools were utilized to answer the questions.

Frequency and Percentage. Frequency and percentage were used to profile the public and private schools regarding their monitoring and evaluation practices. This statistical analysis presented the number of observations of each school type and their proportion concerning the entire group.

Chi-square Test for Equality of Proportions. This statistical test was used to ascertain whether the proportions of schools observing the given monitoring and evaluation practice differ between public and private schools. Except for the variable school-initiated internal evaluation and monitoring of teachers by observation of classes by external inspectors, which were analyzed using the Chi-square test, all other variables were tested using Fisher's Exact Test since the observations are below five. Both tests were conducted at the 5% level of significance.

Chi-square Test for Independence. This statistical test was used to determine whether there is a significant association between the given monitoring and evaluation practices measured on the nominal scale. These variables are the existence of internal evaluation, the existence of external evaluation, the usage of external evaluation results for changes in school policies, putting the results of the external evaluation into action for improving teaching, putting measures derived from the results of external evaluations into practice, and teacher monitoring by principal or senior school staff. **Cramer's V** was used as the association test for six of the eight pairs of variables. The **Phi coefficient** was used to evaluate the existence of internal evaluation and teacher monitoring through peer review. The **Gamma Test** was used to determine whether there is a significant association between the given monitoring and evaluation practices measured on the ordinal scale. These variables are feedbacking to teachers and feedbacking to parents.

3. Results

Profile of monitoring and evaluation practices of public and private schools. The profiles of the monitoring and evaluation practices of public and private schools were compared using frequency and percentage. Tables 2 to 14 present the results of this profiling.

School Type	Mandatory	%	School Initiative	%
Public	100	65.36%	53	34.64%
Private	9	26.47%	25	73.53%
Overall	109	58.29%	78	41.71%

Table 2 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Internal Evaluation

Table 2 presents the profile of public and private schools regarding internal evaluation practices. The data show that public schools are more likely to conduct internal evaluations due to mandatory requirements, with 100 public schools (65.36%) reporting mandatory evaluations compared to only nine private schools (26.47%). In contrast, private schools demonstrate a stronger tendency toward voluntary evaluations, with 25 private schools (73.53%) initiating internal evaluations independently compared to 53 public schools (34.64%).

When combining public and private schools, 58.29% of internal evaluations are conducted because they are mandated, while 41.71% are based on school initiative.

School Type	Mandatory	%	School Initiative	%	No	%
Public	141	92.16%	12	7.84%	0	0
Private	22	64.71%	11	32.35%	1	2.94%
Overall	163	87.17%	23	12.30%	1	0.53%

Table 3 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of External Evaluation

Table 3 presents the profile of public and private schools regarding external evaluation practices. The results show that public schools are more likely to conduct external evaluations due to mandatory requirements, with 141 (92.16%), while only 12 schools (7.84%) conduct external evaluations voluntarily. In private schools, 22 schools (64.71%) conduct external evaluations due to mandatory requirements, while 11 schools (32.35%) conduct external evaluations voluntarily, and 1 (2.94%) school did not practice external evaluation.

87.17% of external evaluations are mandated across public and private schools, 12.30% are school-initiated, and 0.53% of schools reported no external evaluation.

Table 4 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Usage of External Evaluation Results for

School Type	Yes	%	No	%	Not Applicable	%
Public	131	85.62%	14	9.15%	8	5.23%
Private	30	88.24%	3	8.82%	1	2.94%
Overall	161	86.10%	17	9.09%	9	4.81%

Changes in School Policies

Table 4 presents the profile of public and private schools regarding the use of external evaluation results for changes in school policies. The results reveal that 131(85.62%) public schools use external evaluation results to enhance school policies, 14 (9.15%) schools did not, and 8 (5.23%) treated the results as not applicable to the schools. On the other hand, 30 (88.24%) private schools used the results of external

evaluations for school policy improvement, only 3 (8.82%) did not, and only 1 treated the results as not applicable to the school.

Overall, 161 (86.10%) of public and private schools used the evaluation for school improvement, 17 (9.09%) did not, and only 9 (4.81%) treated the results as not applicable.

Table 5 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Putting the Results of External

School Type	Yes	%	No	%	Not Applicable	%
Public	143	93.46%	3	1.96%	7	4.58%
Private	33	97.06%	0	0	1	2.94%
Overall	176	94.12%	3	1.60%	8	4.28%

Evaluation into Action for Improving Teaching

Table 5 presents the profile of public and private schools regarding whether they use the results of external evaluations to improve teaching. The results show that most schools actively use external evaluation results to take action. Notably, 143 public schools (93.46%) and 33 private schools (97.06%) reported utilizing the evaluation outcomes for teaching practices enhancement. Only a small percentage of public schools (1.96%) indicated that they did not use the results, while no private schools reported the same. Additionally, seven public schools (4.58%) and one private school (2.94%) marked this item as not applicable.

Overall, 94.12% of all schools affirmed using external evaluation results for improving teaching, 1.60% did not, and 4.28% indicated the item was not applicable.

Table 6 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Putting Measures Derived from the

School Type	Yes	%	No	%	Not Applicable	%
Public	140	91.50%	6	3.92%	7	4.58%
Private	32	94.12%	0	0	2	5.88%
Overall	172	91.98%	6	3.21%	9	4.81%

Results of the External Evaluations into Practice

Table 6 shows the profile of public and private schools in terms of putting measures derived from the results of external evaluations into practice. The results reveal that many schools take action based on evaluation findings. Among public schools, 140 (91.50%) reported implementing measures derived from external evaluations, while six schools (3.92%) did not, and seven schools (4.58%) indicated that the practice was not applicable. In private schools, 32 schools (94.12%) confirmed applying the measures, with no schools reporting non-implementation and two schools (5.88%) not applicable.

Overall, 91.98% put the results into practice across public and private schools, 3.21% did not, and 4.81% found the item not applicable.

Table 7 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Teacher Monitoring through Assessment

School Type	Yes	%	No	%
Public	151	98.69%	2	1.31%
Private	34	100%	0	0
Overall	185	98.03%	2	1.07%

of Student Achievement

Table 7 presents the profile of public and private schools regarding teacher monitoring through assessment of student achievement. The results show that 151 public schools (98.69%) monitor their teacher through assessment of student achievement, and only two schools did not. In private schools, 34 (100%) monitor their teachers regarding student achievement.

Overall, 185 (98.03%) public and private schools use student achievement assessments to monitor their teachers.

Table 8 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Teacher Monitoring through Peer

School Type	Yes	%	No	%
Public	147	96.08%	6	3.92%
Private	33	97.06%	1	2.95%
Overall	180	96.26%	7	3.74%

Review

Table 8 presents the profile of public and private schools regarding teacher monitoring through peer review. The data reveal that peer review is widely practiced in both school types. In public schools, 147 schools (96.08%) reported engaging in teacher monitoring through peer review, while only six schools (3.92%) indicated otherwise. Similarly, 33 private schools (97.06%) conduct peer reviews, with just one school (2.95%) not practicing it.

Overall, across public and private schools, 96.26% conduct peer reviews for teacher monitoring, while 3.74% do not. These results suggest that teacher monitoring through peer review is a common practice in both public and private educational institutions.

Table 9 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Teacher Monitoring by the Principal or

School Type	Yes	%	No	%
Public	153	100%	0	0
Private	34	100%	0	0
Overall	187	100%	0	0

Senior School Staff

Table 9 presents the profile of public and private schools regarding teacher monitoring conducted by the principal or senior school staff. The data show that teacher monitoring by school leadership is commonly practiced in public and private schools. All 153 public schools (100%) and all 34 private schools (100%) reported that teachers are monitored by either the principal or senior staff. Overall, 100% of the 187

schools surveyed confirmed this practice.

Table 10 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Teacher Monitoring by Observation of

School Type	Yes	%	No	%
Public	136	88.89%	17	11.11%
Private	24	70.59%	10	29.41%
Overall	160	85.56%	27	14.44%

Classes by External Inspectors

Table 10 presents the profile of public and private schools regarding teacher monitoring through the observation of classes by external inspectors. The data indicate that external classroom observation is common, particularly in public schools. Specifically, 136 public schools (88.89%) reported being monitored through external classroom observations, while 17 public schools (11.11%) did not. Among private schools, 24 (70.59%) underwent external observations, while 10 (29.41%) did not.

85.56% of public and private schools reported teacher monitoring through class observations by external inspectors, while 14.44% did not. These findings suggest that while external classroom observations are widely practiced, they are more prevalent in public schools compared to private schools.

Table 11 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Feedbacking to Teachers by the School

School Type	Every day or almost every day	%	About once or twice a week	%	About once or twice a month	%	About once or twice a year	%
Public	28	18.30%	61	39.87%	48	31.37%	16	10.46%
Private	5	14.71%	5	14.71%	20	58.82%	4	11.76%
Overall	33	17.65%	66	35.29%	68	36.36%	20	10.70%

Management Team

Table 11 presents the profile of public and private schools regarding the frequency of feedback the school management team provides to teachers. The data show that among public schools, 28 (18.30%) reported giving feedback every day or almost every day, 61 (39.87%) provided feedback about once or twice a week, 14 (31.37%) about once or twice a month, and 16 (10.46%) about once or twice a year. In private schools, 5 (14.71%) provided feedback every day or almost every day, the same percentage (14.71%) reported feedback once or twice a week, 20 (58.82%) provided it once or twice a month, and 4 (11.76%) once or twice a year.

Overall, across both school types, 17.65% of schools provide feedback daily or almost every day, 35.29% about once or twice a week, 36.36% about once or twice a month, and 10.70% about once or twice a year.

Table 12 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Feedbacking to Parents or Guardians with Information on the School and Student Performance

School Type	Every day or almost every day	%	About once or twice a week	%	About once or twice a month	%	About once or twice a year	%
Public	20	13.07%	31	20.26%	93	60.78%	9	5.88%
Private	1	2.94%	10	29.41%	20	58.82%	3	8.23%
Overall	21	11.23%	41	21.93%	113	60.43%	12	6.42%

Table 12 presents the profile of public and private schools regarding how often they provide feedback to parents or guardians regarding school and student performance. The data show that among public schools, 20 (13.07%) reported providing feedback every day or almost every day, 31(20.26%) once or twice a week, 93 (60.78%) once or twice a month, and 9 (5.88%) once or twice a year. In private schools, only 1 (2.94%) provided feedback every day, 10 (29.41%) once or twice a week, 20 (58.82%) once or twice a month, and 3 (8.23%) once or twice a year.

Overall, across both school types, 11.23% of schools provided feedback daily or almost every day, 21.93% once or twice a week, 60.43% once or twice a month, and 6.42% once or twice a year.

School Type	Mandatory	%	School Initiative	%	No	%
Public	38	24.84%	108	70.59%	7	4.57%
Private	5	14.71%	29	85.29%	0	0
Overall	43	23.00%	137	73.26%	7	3.74%

Table 13 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Seeking Feedback from Students

Table 13 presents the profile of public and private schools in terms of seeking student feedback. The data reveal that in public schools, 38 (24.84%) reported seeking student feedback because it was mandated, while 108 (70.59%) did so voluntarily. In private schools, only 5 (14.71%) gathered feedback due to a mandate, whereas a larger proportion, 29 (85.29%), did so on their initiative.

Overall, 23.00% of schools reported mandatory feedback collection, 73.26% engaged in the practice voluntarily, and only 3.74% indicated they did not seek student feedback.

School Type	Mandatory	%	School Initiative	%	No	%
Public	78	50.98%	71	46.41%	4	2.61%
Private	3	8.82%	31	91.18%	0	0
Overall	81	43.32%	102	54.55%	4	2.13%

Table 14 Profile of Public and Private Schools in terms of Regular Consultation with Experts

Table 14 presents the profile of public and private schools regarding regular consultation with experts.

The data indicate that among public schools, 78 (50.98%) reported mandatory consultation with experts, while 71 (46.41%) engaged in it voluntarily. In contrast, only 3 (8.82%) of private schools reported mandatory consultations, while a large majority, 31 (91.18%), did so by school initiative.
Overall, 43.32% of schools engaged in consultations due to mandatory requirements, 54.55% did so voluntarily, and only 2.13% indicated they did not consult experts.

Difference in the proportion of public and private schools' monitoring and evaluation practices. The Chi-square Test for Equality of Proportions was used to ascertain whether the proportions of schools observing the given monitoring and evaluation practice differ between public and private schools. The appropriate test was carried out depending on the frequency count generated. The test was conducted at the 5% level of significance. The results of the test are shown in Table 15.

Table 15 Chi-square Test for Equality of Proportions of the Profiles of Public and Private Schools

Variable	χ^2	p-value	Remarks
School-initiated Internal Evaluation	17.3*	<.001	Significant
School-initiated External Evaluation	20.5*	<.001	Significant
Use External Evaluation Results for Changes in School Policies	.328^{ns}	1.000	Not Significant
Put the Results of the External Evaluation into Action for Improving Teaching	.878^{ns}	1.000	Not Significant
Put Measures Derived from the Results of External Evaluations into Practice	1.45^{ns}	.649	Not Significant
Monitor Teachers through Assessment of Student Achievement	.449^{ns}	1.000	Not Significant
Monitor Teachers through Peer Review	.074^{ns}	1.000	Not Significant
Monitor Teachers by Principal or Senior School Staff			
Monitor Teachers by Observation of Classes by External Inspectors	7.54*	.006	Significant
Feedback to Teachers by the School Management Team	11.0*	.012	Significant
Feedback to Parents or Guardians with Information on the School and Student Performance	4.00^{ns}	.225	Not Significant
School-Initiated Seeking Written Feedback from Students	3.62^{ns}	.246	Not Significant
School-Initiated Regular Consultation with Experts	22.5*	<.001	Significant

Monitoring and Evaluation Practices.

Note: ns indicates that the Chi-square value is not significant, and * indicates that the value is significant at the 5% significance level.

A significant difference was observed in mandatory school-initiated internal evaluation ($\chi^2 = 17.3$, $p < .001$), indicating that private schools are more proactive than public schools in internal evaluations. Similarly, the difference was significant for mandatory school-initiated external evaluation ($\chi^2 = 20.5$, $p < .001$), again showing greater initiative among private schools.

In contrast, no significant differences were found in several practices. The use of external evaluation results for changes in school policies ($\chi^2 = 0.328$, $p = 1.000$) showed no significant difference in the proportion between public and private schools. Likewise, putting external evaluation results into action for improving teaching ($\chi^2 = 0.878$, $p = 1.000$) and putting measures derived from external evaluations into practice ($\chi^2 = 1.45$, $p = 0.649$) also showed no significant differences in the proportion. Monitoring teachers through assessment of student achievement ($\chi^2 = 0.449$, $p = 1.000$) and monitoring teachers through peer review ($\chi^2 = 0.074$, $p = 1.000$) were similarly implemented across both sectors. Principal and senior school staff monitoring ($\chi^2 = 0.000$, $p = 1.000$) also did not differ between public and private schools. Additionally, feedback to parents or guardians regarding school and student performance ($\chi^2 = 4.00$, $p = 0.225$) and seeking written feedback from students ($\chi^2 = 3.62$, $p = 0.246$) did not show significant differences.

Meanwhile, significant differences were found in teacher monitoring through observation by external inspectors ($\chi^2 = 7.54$, $p = 0.006$), with public schools reporting a higher mandatory proportion. Feedback to teachers by the school management team also differed significantly between school types ($\chi^2 = 11.0$, $p = 0.012$), with public schools providing more frequent feedback. Finally, a highly significant difference was found in regular consultation with experts ($\chi^2 = 22.5$, $p < .001$), with private schools showing greater initiative.

Association between Monitoring and Evaluation Practices. The Chi-square Test for Independence was used to determine whether there is a significant association between the given monitoring and evaluation practices measured on different scales. Cramer's V was used as the association test for six of the eight pairs of variables. The Phi coefficient was used to evaluate the existence of internal evaluation and teacher monitoring through peer review. The Gamma Test was used to determine whether there is a significant association between the given monitoring and evaluation practices measured on the ordinal scale. These variables are feedbacking to teachers and feedbacking to parents. The results of these tests are presented in Table 16.

Table 16 Chi-square Test of Independence for the Significant Association Between Pairs of

Variable	χ^2	p-value	Coefficient
Internal Evaluation and External Evaluation	1.45^{ns}	.558	.088
Existence of external evaluation and usage of external evaluation results for changes in school policies	2.38^{ns}	.663	.078
Existence of external evaluation and putting the results of the external evaluation into action for improving teaching	2.43^{ns}	.300	.081
Existence of external evaluation and putting measures derived from the results of external evaluations into practice	$.205^{ns}$	.838	.023
Existence of internal evaluation and teacher monitoring through peer review	$.516^{ns}$	.701	.053
Existence of internal evaluation and seeking written feedback from students	11.1*	.003	.243
Existence of external evaluation and regular consultation with experts	5.10^{ns}	.182	.117
Feedback to parents or guardians with information on the school and student performance and feedback to teachers by the school management team	40.9*	<.001	.0180 - .543 .362

Monitoring and Evaluation Practices

Note: ns indicates that the Chi-square value is not significant, and * indicates that the value is significant at the 5% significance level.

The results revealed a significant association between the existence of internal evaluation and seeking written feedback from students, $\chi^2(1, N = 188) = 11.1$, $p = .003$. The Cramer's V coefficient was calculated to assess the strength of this association. The value of .243 indicates a moderate positive association.

Another significant result emerged in the relationship between feedback to parents or guardians with information on school and student performance and feedback to teachers by the school management team, $\chi^2(1, N = 188) = 40.9$, $p < .001$, with a Gamma coefficient ranging from .180 to .543. This value suggests a moderate to strong positive association.

In contrast, no significant associations were found among the following practice pairs: Internal Evaluation and External Evaluation: $\chi^2 = 1.45$, $p = .558$, $\Phi_c = .088$; Existence of External Evaluation and Use of Results for Policy Change: $\chi^2 = 2.38$, $p = .663$, $\Phi_c = .078$; Existence of External Evaluation and Putting Results into Action: $\chi^2 = 2.43$, $p = .300$, $\Phi_c = .081$; Existence of External Evaluation and Putting Measures Derived from the Results of External Evaluation into Practice: $\chi^2 = 0.205$, $p = .838$, $\Phi_c = .023$; Existence of Internal Evaluation and Teaching Monitoring through Peer Review: $\chi^2 = 0.516$, $p = .701$, $\Phi = .053$; and Existence of External Evaluation and Regular Expert Consultation: $\chi^2 = 5.10$, $p = .182$, $\Phi_c = .117$
These non-significant results indicate that these practices are not strongly associated, and their implementation in schools tends to occur independently.

Discussion

Institutionalizing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) practices within an organization significantly impacts its overall performance effectiveness (Yetano, 2013). The discussion presents commonalities and distinctions in how schools implement and respond to evaluation and feedback mechanisms. Emphasis is placed on patterns of compliance, initiative, and the functional use of evaluation data across sectors, which provide a deeper understanding of how these practices influence school improvement efforts. Findings suggest that public schools generally comply with externally imposed requirements, whereas private schools are more proactive in independently initiating internal evaluations. Similarly, external evaluation is primarily driven by mandatory requirements, especially in public schools, rather than in private schools, which only show slightly more initiative and variation in their external evaluation practices. Despite being mandatory in the BEMEF, not all public schools have undergone internal and external evaluation, and a considerable percentage have not used the evaluation results in different school improvement mechanisms. This finding is supported by Race (2023), who states that public schools partially comply with the framework. This challenge remains in the system, which is influenced by the school's and teachers' sense of accountability, time-consuming questionnaires, and the submission for compliance mentality (Paragoso & Barazon, 2019). Data revealed that private schools are more likely to utilize the evaluation results. No private school has been recorded as not applying the external evaluation results into action for improving teaching and putting measures derived from the external evaluations into practice. While public and private schools regard the externally imposed requirements as a significant factor for improving their policies, private schools are better at putting them into actual use. This resonates with findings that public schools are partially compliant with "maintaining records of M&E results and integrating such in the preparation of school programs and projects" and in "applying M&E results in improving teaching-learning strategies and individual performance" (Race, 2023).

Likewise, it can be inferred from the results that many schools in the Philippines monitor their teachers through students' performance. Only two schools, both public, did not observe this practice. In the Philippine education system, monitoring teacher performance through student outcomes is common, particularly in public schools (Llego, n.d.) The Department of Education (DepEd) has institutionalized this approach through frameworks like the Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (BEMEF), which emphasizes learner-centered monitoring and using student performance data to inform teaching strategies and school management. Similarly, the results highlight that teacher monitoring by peer review and school leaders or senior staff is a standard and consistently implemented practice across public and private educational institutions. However, when it comes to teacher monitoring by observation of classes by external inspectors, public schools have a higher percentage of compliance than private

schools. Research has already indicated that public schools in the Philippines generally exhibit higher compliance with classroom observations conducted by external inspectors than private schools. This trend is primarily attributed to the Department of Education's (DepEd) regulatory framework, which mandates regular supervision and evaluation in public educational institutions (UNESCO, 2022).

On the other hand, though under the "reasonable supervision and regulation" of DepEd, private schools typically receive fewer external evaluations. Inspections are usually conducted during permit renewals or recognition processes. Due to the greater autonomy afforded to private institutions, they have more discretion in internal monitoring of their teachers, often leading to less consistent external classroom observations (UNESCO, 2022).

In terms of communication, monthly communication is the most common practice for updating parents on school and student performance in both public and private schools, and student feedback is commonly gathered across both public and private schools, especially as a voluntary effort to enhance school practices. Another finding suggests that while public schools tend to provide feedback more frequently, private schools most often provide feedback monthly. The same study by Race (2023) supports this since he revealed that proactive communication emerged as the most effective approach in overcoming challenges related to external stakeholders' limited availability and adaptability.

Another notable finding is that public schools more often consult experts because it is mandated, while private schools typically consult on their initiative. While consultations with experts are common in both sectors, private schools are more proactive in initiating them independently.

The study results also suggest that although some monitoring and evaluation practices are consistently implemented across public and private schools, there are critical areas, particularly those related to initiative, external monitoring, feedback, and expert consultation, where significant differences exist. Findings provide evidence of specific meaningful associations between internal evaluations and student feedback practices, as well as between parent-teacher and teacher-management feedback loops. In contrast, most other monitoring and evaluation practices appear to function independently within the school systems studied. Schools conducting internal evaluations are also more likely to seek written feedback from students. This indicates that schools that regularly communicate with parents are also more likely to provide regular feedback to teachers. The findings also provide evidence of specific meaningful associations between internal evaluations and student feedback practices, as well as between parent-teacher and teacher-management feedback loops. In contrast, most other monitoring and evaluation practices appear to function independently within the school systems studied.

Overall, the findings reveal the need to maximize the M&E results further to create a better profile of the practices in private schools and, more so, in public schools. While teachers generally have a positive attitude towards M&E activities (Paragoso & Barazon, 2019). According to Khanam (2022), school monitoring falls short of its anticipated role in improving school quality, primarily due to barriers that hinder its effective utilization.

The findings have important educational implications, especially in shaping policies and strengthening the use of M&E systems. One key implication is building a stronger culture of using M&E to support school improvement. Although public and private schools participate in M&E activities, their motivation differs. Public schools often follow M&E practices because they are required to do so, while private schools are more likely to take the initiative themselves. This difference suggests that current policies like the BEMEF should be improved. Instead of focusing only on compliance, these frameworks should help schools build their capacity to use M&E as a meaningful tool for growth and development. Moreover, the study

identifies significant associations between evaluation practices, such as internal evaluations and student feedback loops, suggesting that a more integrated approach to M&E can strengthen a school's overall culture of accountability and responsiveness. Policies should therefore encourage holistic and participatory evaluation models that include teachers, students, and parents in the continuous cycle of assessment and improvement.

At the school and classroom level, this study highlights the need to shift M&E from a focus on compliance to a tool for reflection and improvement. Teachers and school leaders, especially in public schools, should use M&E data to improve teaching instead of taking it as a reporting requirement. The effective use of M&E in private schools shows the value of this approach and points to the need for more training and support for public school educators. The study also shows that feedback plays a significant role in successful M&E. Strong links between internal evaluation and student or parent feedback suggest that open and regular communication influence school performance. Schools should set up structured feedback systems that involve students, parents, teachers, and leaders. Practices like peer review, classroom observations by senior staff, and consultation with external experts should be formalized and integrated into continuous professional development plans, rather than treated as compliance-based tasks. Finally, the independence shown by private schools in running evaluations and seeking expert advice offers a valuable model for public schools. Supporting school-level innovation can lead to more responsive and effective M&E systems.

This paper examines only the profile of public and private schools in terms of their monitoring and evaluation practices. Specifically, it only focuses on the following variables already mentioned. Lastly, the data used in this study were taken from the results of PISA 2022. While the schools are representative of the general population of schools in the Philippines, each school is subject to its realities and context in terms of M&E practices. Since the school questionnaire does not explicitly ask for an explanation of such practices, or their lack thereof, understanding these realities may be more complex and needs further investigation. Furthermore, the school heads answered the questions. While they are persons of authority and knowledge in M&E practices in their respective schools, their answers might have been affected by a certain level of social desirability regarding how their school will be perceived.

4. Conclusion

The practices of public and private schools in terms of monitoring and evaluation show some commonalities and differences. Both school types recognize the value of evaluation in improving teaching practices, informing school policies, and enhancing overall school performance. Standard practices such as teacher monitoring by school leaders, use of evaluation results to improve instruction, and monthly communication with parents indicate shared commitments to accountability and instructional improvement.

However, significant differences were also found. Public schools tend to implement monitoring and evaluation practices in response to mandatory requirements, while private schools are likelier to engage in these practices on their initiative. Own This was particularly evident in internal and external evaluations, expert consultations, and the frequency and direction of feedback mechanisms. Private schools showed greater autonomy and proactivity, whereas public schools were more compliance-driven.

Moreover, meaningful associations were identified between certain paired practices, such as internal evaluation and the collection of student feedback, and between parent-teacher and teacher-management feedback loops. These associations suggest the existence of interconnected practices that reinforce a

school's monitoring and evaluation culture.

The discussion highlights that although monitoring and evaluation are standard practices in both public and private institutions, there are notable differences in their underlying motivations, how often they are conducted, and the methods used for implementation. These distinctions reflect the unique objectives and operational dynamics of each sector. In public institutions, M&E is primarily driven by the need for accountability, transparency, and the effective use of public resources. These practices are often aligned with policy goals. In contrast, private institutions use M&E to enhance school performance through their capabilities and resources. The mechanisms and processes involved in M&E also vary, reflecting each sector's unique operational demands and strategic priorities.

These insights can guide policy enhancements and capacity-building efforts to foster more reflective, data-informed, and context-sensitive monitoring and evaluation systems across the education sector. Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed to enhance the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation practices in both public and private schools. The first is to encourage school-initiated M&E practices**.** Since private schools demonstrate greater initiative in conducting internal and external evaluations, public schools may benefit from capacity-building programs that promote school-initiated monitoring and evaluation efforts beyond compliance. Empowering schools to take ownership of these processes can lead to more meaningful and sustainable improvements. It is also recommended that feedback mechanisms in schools be strengthened. The study found strong associations between feedback to parents, teachers, and students. Schools should develop structured, consistent, and multidirectional feedback systems to ensure that all stakeholders are engaged in the continuous improvement process. Emphasis should be placed on increasing the frequency and quality of feedback, particularly in private schools where feedback to teachers occurs less frequently. Another recommendation is to institutionalize peer review and expert consultation. As both practices were found to be common yet differently motivated across sectors, the Department of Education and private school associations should institutionalize peer review systems and expert consultations as integral parts of school improvement frameworks. Public schools, in particular, should be supported in accessing expert advice regularly, not merely in response to mandates. Another is to maximize the use of M&E results. While many schools report implementing evaluation results, more structured guidance and accountability measures could ensure these actions lead to concrete, documented changes in instructional strategies, student outcomes, and school policy reforms. Given the significant association between internal evaluation and seeking student feedback, schools should adopt more formal mechanisms for collecting and utilizing student input. They should foster a culture of student voice. This can nurture an inclusive, responsive, and continuous learning culture. Finally, educational policymakers should consider these findings when designing national monitoring and evaluation policies that are aligned and well-supported. Tailored interventions, resources, and training should be provided to public and private schools based on their specific strengths, gaps, and areas of growth identified in this study. By implementing these recommendations, schools can enhance the quality and impact of their monitoring and evaluation practices, ultimately leading to improved teaching and learning outcomes.

Data Availability Statement: The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in the PISA 2022 Database at https://www.oecd.org/en/about/programmes/pisa.html.

Competing Interests: The authors declare no relevant financial or non-financial competing interests.

Funding: This study received no funding.

References

1. Bernardo, A. B., Cordel, M. I., Lapinid, M. R., & Teves, J. M. (2022). Contrasting profiles of low-performing mathematics students in public and private schools in the Philippines: Insights from machine learning. Journal of Intelligence, 10. https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence10030061
2. Congressional Policy and Budget Research Department. (2024). Philippines' performance in the 2018 and 2022 PISA. https://cpbrd.congress.gov.ph/images/PDF%20Attachments/Facts%20in%20Figures/FF202411_Philippines_Perf_in_the_2018_and_2021_PISA
3. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. SAGE.
4. Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2019). Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research. Pearson.
5. De Grauwe, A. (2005). Improving the quality of education through school-based Management: Learning from international experiences. International Review of Education, 51(4). ResearchGate. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-005-7733-1
6. De Grauwe, A. (2007). Transforming school supervision into a tool for quality improvement. International Review of Education, 53(1), 709-714. ResearchGate. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-007-9057-9
7. Educational Research Centre. (n.d.). Who takes part in PISA? ERC. https://www.erc.ie/studies/pisa/who-takes-part-in-pisa/
8. Garforth, L. (2004). Supervision of primary schools in Bolgatanga district: Constraints and ways forward. Mimeo.
9. Hanushek, E., & Woessmann, L. (2011). The Economics of International Differences in Educational Achievement. Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-444-53429-3.00002-8.
10. Hoyle, E., & Wallace, M. (2005). Educational leadership: Ambiguity, professionals, and managerialism. SAGE Publications.
11. Khanam, A. (2022). Role of school monitoring in school quality enhancement. The Journal of Positive Psychology, 6 (7), 3952–3962. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/365186381
12. Latif, N., Khanam, A., & Batool, A. (2022). Role of school monitoring in school quality enhancement. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(7), 3952-3962. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/365186381_Role_Of_School_Monitoring_In_School_Quality_Enhancement
13. Learmont, J. (2000). Inspection: What is in it for school? Google Books. https://books.google.com.ph/books/about/Inspection.html?id=Qs0IGANC17QC&redir_esc=y
14. Llego, M. A. (n.d.). DepEd Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (BEMEF). TeacherPH. https://www.teacherph.com/deped-basic-education-monitoring-and-evaluation-framework-bemef//?utm_source=chatgpt.com
15. Lugaz, C., De Grauwe, A., & Balde, D. (2006). Ecole et de´centralisation. Expe´riences et de´fis en Afrique francophone. UNESCO.
16. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2019). PISA 2022

Assessment
and Analytical Framework. PISA, OECD Publishing Press.
17. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2022). School questionnaire for PISA 2022. PISA 2022 Database. https://www.oecd.org/en/data/datasets/pisa-2022-database.html
18. Paragoso, S. D., & Barazon, L. J. M. (2019). School monitoring, evaluation, and adjustment (SMEA) in Central Cebu, Philippines. CNU Journal of Higher Education, 13, 56-75. ResearchGate. https://jhe.cnu.edu.ph/index.php/ojs3/article/view/16/6
19. Race, R. L. (2023, December). Improving the M&E system of schools using the R.I.S.E. model. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374509994_IMPROVING_THE_M_E_SYSTEM_OF_SCHOOLS_USING_THE_RISE_MODEL
20. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. (2022). Non-State Actors in Education. UNESCO. https://education-profiles.org/eastern-and-south-eastern-asia/philippines/~non-state-actors-in-education?utm_source=chatgpt.com
21. Wilcox, B. (2000). Making school inspection visits more effective: The English experience. UNESCO. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000120289
22. Yetano, A. (2013). What drives the institutionalization of performance measurement and management in local government? Public Performance & Management Review, 37(1), 50–86. https://doi.org/10.2753/PMR1530-9576370103