

ASSESSMENT OF ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PROJECTS, PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES PLAN IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Zydel C. Robles, Delon A. Ching, EdD^{b*}

^a zydel.robles@deped.gov.ph

^a Teacher I, DepEd Bukal Sur Elementary School, Candelaria West, 4323 Philippines

^b Vice President for Academic Affairs, Laguna State Polytechnic University, San Pablo City, Laguna 4000 Philippines

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the monitoring and evaluation processes in the implementation of project, program, and activities (PPA's) in the school annual improvement plan. The study employed the developmental research design which includes 105 teachers in Candelaria West District, Division of Quezon during the School Year 2024-2025. The A four-part survey questionnaire was utilized to determine and interpret the respondents' school profile, monitoring and evaluation of PPA's in AIP in terms of the Key Performance Indicators, school M&E process, and the applicability of the proposed M&E implementation plan guide. The results revealed that the school's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system is highly implemented in carrying out Projects, Programs, and Activities (PPAs), with consistently high ratings across key indicators. Likewise, the level of implementation of school Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Process is perceived as effective. Moreover, the results indicate a significant positive relationship between the implementation of the school's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system and the AIP Key Performance Indicators. The proposed M&E implementation plan guide have high applicability in terms of relevance and alignment with school goals, feasibility and usability of the M&E plan, clarity of the M&E plan guide, and impact on program improvement.

Keywords: *Monitoring and Evaluation, Annual Implementation Plan, Key Performance Indicators*

1. Introduction

In Candelaria West District monitoring and evaluation is an essential mechanism that the district utilizes to assess and track the progress of the school PPA's stipulated in the Annual Improvement Plan of the thirteen schools that it handles. Teachers who are tasked as project lead in the varied PPA's in the key performance indicators in the Annual Implementation such around access, quality, equity and resiliency and well-being design their own monitoring and evaluation tools to track the progress of the implementation of the programs, projects, and activities. However, during the quarterly SMEPA (School Monitoring Evaluation Plan Adjustment), it usually found out that the objectives of the PPA's were did not meet. Some findings show that misalignment of objectives to the target possible outcomes of the programs or projects. Supported by Sheth (2019), many organizations usually overlook this important alignment or focus on output and activity data that may not be pertinent to their main goals and objectives. The comprehension and dissemination of social impact are impeded by this imbalance.

Effective monitoring and evaluation systems are essential for projects, programs, and activities in educational institutions. These programs provide teachers with a methodical way to assess the

accomplishments, impact, and evolution of various projects within the classroom. Through applying methodical monitoring and evaluation of these endeavors, educational institutions can acquire crucial data and insights that facilitate informed decision-making, improve the performance of learners, and ensure efficacious allocation of resources. Additionally, by employing monitoring and evaluation techniques to identify areas of success and those that require improvement, schools can continuously raise the standard and relevance of their initiatives, programs, and activities. Finally, schools may maximize the benefits and positive outcomes of their educational activities with the help of an effective evaluation and monitoring system.

According to Tekkwo (2020), assessing the project success and performance is a problem that is addressed by monitoring and evaluation (M&E) methodologies. M&E is now required for every organization's endeavor. Without a structure for monitoring and evaluation in place, no company would pursue development efforts at all.

In relation to RA 9155 or "Governance of Basic Education Act of 2001" and RA 10533 or "Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, DepEd implements major PPAs to ensure access to and improve the quality of basic education, an end toward which all operating units at all governance levels have attendant roles, tasks, and responsibilities for which they are principally accountable.

Relative to this, DepEd develops the Basic Education Development Plan (BEDP) 2030 – a long-term plan for basic education anchored on the Sulong Edukalidad, the Philippine Development Plan, Ambisyon Natin 2040, and the commitments in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 2030 providing a strategic roadmap for the department to improve the delivery and quality of basic education and the experience of learners in the basic education learning environment. In support to this, DepEd developed this policy framework on Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (BEMEF) to track and measure the achievement of the BEDP 2030.

In the context of the school program, one among DepEd programs that has utilize monitoring and evaluation is the Annual Improvement Plan or AIP. Annual Improvement Plan focused on its four key results area including Access, Quality, Equity and Resiliency and Well-being. When dealing about the access the school the Basic Education Development Plan (BEDP 2030) defines access as providing opportunity for all school-age children, youth who are not enrolled in school, and adults to obtain vital fundamental information proper monitoring and evaluation of the mechanisms that the schools apply to adhere in this goal must be evident. Quality on the other hand, deals on the relevance and responsive instruction that teachers provide to learners, equity is about equal access of the students in the different programs and projects that the institution provides and lastly resiliency and well-being that deals on the systematic approach that the school delivers to the learners to guaranteed that learners are resilient, aware of their rights, capable of defending oneself, and able to make an education-related claim even if they are aware of their obligations.

Furthermore, Palingcod (2022), emphasized that monitoring and evaluation serve a vital purpose at the program level, which is to systematically track implementation, including program outputs, as well as to assess effectiveness. This is critical because it determines when a program is on track and when changes are required.

Thus, to address the four primary outcome areas of access, quality, resiliency, and governance outlined in the school annual improvement plan, the researcher of this study conceptualized to identify the monitoring and evaluation process in the implementation of the school programs, projects, and activities. The findings of the study will serve as the basis in the designing and crafting of monitoring and evaluation guide for teachers in the implementation of the PPA's in the AIP.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to investigate the monitoring and evaluation processes in the implementation of project, program, and activities (PPA's) in the school annual improvement plan.

Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the schools in Candelaria West District in terms of:
 - 1.1. enrolment;
 - 1.2. school size;
 - 1.3. dropout rate;
 - 1.4. promotion;
 - 1.5. teachers' educational attainment; and
 - 1.6. status of annual implementation plan?
2. What is the level of implementation of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in the Implementation of the Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs) in the school Annual Implementation Plan (AIP) in terms of:
 - 1.1. access;
 - 1.2. quality;
 - 1.3. equity; and
 - 1.4. resiliency and well-being?
3. What is the level of implementation of School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Process terms of:
 - 2.1. data analysis;
 - 2.2. monitoring plan;
 - 2.3. evaluation plan;
 - 2.4. statistical and analytical;
 - 2.5. project management;
 - 2.6. report writing; and
 - 2.7. time management?
4. What is the level of applicability of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan guide in enhancing the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) process of Projects, Programs, and Activities (PPAs) in terms of:
 - 4.1. relevance and alignment with school goals;
 - 4.2. feasibility and usability of the M&E plan;
 - 4.3. clarity of the M&E plan guide; and
 - 4.4. impact on program improvement?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the AIP Key performance indicators and the level of applicability of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan guide in enhancing the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) process of Projects, Programs, and Activities?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the level of implementation of the monitoring and evaluation processes and the level of applicability of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan guide in enhancing the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) process of Projects, Programs, and Activities?

1.Methodology

A developmental research design was utilized in this study. It sought to find out the level of effectiveness of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in the Implementation of the Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs) in the school Annual Implementation Plan (AIP) in terms of Access, Quality, Efficiency, and Resiliency and Well-Being. Moreover, this study also determined the level of

effectiveness of school Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Process terms of data analysis, monitoring plans, evaluation plans, statistical and analytical, project management, time management, and report writing. Additionally, it was intended to identify the level of applicability of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan guide in enhancing the monitoring and evaluation process of Projects, Programs, and Activities (PPAs) in terms of relevance and alignment with school goals, feasibility and usability of the M&E plan, clarity of the M&E plan guide, and impact on program improvement. Finally, it aimed to measure the significant relationship between level of effectiveness of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and the AIP Key Performance Indicators.

Given the objectives of this study, the researcher utilized the developmental research design since it is designed to specifically address existing problems by emphasizing systematic process that leads to design, development, and assessment of educational interventions and ensuring its internal consistency and effectiveness (Gonzales et. al., 2023).

The main data collection tool was an online questionnaire crafted by the researcher. The questionnaire is divided into four sections: school profile, school monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in the implementation of the Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs) in the school Annual Implementation Plan (AIP), School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Process, and applicability of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan guide.

This study was directed in the public elementary schools of the Division of Quezon, situated in the municipality of Candelaria. There were one hundred five (110) teacher respondents. The sample size of the teachers was currently associated within the eleven (11) public elementary schools in the Candelaria West District. The respondents were chosen due to their direct involvement in monitoring and evaluation practices in schools as project coordinators. This provided first-hand insights and experiences that ensure the reliability of the results of the study. Using purposive sampling, the teachers of Candelaria West District were the study's respondents. This sampling is a sort of non-random sample strategy, which is why this research utilized it. Purposive sampling involves the researcher selecting a sample on purpose that is most likely to yield data that addresses the research issue. This supports Hassan's (2018) notion that purposive sampling is appropriate for researchers looking to focus on a certain group of respondents who can vividly provide details regarding the study being undertaken. Furthermore, teachers were the most appropriate respondents as they possess firsthand experience and direct involvement in the project, programs, and activities management in schools. Their insights, expertise, and practical knowledge enabled them to provide comprehensive and credible information that is essential to achieving the study's objectives. Additionally, selecting teachers from Candelaria West District ensures that data was gathered from a diverse yet relevant group, enhancing the validity and reliability of the findings. The use of purposive sampling also allowed the researcher to concentrate on individuals who have substantial exposure to the educational setting, curriculum implementation, and challenges that are pertinent to the study. The researcher crafted a researcher-made survey questionnaire that is comprised of four parts: school profile, school monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in the implementation of the Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs) in the school Annual Implementation Plan (AIP), School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Process, and applicability of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan guide. This method was used for purposive sampling in the data gathering.

Construction. To investigate the monitoring and evaluation processes in the implementation of project, program, and activities (PPA's) in the school annual improvement plan, the researcher crafted an online survey questionnaire that was divided into four parts namely; school profile, school monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in the implementation of the Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs) in the school Annual Implementation Plan (AIP), School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Process, and applicability of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan guide.

Part 1. School Profile. This part deals with school profile in terms of enrolment, school size, dropout rate, promotion, teachers' educational attainment, and status of annual implementation plan

Part 2. School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in the implementation of the Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs) in the school Annual Implementation Plan (AIP). This mainly focus on the school M&E in the implementation of PPAs in AIP in terms of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) such as, Access, Quality, Equity, and Resiliency and Well-Being.

Part 3. School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Process. This includes the different school M&E process namely: data analysis, monitoring plan, evaluation plan, statistical and analytical, project management, report writing, and time management

Part 4. Applicability of the Proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Implementation Plan Guide. This centers on the suitability of the proposed M&E implementation plan guide.

Validation. To ensure the congruency and accuracy of the survey questionnaire, the researcher presented it to the thesis adviser and other panel members for corrections and suggestions for its enhancement. The researcher requested for the content validation conducted by one principal, one head teacher, two master teachers and two English experts to guarantee the quality of statements and alignment to the subject matter under the study. Moreover, to measure the internal consistency of the items in the survey questionnaire, the researcher administered a pilot testing to thirty (30) teachers before the actual conduct of the study. The data gathered from the pilot testing were subjected to Cronbach's Alpha. The following are the statistical measures used in the study. In the presence of the school profile, frequency count and percentage were used. In describing the level of implementation of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in the Implementation of the Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs) in the school Annual Implementation Plan (AIP), level of implementation of School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Process, and applicability of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) implementation plan guide in enhancing the monitoring and evaluation (M&E), the mean and standard deviation were utilized. In proving the relationship between level of effectiveness of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and the AIP Key Performance Indicators, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was employed.

2. Results and Discussion

Table 2.

Profile of the Schools in Candelaria West District

School	Enrollment	School Size	Dropout Rate	Promotion Rate	Status of AIP
Bukal Sur ES	1,258	Large	0.32%	99.08%	On-Going
Bukal Norte ES	275	Small	0.23%	99.12%	Completed
Buenavista East ES	218	Small	0.22%	99.06%	On-Going
Buenavista West ES	296	Small	0.34%	98.45%	Completed
Candelaria ES-Main	1,350	Large	1.05%	97.63%	On-Going
Candelaria ES-1&2	1,368	Large	1.16%	97.84%	On-Going
Masin ES	1,170	Medium	0.30%	99.21%	Completed
Mayapyap ES	194	Small	0.21%	99.15%	Completed
Masalukot I ES	663	Medium	0.29%	98.01%	On-Going
Masalukot II ES	146	Small	0.32%	99.07%	Completed
Masalukot III ES	117	Small	0.24%	99.87%	Completed

Table 2 shows that the district has three large schools, two medium-sized schools, and six small-sized schools. Most of these schools has a dropout rate of under 1%, while the promotion rate is at least 97%. This shows that students are sticking around and making academic progress. Out of the total, six schools have completed their Annual Implementation Plans (AIPs), while the other five are still working on theirs. This hints that some schools might be running into hurdles when it comes to putting their plans into action. Larger schools often have more resources and staff to carry out initiatives smoothly, whereas smaller schools can struggle with limited personnel and infrastructure, making it tougher to implement their projects.

When it comes to funding, its availability is crucial. Schools with limited budgets often struggle with delays, incomplete plans, or difficulties in keeping their programs running smoothly. Another important aspect is the administrative capacity. Schools with seasoned administrators tend to navigate processes and secure resources more efficiently, while others may find themselves tangled in challenges in coordinating with different stakeholders. All these elements play a significant role in how effectively a program can be implemented in a school.

Assessing the school profile is vital for grasping the impact of educational programs and student outcomes in the Candelaria West District. Additionally, the data collected from various schools indicates that the distribution of resources and the execution of programs can differ significantly.

Respondents' Educational Attainment

Table 3.

Educational Attainment of Teachers in Candelaria West District

Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's Degree	28	26.7%
With MA/MS Units	45	42.9%
MA/MS Degree	28	26.7%
With PhD/EdD Units	3	2.9%
With PhD/EdD Degree	1	1.0%

In Table 3, you can see the educational backgrounds of the instructors in the Candelaria West District. Out of 45 teachers, or 42% of the total, the majority have earned a Master's degree or completed MA units. This shows a strong commitment to professional development, which can enhance how the curriculum is implemented, improve teaching strategies, and boost student engagement. The educational achievements of the teachers highlight the district's focus on professional growth. Additionally, the presence of a doctorate holder reinforces the district's commitment to leadership and academic excellence, potentially impacting school reform initiatives and policymaking.

Level of Implementation of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs)

Table 4

Level of Implementation of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs) in terms of Access

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>The school ...</i>			
1. efficiently assesses the implementation of child-mapping and advocacy programs to locate out-of-school children and encourage their return to formal education.	4.52	0.59	Highly Implemented
2. utilizes an action plan in activities for early registration.	4.61	0.55	Highly Implemented
3. monitors the number of enrolments, drop-out rate, and absenteeism and addressing its causes through timely intervention programs.	4.71	0.49	Highly Implemented
4. guarantees to help learners identified at risk of dropping out.	4.68	0.53	Highly Implemented
5. ensures that partnerships with parents, community leaders, and local government units are actively supporting school access programs to improve student retention and participation.	4.71	0.48	Highly Implemented
Overall	4.65	0.43	Highly Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

The findings reveal that Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of Projects, Programs, and Activities (PPAs) focused on Access is being implemented quite effectively, with an impressive overall mean of 4.65 and a standard deviation of 0.43. This suggests that strategies aimed at ensuring student enrollment, retention, and engagement are seamlessly woven into school operations. Notably, the third and fifth categories, which scored the highest mean of 4.71, highlight two critical areas: timely interventions to tackle enrollment and dropout trends, and strong partnerships among parents, community leaders, and local government units (LGUs) to bolster access initiatives. These results underscore the significance of proactive monitoring techniques and collaborative efforts in enhancing and maintaining student participation, reinforcing the district's dedication to providing equitable education. The district's capacity to implement early detection and response strategies plays a vital role in preventing student disengagement. Whether it's dealing with attendance issues, financial hardships, or other obstacles, taking swift action ensures that students get the support they need before problems escalate. Additionally, some children frequently change schools due to economic instability, displacement, or family situations, which complicates efforts to track and reintegrate them into formal education. Without flexible strategies, schools may find it challenging to keep pace with changing enrollment trends.

This aligns with the work of Ortiz and Quimio (2020), who suggest that keeping a close eye on

enrollment and dropout rates allows for timely interventions that cater to student needs, ultimately enhancing educational access. Their study highlights the effectiveness of early detection strategies, ensuring that schools can tackle potential barriers before they escalate. In a similar vein, Ablasa (2024) underscores the significance of robust partnerships among educators, parents, and local leaders in retaining students, echoing the findings from your research on community involvement in school initiatives. These connections create a nurturing environment that motivates students to remain in school, which plays a key role in the district's impressive low dropout and high promotion rates. However, despite the overall implementation of monitoring and evaluation (M&E), the first indicator showed the lowest average score of 4.52 with a standard deviation of 0.59, pointing to challenges in child-mapping initiatives and re-enrollment programs. Schools with limited resources often find it tough to maintain effective mapping efforts. Successful child mapping demands logistical support, including tools for data collection, transportation, and dedicated personnel for outreach. These hurdles might stem from inadequate training for staff, a shortage of resources, or a disconnect between program goals and the realities of the community. Additionally, effective child mapping hinges on strong collaboration among schools, local government units (LGUs), and community members. If this coordination is lacking or inconsistent, vital information about unenrolled children could be missed or delayed. Alonzo et al. (2020) tackle similar issues, pointing out that poor communication and coordination among stakeholders hinder child advocacy efforts, making it tough to identify and reintegrate out-of-school children. This highlights that, although there are attempts at intervention, they need to be refined in their execution, with better training and more collaboration among those involved to truly reach their potential.

Table 5

Level of Implementation of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs) in terms of Access in terms of Quality

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>The School...</i>			
1. monitors and supports the implementation of reading programs, leading to measurable improvements in learners' reading comprehension and literacy skills.	4.73	0.44	Highly Implemented
2. ensures that numeracy interventions and remedial programs are effectively executed, resulting in better performance in mathematics and problem-solving skills among learners.	4.60	0.51	Highly Implemented
3. provides financial allotment intended for the reproduction of learning materials to utilize for classroom instructions.	4.50	0.61	Highly Implemented
4. continuous capacity building of teachers to calibrate their instructional competencies.	4.63	0.52	Highly Implemented
5. monitors and gains feedback from learners about the efficiency and effectiveness of PPA's intended for providing them relevant and quality education.	4.52	0.56	Highly Implemented
Overall	4.60	0.43	Highly Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

Table 5 reveals a strong commitment to Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in ensuring that school programs are executed with quality, boasting an impressive overall mean of 4.60 and a standard deviation of 0.43. The standout criterion, with a mean of 4.73, showcases the effective implementation of structured reading programs that have significantly boosted literacy skills among students in the Candelaria West District. These findings reinforce the district's focus on literacy development, illustrating that well-executed reading programs enhance comprehension and academic achievement. Schools in the district are actively rolling out structured numeracy and literacy initiatives, including targeted remedial sessions, differentiated instruction, and adaptive teaching methods that effectively help students understand mathematical concepts. This commitment is reflected in their various reading and numeracy programs, which are diligently implemented and monitored across schools. This aligns with the findings of Kim and Quinn (2013), whose meta-analysis indicated that consistent, school-monitored reading interventions greatly improved literacy outcomes, especially for students from low-income backgrounds. While still showing a strong level of implementation, the third indicator (with a mean of 4.50 and a standard deviation of 0.61) highlights the importance of investing financial resources in educational facilities to enhance instructional delivery and boost student engagement. The results emphasize the necessity of ongoing financial support for educational resources, ensuring that institutions can keep providing top-notch instruction and student assistance. However, schools often encounter budget limitations that restrict the resources available for printing instructional materials, worksheets, and reference materials. When funds are spread thin across various educational needs, the costs of reproduction may not get the attention they deserve. Additionally, printing can be quite expensive, especially when it comes to large-scale reproductions of textbooks, modules, and other manuals. Schools may find it challenging to balance costs, regular updates, and sustainable production methods. This supports the findings of Ofem et al. (2021), which state that adequate funding for educational resources and infrastructure directly influences learning opportunities and overall academic success.

Table 6

Level of Implementation of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs) in terms of Equity

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>The School...</i>			
1. has an action plan that provides guide in the implementation of PPA's in ensuring equity for the learners.	4.66	0.52	Highly Implemented
2. Integrates cultural sensitivity and respect for diversity in its programs, ensuring that all learners feel valued and respected.	4.60	0.53	Highly Implemented
3. promotes equal opportunity to the learners in utilizing the school material resources intended for their learning.	4.68	0.51	Highly Implemented
4. promotes the involvement of students from diverse backgrounds in leadership roles, extracurricular activities, and decision-making processes.	4.70	0.48	Highly Implemented
5. has an effective system for identifying and addressing any equity-related issues or barriers that may hinder students' full participation in PPAs.	4.59	0.57	Highly Implemented
Overall	4.64	0.45	Highly Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

Table 6 highlights a strong commitment to Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in promoting equity within educational programs, boasting an impressive overall mean of 4.64 and a standard deviation of 0.45. The standout indicator, which achieved the highest mean of 4.70, underscores the importance of actively encouraging students to take on leadership roles, engage in extracurricular activities, and participate in decision-making processes. This reflects how schools in the Candelaria West District foster diversity and empower students, creating opportunities for individuals from various backgrounds to engage in meaningful school activities. A key factor in this is the district's deliberate effort to provide leadership opportunities for all students, ensuring that everyone has equitable access to student governance, clubs, and activities. This commitment is evident through the establishment of student councils such as SPG, YES-O, BKD, and SWAT, which help cultivate students' leadership skills and sense of accountability.

Additionally, schools in the Candelaria West District have successfully rolled out equity-focused initiatives that encourage student leadership and active involvement. Students are not just passive recipients; they actively participate in discussions surrounding school policies, projects, and improvement plans, which reinforces their sense of agency and responsibility. This engagement is particularly noticeable during discussions about each school's student handbook.

This focus on getting students involved mirrors larger trends in education that link student leadership and participation in extracurricular activities to improved academic success and social growth. This idea connects with the work of Tian and Yao (2020), who highlight that effective monitoring and evaluation practices allow various stakeholders, including students, to influence their learning environment. This reinforces the belief that structured oversight boosts accountability and promotes inclusivity in school programs.

Table 7

Level of Implementation of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs) in terms of Resiliency and Well-Being

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>The School...</i>			
1. implements programs that promote students' mental health and emotional well-being, such as counseling services, peer support groups, and stress management activities.	4.47	0.61	Implemented
2. ensures that students and staff are well-equipped with knowledge and training on disaster preparedness, emergency response, and safety measures.	4.58	0.55	Highly Implemented
3. promotes good hygiene and health practices by providing clean facilities, access to safe drinking water, and health awareness campaigns.	4.61	0.56	Highly Implemented
4. enforces policies and programs that prevent bullying, discrimination, and any form of violence, ensuring a safe and supportive learning environment for all students.	4.60	0.57	Highly Implemented
5. has effective interventions, such as financial assistance, feeding programs, and academic support, to help students facing personal, economic, or social challenges.	4.51	0.64	Highly Implemented
Overall	4.55	0.50	Highly Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

Table 7 highlights that schools in the Candelaria West District are doing a fantastic job of implementing programs that boost student resilience and well-being, boasting an impressive overall mean score of 4.55 with a standard deviation of 0.50. The standout indicator, which scored the highest at 4.61, focuses on how schools promote good hygiene and health practices by maintaining clean facilities, providing safe drinking water, and running health awareness initiatives. This commitment is evident as schools work hard to keep classrooms, restrooms, and common areas clean and sanitary, thanks to the collaborative efforts of stakeholders during Brigada Eskwela and monthly Brigada Plus activities. These initiatives help minimize health risks and create a safe learning environment. Additionally, every school has either installed water filtration systems or secured dependable sources of clean water for drinking and handwashing, in line with the DepEd initiative in Project WINS (Wash in School). This ensures that students stay hydrated and steer clear of health issues linked to unsafe water consumption while also supporting good hygiene practices. This aligns with Kabir (2021), who notes that enhancing hygiene and sanitation practices in educational settings is crucial for preventing infections, controlling the spread of pathogens, and promoting overall good health.

In Candelaria West District, putting mental health care on the same level as physical wellness activities can really help kids tackle both academic and personal challenges. While there are initiatives in place that focus on building resilience and promoting student well-being, boosting access to counseling services and emotional support networks would enhance the district's comprehensive approach to education. However, the initial implementation of these programs showed a lower average score of 4.47, which suggests there are some hurdles with mental health initiatives like counseling services, peer support groups, and stress management activities. Even with ongoing efforts to foster emotional well-being, schools in the district often face limitations in specialized mental health resources, qualified staff, and program availability. This is largely due to a shortage of guidance counselors and mental health professionals, making it tough to offer consistent and accessible counseling for students who really need that emotional support.

Teachers and school staff are essential in spotting and helping students who face emotional challenges. However, without the right training, they might find it tough to notice signs of distress or to offer the right support. While some schools do have mental health activities, these efforts often aren't fully woven into the curriculum or school policies, which can lead to uneven implementation and limited effectiveness.

This point is backed up by Muhibbin et al. (2023), who highlight how crucial emotional intelligence is for fostering student well-being. They show that educational settings that nurture emotional resilience can significantly boost student success and engagement.

Table 8

Summary Table on the Level of Implementation of the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in the Implementation of the Projects, Programs and Activities (PPAs)

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Access	4.65	0.43	Highly Implemented
Quality	4.60	0.43	Highly Implemented
Equity	4.64	0.45	Highly Implemented
Resiliency and Well-Being	4.55	0.50	Highly Implemented
Overall	4.61	0.45	Highly Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

The insights presented in Table 8 highlight how effectively school monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are being implemented in the execution of Projects, Programs, and Activities (PPAs) within the Candelaria West District. With an overall mean of 4.61 and a standard deviation of 0.45, it's clear that the district's M&E framework is not only consistently applied but also yields significant results in ensuring the success of essential educational programs. This success is largely due to educational policies like the Basic Education Development Plan (BEDP) 2030, which prioritize access, equity, and quality as the core foundations of education. Schools in the district are aligning their initiatives with these national goals, which helps them maintain structured implementation and ongoing improvement. Additionally, schools are making a concerted effort to promote inclusive education, guaranteeing that students from various backgrounds have equal chances to engage in leadership roles, extracurricular activities, and academic programs. This dedication to equity creates a nurturing learning environment. The district has also shown resilience in adapting to challenges, such as those posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, by rolling out learning recovery programs, embracing digital education strategies, and offering flexible learning options. These initiatives bolster educational resilience, ensuring that students can continue to thrive even amidst disruptions.

A well-functioning M&E system does more than just enhance program implementation; it fosters a culture of ongoing improvement within the district. Schools can leverage real-time data to refine their programs, allocate resources more effectively, and foresee potential challenges. Additionally, this system encourages transparency, ensuring that all stakeholders—teachers, administrators, and legislators—can collaborate to elevate educational standards. Chukwu et al. (2019) highlight the critical role of M&E in achieving educational objectives, noting that continuous monitoring helps maintain alignment with institutional goals and promotes accountability. In the Candelaria West District, the impressive effectiveness of M&E shows that schools have established a robust framework for tracking key performance indicators (KPIs), enabling administrators and educators to adapt policies based on solid data.

Table 9

Level of Implementation of School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in terms of Data Analysis

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>As a Project and Program Coordinator, I...</i>			
1. can extract relevant information from the data collected during the monitoring and evaluation of the school PPA's in the AIP.	4.55	0.59	Highly Implemented
2. gain relevant insights based on the results of the data collected.	4.52	0.61	Highly Implemented
3. can generate accurate and consistent interpretations of data, minimizing errors and ensuring credibility in evaluating PPA effectiveness.	4.48	0.62	Implemented
4. identify the trends and issues using the data collected during the monitoring and evaluation of the school PPA's in the AIP	4.54	0.61	Highly Implemented
5. present data in a clear, structured, and easily understandable manner, allowing stakeholders to interpret and act upon the findings effectively.	4.47	0.64	Implemented
Overall	4.51	0.56	Highly Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

Table 9 reveals that the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) efforts in the Candelaria West District are quite robust, especially when it comes to data analysis, boasting an impressive overall mean of 4.51 and a standard deviation of 0.56. Interestingly, the first indicator stands out with the highest mean score of 4.55 (SD = 0.59), suggesting that program coordinators excel at pulling valuable insights from the data gathered during the monitoring and evaluation of school Projects, Programs, and Activities (PPAs) outlined in the Annual Implementation Plan. This success can be attributed to the training that educators, program coordinators, and administrators receive in data analysis and interpretation, which empowers them to spot trends, evaluate program effectiveness, and make well-informed decisions based on the monitoring outcomes.

Furthermore, the M&E process is intricately tied to the Annual Improvement Plan (AIP), ensuring that the data collected directly informs program adjustments, resource distribution, and strategic planning. These insights highlight the vital importance of data analysis in enhancing M&E processes across the district, guaranteeing that educational programs are grounded in evidence and adaptable to evolving needs. The ability to gather and communicate insights effectively fosters accountability and enhances collaboration, leading to a more agile and responsive educational landscape.

This impressive level of effectiveness backs up Osiesi's (2023) assertion that having systematic and regular monitoring and evaluation (M&E) procedures can lead to better outcomes in primary schools. By consistently using data-driven methods, schools can ensure that their teaching and learning strategies are based on solid evidence, which leads to more sustainable and impactful educational practices. This approach not only boosts the implementation of PPA but also fosters long-term educational growth by adjusting techniques based on real findings. On a different note, the fifth indicator, while still considered effective, had the lowest average score of 4.47 (SD = 0.56). This suggests that although district program and project coordinators are generally good at providing data in a systematic and accessible way, there's some inconsistency in how clearly this information is communicated to all stakeholder groups. This inconsistency stems from the absence of standardized reporting formats. Without consistent templates or structured guidelines for reporting, the way data is presented can differ from one school to another, leading to mixed messages about the findings. Another issue is the frequent use of technical language. Reports often lean on academic or technical jargon, which can be tough for non-specialist stakeholders—like parents or community leaders—to grasp and act on. As Boeren (2017) points out, effectively presenting data goes beyond just having technical skills; it's crucial for fostering collaboration among educators and decision-makers.

When evaluations are easy to access and well-organized, teachers and administrators can really grasp the data, leading to smarter decisions and timely tweaks to educational programs. The success seen in the Candelaria West District shows that schools appreciate clear communication about evaluation results, which helps foster teamwork aimed at improving education. That said, enhancing how these findings are presented could really ramp up engagement from stakeholders and their responsiveness to important insights.

Table 10*Level of Implementation of School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in terms of Monitoring Plan*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>As a Project and Program Coordinator, I...</i>			
1. utilize action plan and framework to follow to effectively monitor and evaluate the school PPA's in the AIP.	4.53	0.57	Highly Implemented
2. can plan a well-structured monitoring plan aligned with the set timelines of the PPAs in the AIP to ensure systematic tracking of progress.	4.50	0.57	Highly Implemented
3. can identify the area of the school PPA's in the AIP that needs improvement or enhancement.	4.55	0.55	Highly Implemented
4. guarantee to utilize appropriate tool intended to induce the needed data to monitor the efficiency of school PPA's in the AIP.	4.47	0.59	Implemented
5. utilize timeline that displays when to monitor and evaluate the school PPA's in the AIP.	4.45	0.57	Implemented e
Overall	4.50	0.50	Highly Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

Table 10 reveals that the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) process in the Candelaria West District is being implemented quite effectively, boasting an impressive overall mean of 4.50 and a standard deviation of 0.50. Among the various indicators, the third one stands out with the highest mean of 4.55 (SD = 0.55), suggesting that project and program coordinators excel at pinpointing areas within the school PPAs in the Annual Implementation Plan (AIP) that require adjustments or improvements. This success can be attributed to the close integration of the evaluation process with the School Improvement Plan (SIP) and AIP, ensuring that the insights gained directly influence program modifications, resource distribution, and strategic planning. Schools are making good use of structured evaluation tools like gap analysis templates, root-cause analysis templates, and why-why diagrams, which are instrumental in identifying weaknesses and fine-tuning interventions. The strong performance of the Candelaria West District in this regard highlights that schools are actively embracing M&E frameworks to foster ongoing improvements in program delivery. Additionally, the effectiveness of monitoring hinges on how feedback is communicated to school staff. In this context, the district's M&E system proves to be highly effective, showcasing a well-established feedback mechanism that significantly influences instructional choices, resource allocation, and institutional planning. By nurturing a data-driven culture, schools empower teachers and administrators to make informed decisions that enhance learning outcomes and maximize the impact of educational programs.

This finding aligns with Msezane (2019), who highlights how crucial effective monitoring systems are for fostering school development. Schools that consistently pinpoint areas needing improvement can implement targeted strategies, ensuring that teaching methods evolve based on real data rather than just general tweaks. On the flip side, the fifth indicator received the lowest score among the components analyzed, yet it was still deemed effective with an average rating of 4.45 (SD = 0.57). This suggests that while district project and program managers are doing a good job using schedules to

oversee and assess school PPAs, there's definitely room for improvement in how these plans are executed and managed. One reason for this is that schools might lack a clear, organized timeline for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities, which can lead to inconsistencies in how evaluations are carried out and reported. Additionally, with so many responsibilities—like implementing the curriculum, assessing students, and handling administrative duties—M&E scheduling can often take a backseat, impacting its reliability.

Moreover, there are also delays in collecting and reporting data. If schools face hurdles in gathering and analyzing information, it can throw off the evaluation timeline, leading to delays in making decisions and adjusting programs. This situation mirrors the findings of Eisenstein et al. (2019), who stress the need for ongoing and timely evaluations in educational interventions, arguing that sustained monitoring enhances overall program effectiveness. Having a well-defined timeline is essential to ensure evaluations occur at the right moments, enabling schools to adapt their programs in real time. The experience of Candelaria West District in this regard suggests that schools need to fine-tune their structured evaluation timelines for monitoring and evaluation to better respond to the ever-changing demands of education.

Table 11

Level of Implementation of School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in terms of Evaluation Plan

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>As a Project and Program Coordinator, I...</i>			
1. can consider the availability of resources (time, budget, and personnel) necessary for effective data collection and analysis.	4.49	0.62	Implemented
2. clearly define the objectives, key performance indicators (KPIs), and expected outcomes of the school's PPAs in alignment with the AIP.	4.48	0.61	Implemented
3. design appropriate tool to use in the evaluation of the school PPA's in the AIP.	4.47	0.67	Implemented
4. involve key stakeholders (school heads, teachers, parents, and students) in the planning and decision-making process.	4.54	0.59	Highly Implemented
5. include systematic process for monitoring progress, addressing challenges, and providing feedback for continuous improvement.	4.45	0.64	Implemented
Overall	4.48	0.57	Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

Table 11 reveals that the implementation level of school monitoring and evaluation (M&E) regarding the evaluation plan process is quite strong, with an overall mean score of 4.48 and a standard deviation of 0.57. This indicates that the project and program coordinators in the Candelaria West District are doing a commendable job in executing evaluation plans as part of their school monitoring and assessment efforts. Notably, the fourth objective stands out with the highest mean of 4.54 and a standard deviation of 0.59. This suggests that these coordinators are particularly effective at involving

key stakeholders—like school principals, teachers, parents, and students—in the planning and decision-making processes.

This aligns with the findings of Muwanguzi et al. (2023), who emphasized that community engagement should be a core mission of educational institutions. The intersection of community involvement and educational progress has been recognized as vital in addressing contemporary educational challenges. Moreover, the significance of community-engaged learning highlights how interactive participation can enhance learning experiences and bolster community support, reinforcing the idea that including key stakeholders in decision-making can lead to better educational outcomes (Purcell 2017).

However, even though the effectiveness was rated positively, the third target received the lowest mean score of 4.47, with a standard deviation of 0.67. This indicates that while the project and program coordinators in Candelaria West District are generally effective in creating suitable tools for evaluating school PPAs in the AIP, there's still room for improvement. It underscores the importance of process evaluation in developing educational programs, particularly the need to incorporate feedback from stakeholders to refine program design and effectiveness. This highlights the concept that effective evaluation systems should be developed in partnership with various stakeholders, including educators, parents, and students, to ensure they are relevant and adaptable to local needs (Abdullah et al., 2021).

Table 12

Level of Implemented of School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in terms of Statistical and Analytical

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>As a Project and Program Coordinator, I...</i>			
1. can analyze the data in a comprehensible day	4.43	0.59	Implemented
2. can analyze data and identify trends	4.44	0.60	Implemented
3. can draw conclusions from the data gained in the monitoring and evaluation of the school PPA's in the AIP	4.44	0.60	Implemented
4. can identify the risks that can hamper the progress of the school PPA's	4.50	0.61	Highly Implemented
5. ensure to develop strategies to mitigate the possible risks in the attainment of the goals of the school PPA's in the AIP.	4.48	0.61	Implemented
Overall	4.46	0.55	Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

The data presented in Table 12 indicates that the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system in Candelaria West District is not only statistically sound but also analytically robust, boasting an overall mean of 4.46 and a standard deviation of 0.55. A key factor in this effectiveness is the ability of program and project coordinators to identify potential hazards that could hinder the successful completion of school Projects, Programs, and Activities (PPAs). This is reflected in the fourth objective, which achieved the highest mean score of 4.50 (SD = 0.61). In the context of Candelaria West District, this suggests that school administrators are employing systematic evaluation methods to enhance both student performance and the resilience of their institutions. When risks are identified and managed effectively, schools can maintain a strong focus on instructional quality while fostering a supportive learning atmosphere. This underscores the importance of ongoing monitoring, where schools leverage empirical

data to refine their strategies, optimize resources, and uphold the quality of their educational offerings. The capacity to assess risks aligns with the insights of Etges et al. (2018), who contend that utilizing risk assessment frameworks enables educational stakeholders to strategically focus on areas that need immediate attention. By integrating these frameworks, schools can proactively tackle potential challenges, ensuring that their interventions are not merely reactive but also preemptive, thus preventing disruptions in program implementation.

On a different note, the first indication, which still holds up as effective with a mean score of 4.43 (SD = 0.59), received the lowest rating among the components assessed. This suggests that while schools are doing a decent job with data analysis, there’s room for improvement when it comes to making statistical interpretations clearer and more accessible. In the Candelaria West District, the effectiveness observed indicates that schools are focused on making decisions based on solid evidence; however, enhancing the way data is presented and analyzed could really boost stakeholder engagement and transparency during review processes. Felix et al. (2024) emphasize that having strong statistical literacy among educators and program managers is essential for making well-informed decisions. When schools develop a solid ability to analyze quantitative data, it significantly enhances educational quality by turning complex information into actionable insights.

Table 13
Level of Implementation of School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in terms of Project Management

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>As a Project and Program Coordinator, I...</i>			
1. efficiently and effectively coordination of tasks and resources	4.41	0.60	Implemented
2. design a well-established timelines and goals.	4.45	0.59	Implemented
3. can manage multiple tasks	4.44	0.63	Implemented
4. can be able to anticipate and mitigate risks	4.47	0.64	Implemented
5. can delegate tasks and provide guidance to team members	4.50	0.56	Highly Implemented
Overall	4.45	0.55	Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

Table 13 highlights that the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system in the Candelaria West District is actively used for project management, boasting an impressive overall mean of 4.45 and a standard deviation of 0.55. Among the various indicators, the fifth one stands out with the highest mean of 4.45 (SD = 0.55), showcasing that the district's project and program coordinators excel at delegating tasks and leading their teams effectively. Effective delegation is crucial in educational leadership, as it ensures that roles are clearly defined and strategically assigned to enhance workflow efficiency. This aligns with the findings of Eze et al. (2023), who suggest that a well-structured delegation process can significantly improve team dynamics and project results. The strong delegation practices observed in the Candelaria West District illustrate how schools manage large-scale educational initiatives, such as literacy programs and school-based feeding schemes, with remarkable efficiency. For instance, implementing reading interventions often requires seamless coordination among reading coordinators, classroom teachers, and support staff. By empowering school leaders to delegate specific tasks—like diagnostic assessments, instructional adjustments, and progress tracking—they can ensure

that students receive tailored support without overburdening individual teachers. This organized approach not only enhances the district's capacity to maintain educational programs but also fosters accountability and collaboration among all stakeholders involved.

Let's talk about the importance of structured delegation in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) for effective oversight and accountability. Chukwu et al. (2019) point out that using systematic delegation techniques can really clarify roles, helping project teams collaborate better to meet their institutional goals. A great example of this is the Candelaria West District, where school development plans are executed by teams that split responsibilities for things like infrastructure upgrades, student welfare programs, and curriculum changes. The success of this delegation shows that coordinators are managing to strike a balance between administrative oversight and giving teams the autonomy they need, which helps keep tasks on track with set timelines and objectives. That said, the first indicator, while still considered effective, had the lowest average score of 4.41 (SD = 0.60). This suggests that even though program directors are adept at organizing work and resources, there might be some minor inefficiencies when it comes to allocating resources for specific school programs. Lewallen et al. (2019) highlight that effective coordination involves tackling both the logistical and socio-emotional aspects of school operations.

To ensure fair access, the Candelaria West District carefully distributes educational resources like instructional materials, teacher workload assignments, and student support programs. However, the slight difference in rankings might indicate challenges in achieving uniform resource allocation, particularly in schools with varying enrollment sizes or infrastructure limitations. Despite this, the data indicates that project coordinators' efforts to balance administrative duties with student-focused initiatives are well recognized by school staff and stakeholders. This acknowledgment of effective coordination suggests that while there's room for improvement in resource management, the existing processes are already playing a significant role in the district's long-term educational growth.

Table 14

Level of Implemented of School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in terms of Report Writing

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>As a Project and Program Coordinator, I...</i>			
1. clearly present findings, analyses, and recommendations in a structured and comprehensive manner, ensuring all relevant aspects of PPAs in the AIP are effectively communicated.	4.48	0.61	Implemented
2. can summarize the findings in a sequential order.	4.41	0.58	Implemented
3. provide actionable recommendations and relevant information that help school leaders, teachers, and other stakeholders make informed decisions for program and project enhancements.	4.43	0.59	Implemented
4. provide a clear picture and representation of the progress, challenges, and issues of the PPA's in the AIP.	4.47	0.62	Implemented
5. ensure to report relevant information to help decision-makers understand the situation	4.44	0.59	Implemented
Overall	4.44	0.55	Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

Table 14 reveals that the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system in the Candelaria West District is effectively implemented through report writing, boasting an impressive overall mean of 4.44

and a standard deviation of 0.55. This indicates that the district's project and program coordinators excel at documenting M&E processes in a systematic and thorough way. The first indication stands out with the highest mean of 4.47 (SD = 0.61), suggesting that coordinators are quite adept at presenting findings, conducting analyses, and crafting well-structured recommendations. This level of effectiveness is crucial in the Candelaria West District, where schools routinely generate reports to assess the success of various initiatives, including student reading programs, infrastructure development projects, and targeted interventions aimed at enhancing student welfare. Clear and well-articulated reports ensure that stakeholders—like school principals, local government officials, and education policymakers—receive accurate and actionable insights.

Teng and Huang (2018) highlight the importance of self-regulation in writing techniques, noting that M&E coordinators must skillfully synthesize data to deliver findings that inform decision-making. This means evaluators in schools across the district need to carefully analyze performance metrics and translate raw data into meaningful insights that directly influence improvements in curriculum implementation, resource allocation, and intervention strategies. While the overall success of report writing is commendable, the second indication recorded the lowest mean score of 4.41 (SD = 0.58). This suggests that, although project and program directors are proficient at summarizing information in a logical sequence, there may be minor areas that could benefit from further elaboration.

In the Candelaria West District, where reports play a vital role in securing funding and government support for school projects, ensuring clarity and coherence in the sequencing of findings is essential for enhancing the impact of proposed changes. Sari et al. (2021) argue that well-structured and coherent summaries enhance educational evaluations by providing stakeholders with data that's logically organized. This clarity makes it easier to identify trends and pinpoint areas that need improvement.

Table 15

Level of Implemented of School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in terms of Time Management

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
<i>As a Project and Program Coordinator, I...</i>			
1. have a well-planned timetable intended for the monitoring and evaluation of the school PPA's in the AIP.	4.45	0.59	Implemented
2. ensure that the project is completed within the allocated budget.	4.45	0.58	Implemented
3. can foresee and identify potential problems and delays in the project.	4.42	0.57	Implemented
4. guarantee that the project is monitored and evaluated on a regular basis	4.46	0.57	Implemented
5. can prioritize work and ensure they meet all their deadlines.	4.44	0.59	Implemented
Overall	4.44	0.53	Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

Table 15 reveals that the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system in the Candelaria West District is effectively managing time, boasting an overall mean score of 4.44 with a standard deviation of 0.53. While it's still considered implemented, this component has one of the lower mean scores compared to others. This suggests that project coordinators might be juggling too many priorities and facing a heavy workload. Educators and administrators are balancing a variety of tasks, from lesson

planning and student assessments to administrative duties and program execution. With so many responsibilities on their plates, M&E activities might not always get the focus they deserve. On a brighter note, the fourth indicator shines with the highest mean of 4.46 (SD = 0.53), showing that project and program coordinators are doing an excellent job of regularly monitoring and reviewing school initiatives. This is a testament to the Candelaria West District's thorough approach to educational planning. For instance, the district's annual literacy intervention programs heavily depend on timely monitoring and evaluation methods to track student progress, adjust teaching strategies, and ensure that interventions stay aligned with learning goals.

The focus on structured time management aligns with the findings of Kroll and Moynihan (2017), which suggest that using monitoring frameworks helps keep projects on track and boosts their overall quality. When educators and school officials clearly communicate their roles, responsibilities, and deadlines—especially during budget discussions for instructional materials—it enhances accountability and ensures that planned activities unfold as intended (Navarta-Sánchez et al., 2020). However, the third indicator, while still deemed effective, received the lowest average score of 4.42 (SD = 0.57). This suggests that although project and program coordinators are adept at predicting and spotting potential delays, they might find it challenging to foresee unexpected obstacles.

In the Candelaria West District, where schools manage a range of programs, from food initiatives to classroom improvements, early intervention is crucial for keeping things moving. Delays in government procurement or unforeseen logistical issues, like transportation shortages for school supplies, can hinder project completion. By employing proactive strategies, such as early identification of supply chain risks or planning for alternative resources, these challenges can be addressed. This aligns with Rachmawati et al. (2023), who highlight the importance of proactive planning in minimizing risks and boosting operational efficiency. Similarly, Meng (2019) points out that well-organized management practices, often seen in construction and infrastructure projects, can also be beneficial in educational settings where the success of interventions is closely tied to timing.

Table 16

Summary Table on the Level of Implementation of School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Process

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Data Analysis	4.51	0.56	Highly Implemented
Monitoring Plan	4.50	0.50	Highly Implemented
Evaluation Plan	4.48	0.57	Implemented
Statistical and Analytical	4.46	0.55	Implemented
Project Management	4.45	0.55	Implemented
Report Writing	4.44	0.55	Implemented
Time Management	4.44	0.53	Implemented
Overall	4.47	0.54	Implemented

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Highly Implemented, 3.50-4.49 Implemented, 2.50-3.49 Moderately Implemented, 1.50-2.49 Less Implemented, 1.00-1.49 Not at all Implemented

Table 16 highlights that the School Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Process in the Candelaria West District is actively in place, boasting an average score of 4.47 and a standard deviation of 0.54. This suggests that schools in the district are effectively employing M&E strategies that foster continuous improvement in their educational practices. Interestingly, the Data Analysis Process and the Monitoring Plan Process emerged as the standout components, with impressive mean ratings of 4.51 and

4.50, respectively. This indicates that teachers and program coordinators possess a solid ability to interpret data. Schools are making good use of structured monitoring tools, like the School Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adjustment (SMEA) framework, which helps them consistently track school performance and the effectiveness of their programs. This commitment to evidence-based decision-making is evident, ensuring that evaluation data is utilized effectively to inform instructional practices and program modifications.

In Candelaria West District, school leaders and program coordinators play a crucial role in managing data analysis techniques, facilitating curriculum implementation, and providing timely feedback to instructors on their teaching methods. For instance, local literacy initiatives depend on accurate data analysis to assess student reading progress and refine intervention strategies. The strong effectiveness of these monitoring systems indicates that schools are dedicated to maintaining thorough follow-up mechanisms, helping educators make informed adjustments to their teaching and learning activities.

Paquinol and Cabigas (2023) emphasize that thorough educational supervision boosts teacher effectiveness, which in turn enhances educational outcomes. They also point out that various school monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes—like evaluation plans, statistical analysis, project management, report writing, and time management—are seen as effective. This indicates that schools in the district are employing systematic methods for conducting evaluations and managing important educational programs. Nasution et al. (2023) contend that well-structured M&E strategies are essential for upholding high educational standards and pinpointing areas that need improvement. In the Candelaria West District, the effectiveness of these processes translates into better resource management and program efficiency. For instance, the district's budget for instructional materials and infrastructure upgrades is guided by M&E insights, ensuring that investments directly enhance student learning outcomes. Additionally, schools that effectively manage their time and reporting processes can communicate results to stakeholders more clearly, fostering transparency and data-driven planning.

Table 17
Level of Applicability of the Proposed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Guide in terms of Relevance and Alignment with School Goals

Indicators	Experts			Teachers		
	Mean	SD	VI	Mean	SD	VI
The M&E plan guide...						
1. addresses the specific learning objectives outlined in the school curriculum.	4.50	0.53	VHA	4.60	0.49	VHA
2. aligns with national education policies and frameworks.	4.30	0.48	HA	4.60	0.49	VHA
3. includes strategies for addressing issues like dropout rates and absenteeism.	4.50	0.53	VHA	4.52	0.62	VHA
4. ensures that extracurricular activities are evaluated for their contribution to student development.	3.40	0.52	MA	4.37	0.61	HA
5. promotes sustainable practices in school program implementation.	4.60	0.52	VHA	4.67	0.51	VHA
Overall	4.26	0.52	HA	4.55	0.55	VHA

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Very High Applicability, 3.50-4.49 High Applicability, 2.50-3.49 Moderate Applicability, 1.50-2.49 Low Applicability, 1.00-1.49 Very Low Applicability

Table 17 highlights how well the proposed monitoring and evaluation (M&E) implementation plan guide aligns with school goals and its overall relevance. The findings show that the M&E plan guide has a strong applicability, boasting an impressive mean score of 4.26 and a standard deviation of 0.52, as validated by experts. This high score reflects its solid connection to educational policies and institutional objectives. Specifically, the M&E framework is crafted to align with the Department of Education's Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (BEMEF) outlined in DepEd Order No. 29, s. 2022. This ensures that monitoring efforts are in sync with policy goals and institutional priorities. As a result, school leaders and master teachers can effectively track progress and adjust strategies in line with national education standards.

Moreover, the M&E plan guide serves as a valuable tool for making evidence-based decisions. School leaders understand the significance of data-driven monitoring, which empowers them to evaluate program effectiveness, pinpoint gaps, and implement targeted interventions. This structured approach guarantees that School Improvement Plans (SIPs) and Annual Implementation Plans (AIPs) are responsive to the needs of students and the goals of the institution. The alignment of the M&E plan with specific learning objectives is vital, as it lays the groundwork for effective educational practices. Comprehensive frameworks like this one are crucial for creating an educational environment that meets both local and national standards (Aithal & Aithal, 2020).

On another note, when we look at the teachers' perspective, the proposed M&E implementation plan guide appears to be highly relevant and well-aligned with school goals, boasting an impressive mean score of 4.55 and a standard deviation of 0.55. This suggests that it effectively supports project implementation and resource allocation. Teachers who also take on the role of project coordinators depend on M&E findings to fine-tune resource distribution, enhance program execution, and ensure everything aligns with school improvement plans (SIPs) and Annual Implementation Plans (AIPs). This organized approach really boosts efficiency and accountability. However, the third indicator received the lowest mean scores of 3.40 and 4.37 from experts and teachers, respectively, even though it was rated as having 'high applicability' and 'very high applicability.' This could be because the proposed M&E plan guide seems to be missing standardized evaluation metrics. Without clear benchmarks, schools might end up relying on general observations instead of structured evaluations.

For instance, some schools evaluate extracurricular activities based on participation rates, while others might focus on the skills developed or behavioral improvements. This inconsistency makes it tough to draw comparisons. This ties back to Marasigan & Casalme, 2019, which points out that many schools lack clear, structured criteria for assessing the effectiveness of extracurricular activities, leading to inconsistent and subjective evaluations.

The alignment of the M&E plan with specific learning objectives is important because it lays the groundwork for effective educational practices. Frameworks like this are vital for creating an educational environment that addresses the unique needs of schools in the Candelaria West District, guiding them toward a systematic M&E process. When M&E plans are in sync with educational policies, it ensures that schools are not just chasing set goals but are also in line with broader governmental strategies that shape educational outcomes. This connection between educational policies at various levels is key to making the most of available resources (Roofe & Ferguson, 2018).

Table 18

Level of Applicability of the Proposed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Guide in terms of Feasibility and Usability of the M&E Plan

Indicators	Experts			Teachers		
	Mean	SD	VI	Mean	SD	VI
The M&E plan guide...						
1. provides clear instructions on how to use data collection tools specific to school programs.	4.20	0.63	HA	4.60	0.53	VHA
2. provides a timeline for implementing the M&E processes that is realistic for school administrators and staff.	4.30	0.67	HA	4.47	0.57	HA
3. offers practical examples of how to measure program success (e.g., pre- and post-test results).	4.30	0.82	HA	4.43	0.56	HA
4. provides resources required to implement the guide (e.g., materials, time, and personnel) which are readily available in the school.	4.40	0.52	HA	4.73	0.45	VHA
5. includes simplified templates for reporting results to stakeholders like parents, teachers, and the school board.	3.30	0.48	MA	4.52	0.57	VHA
Overall	4.10	0.62	HA	4.55	0.53	VHA

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Very High Applicability (VHA), 3.50-4.49 High Applicability (HA), 2.50-3.49 Moderate Applicability (MA), 1.50-2.49 Low Applicability (LA), 1.00-1.49 Very Low Applicability (VLA)

Table 18 provides an analysis of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan Guide, highlighting its strong applicability in terms of feasibility and usability for both experts and teachers. Most of the evaluated indicators show a high level of applicability, with one notable exception: the last indicator, which is crucial for school administrators and educational staff looking to improve their monitoring and evaluation practices. Specifically, this last indicator, which mentions that the M&E plan "includes simplified templates for reporting results to stakeholders like parents, teachers, and the school board," received the lowest mean score of 3.30 and a standard deviation of 0.48, suggesting a moderate level of applicability. The reason for this is that the guide could use some work on how it presents data. Each school tends to format its reports differently, using various levels of detail, terminology, and structure. Without a consistent format, it becomes tough to make comparisons across schools or programs, which can hinder stakeholders from pulling out key insights. Experts point out that while M&E frameworks can offer valuable insights, the way data is organized and presented might be too technical for those who aren't specialists, making it hard to draw actionable conclusions (Patton, 2017). On a brighter note, when it comes to teachers, the proposed M&E implementation plan guide appears to be highly applicable, boasting an overall mean score of 4.55 and a standard deviation of 0.53. This positive reception is likely due to the guide's practical and user-friendly design. It seems to provide clear, structured processes for conducting M&E, allowing teachers to seamlessly incorporate monitoring tasks into their daily routines without adding too much administrative hassle. The M&E framework is closely tied to classroom practices, as it considers teachers' daily instructional duties. This means its tools and

strategies can be seamlessly integrated into real-time lesson planning, assessing student performance, adjusting the curriculum, and collecting data. Research highlights that having clear instructions for data collection is crucial for effective implementation (2019), (Indrayani & Hidayati, 2023).

Table 19

Level of Applicability of the Proposed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Guide in terms of Clarity of the M&E Plan Guide

Indicators	Experts			Teachers		
	Mean	SD	VI	Mean	SD	VI
The M&E plan guide...						
1. provides clear and detailed instructions for monitoring school programs.	4.30	0.67	HA	4.55	0.50	VHA
2. includes well-defined objectives that align with the school's needs.	4.40	0.7	HA	4.52	0.54	VHA
3. clearly states the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders in the M&E process	4.00	0.67	HA	4.62	0.56	VHA
4. provide easy to understand roles terminologies and concepts	3.90	0.57	HA	4.70	0.50	VHA
5. offers straightforward methods for assessing program effectiveness.	3.90	0.74	HA	4.57	0.62	VHA
Overall	4.10	0.67	HA	4.59	0.54	VHA

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Very High Applicability (VHA), 3.50-4.49 High Applicability (HA), 2.50-3.49 Moderate Applicability (MA), 1.50-2.49 Low Applicability (LA), 1.00-1.49 Very Low Applicability (VLA)

Table 19 sheds light on how well the proposed monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan guide is understood, particularly in terms of its clarity. The findings show that the clarity indicators received high scores for applicability, highlighting how effectively the M&E plan supports clear communication and the implementation of school programs. When we look at the experts' feedback, the overall applicability rating stands at a solid 4.10, suggesting that the guide does a great job of meeting the needs of stakeholders involved in monitoring and evaluation. The significance of clarity in M&E planning is well-documented in the literature. Iddi (2018) points out that having clear objectives and defined roles for stakeholders is crucial for fostering effective community participation in M&E processes. This underscores that the success of M&E systems heavily relies on how well stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities within these frameworks (Amalia, 2019). While Sridharan et al. touch on integrating gender and human rights into planning, they don't specifically address clarity in M&E, which is why that citation was omitted (Iddi, 2018). On the flip side, when we consider the teachers' perspectives, the overall mean score is 4.59 with a standard deviation of 0.54, indicating Very High Applicability. The statement that scored the highest, at 4.70, is "provide easy to understand roles, terminologies and concepts," showing strong agreement among respondents. The statement with the lowest mean, "includes well-defined objectives that align with the school's needs," still scores a respectable 4.52, which also falls under Very High Applicability.

The findings indicate that educators and school staff find the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan Guide to be incredibly clear and user-friendly. The standout feature is the highest-rated indicator, which highlights how well the guide simplifies technical details, making M&E approachable even for

those who might not have much experience with data analysis or program evaluation. This is especially crucial in schools where staff often juggle various responsibilities and could really benefit from a guide that cuts through the confusion. This aligns with Scriven (2016), who emphasizes the need for clarity in evaluation frameworks, ensuring that educators can easily understand and apply the findings. The study shows that the M&E guide is indeed very clear and user-friendly, reinforcing Scriven's point about the importance of accessible evaluation models. On the flip side, the slightly lower score regarding alignment with school needs suggests there's room for improvement.

While it's still rated quite highly, it hints that some objectives in the guide might be better suited to the specific contexts of different schools. This underscores the necessity for school administrators to tailor the M&E framework to fit their unique student demographics, curriculum focuses, and institutional goals. By ensuring that the guide more prominently incorporates school-specific needs, we can enhance the effectiveness and relevance of school programs, projects, and activities, ultimately leading to more targeted and meaningful educational outcomes. This is in line with Fitzpatrick et al. (2017), who point out that different evaluation approaches should be adapted to meet school needs, particularly regarding student demographics, curriculum focus, and institutional goals, highlighting the importance of structured reporting tools that help educators track progress and refine their strategies effectively.

Table 20

Level of Applicability of the Proposed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Guide in terms of Impact on Program Improvement

Indicators	Experts			Teachers		
	Mean	SD	VI	Mean	SD	VI
The M&E plan guide...						
1. identifies specific gaps in school program implementation	4.10	0.74	HA	4.43	0.65	HA
2. provides actionable steps to enhance the effectiveness of the PPAs	4.00	0.67	HA	4.53	0.60	VHA
3. directly supports the improvement of student outcomes, such as increased academic performance and reduced absenteeism.	3.90	0.57	HA	4.53	0.57	VHA
4. enables school staff to make data-driven adjustments to ongoing programs in a timely manner	3.90	0.57	HA	4.50	0.62	VHA
5. includes strategies to sustain long-term improvements, such as follow-up activities or regular progress feedback.	4.10	0.57	HA	4.43	0.70	HA
Overall	4.00	0.62	HA	4.48	0.63	HA

Legend: 4.50-5.00 Very High Applicability (VHA), 3.50-4.49 High Applicability (HA), 2.50-3.49 Moderate Applicability (MA), 1.50-2.49 Low Applicability (LA), 1.00-1.49 Very Low Applicability (VLA)

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan Guide shows a strong potential for improving programs, as highlighted by the data in Table 20. It consistently received high average scores across all indicators, suggesting it could be quite effective in enhancing educational initiatives. One key indicator, which "identifies specific gaps in school program implementation," achieved a mean score of 4.10 with a standard deviation of 0.62, reflecting a solid consensus on its relevance. Research backs up the

importance of spotting these gaps for ongoing program enhancement. Given the diverse socio-economic and instructional settings of schools in the district, program implementation can vary widely. Experts agree that the M&E guide does a great job of identifying these gaps, helping educators see where programs might be lacking or need extra support. For instance, some schools face challenges with student engagement in literacy programs, and the guide can help uncover the reasons behind low participation—be it ineffective teaching methods, lack of resources, or scheduling conflicts. Tools like the Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) are particularly useful for revealing shortcomings in educational programs and guiding necessary adjustments (Nuland et al., 2016).

The second indicator indicates that the M&E plan "provides actionable steps to enhance the effectiveness of the PPAs," scoring a mean of 4.00 with a standard deviation of 0.67. For example, if a feeding program is seeing low student participation, the guide can help fine-tune things like distribution models or meal quality, making necessary adjustments based on local conditions instead of sticking to a generic policy. While the guide lays out structured recommendations, experts point out that the real effectiveness of a program hinges on how well schools implement these interventions (Alshehri et al., 2019). This highlights the importance of tailoring solutions to meet each school's specific challenges rather than applying a one-size-fits-all strategy. The assertion that the M&E framework "directly supports the improvement of student outcomes, such as increased academic performance and reduced absenteeism" earned a score of 3.90 (SD = 0.57). For instance, while monitoring student attendance can help identify trends in absenteeism, deeper issues—like transportation difficulties or family obligations—call for non-academic interventions that go beyond the typical M&E scope. M&E has the potential to positively influence student performance, but experts recognize that external factors—such as home environment, economic struggles, and community support—play a significant role in shaping student outcomes (Ferguson et al., 2020). This helps explain the slightly lower rating, as simply monitoring isn't enough to tackle learning disparities without additional supportive initiatives.

One important point highlighted is how the guide helps school staff "make data-driven adjustments to ongoing programs in a timely manner," scoring an average of 3.90 (SD = 0.67). This quick responsiveness is crucial for maximizing the impact of programs. For instance, if a school identifies that students are struggling with reading, by the time they implement changes—like adding tutoring or updating the curriculum—the academic term might be too far along for effective early intervention. Research shows that using data promptly is essential for adaptive management in education, enabling real-time adjustments based on feedback (Willms et al., 2023). Additionally, the guide offers "strategies to sustain long-term improvements, such as follow-up activities or regular progress feedback," which received a score of 4.10 (SD = 0.57). Some schools frequently revise their professional development programs based on monitoring and evaluation (M&E) findings, while others face challenges due to limited funding or inconsistent support from administration. Achieving long-term sustainability in educational interventions relies on regular evaluation and feedback systems. Programs that include ongoing assessments tend to have more lasting impacts compared to those that only evaluate sporadically (Wajid et al., 2019; Eide et al., 2016).

When we look at the teachers' data, the average score comes out to 4.48, with a standard deviation of 0.63, indicating a High Applicability. Among the various indicators, two statements stand out: "provides actionable steps to enhance the effectiveness of the PPAs" and "directly supports the improvement of student outcomes, such as increased academic performance and reduced absenteeism," both scoring a high mean of 4.53, which is rated as Very High Applicability. On the flip side, the lowest mean is found in two other statements: "identifies specific gaps in school program implementation" and "includes strategies to sustain long-term improvements, such as follow-up activities or regular progress feedback," each earning a score of 4.43, which is still considered High Applicability. This data shows that the M&E Plan Guide is viewed as a valuable resource for enhancing school programs, particularly in offering actionable steps and boosting student outcomes. It suggests that the guide effectively turns data

and evaluations into tangible improvements that are essential for dynamic school settings that need timely interventions. The high ratings in these areas reflect a strong belief in the guide's ability to foster meaningful academic progress and operational efficiency. This aligns with the insights from McDavid & Hawthorn (2018), who stress that well-crafted M&E plans are crucial for translating evaluation findings into actionable improvements, enabling schools to tackle challenges effectively and refine their educational strategies.

On a different note, the slightly lower scores related to pinpointing implementation gaps and maintaining long-term improvements suggest there are areas that could use some fine-tuning. Even though these elements are still considered quite relevant, they might benefit from a bit more attention—like improved diagnostic tools for gap analysis or more organized frameworks for ongoing monitoring. When we look at school programs, projects, and activities, this insight highlights the importance of ongoing capacity building for staff. It's crucial to use the M&E guide not just for quick fixes but also for long-term development planning. By bolstering these aspects, we can ensure that school initiatives stay responsive, informed by data, and resilient over time. Research shows that when educators engage in capacity building, they become better at interpreting M&E findings, making sure that evaluation processes are proactive rather than just reactive in guiding school development (Nuland & Lunenberg, 2016).

Table 21

Test of relationship between the AIP Key performance and the level of applicability of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan guide in enhancing the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) process of Projects, Programs, and Activities

AIP Key Performance	Applicability of the Proposed M & E Plan Guide			
	Relevance and Alignment with School Goals	Feasibility and Usability of the M&E Plan	Clarity of the M&E Plan Guide	Impact on Program Improvement
Access	0.217	0.141	0.029	0.091
Quality	0.203	0.064	-0.029	0.05
Equity	0.287*	-0.034	-0.118	0.067
Resiliency & Well-Being	0.112	-0.048	-0.131	-0.103

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In Table 22, we examined how AIP Key Performance correlates with the applicability of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan Guide across four different components. Out of all the values we looked at, only one stood out as significant: a positive correlation ($r = 0.287$) between Equity and Relevance and Alignment with School Goals*, which was significant at the 0.05 level. This indicates a weak yet statistically significant relationship. The other correlations between various AIP key performance areas and the components of the M&E Plan Guide didn't show any statistical significance and generally had weak correlation values, ranging from -0.131 to 0.217. Therefore, the hypothesis suggesting a significant relationship between AIP key performance and the applicability of the M&E Plan Guide is only partially supported, particularly regarding the connection between Equity and Relevance and Alignment. The notable relationship between Equity and the Relevance and Alignment of the M&E Plan Guide suggests that schools find the guide particularly beneficial for aligning their programs with equitable outcomes, like ensuring fair resource distribution and support for marginalized

learners. This is vital for fostering inclusive education and indicates that when schools focus on equity, the M&E guide plays a key role in making sure their programs reflect this commitment. The guide underscores the importance of equity in education, showing how structured M&E frameworks can help schools align their programs with inclusive outcomes (UNESCO, 2017).

It seems that the lack of strong correlations in certain areas, even though the M&E plan is highly applicable and the AIP key performance indicators are effective, might indicate a disconnect in integration. This suggests that while the M&E guide is well-crafted, it may not be fully customized or clearly linked to specific performance areas like Quality or Well-being. For school programs, this means that administrators should focus on further tailoring the guide's use across all performance indicators. By aligning M&E processes more closely with strategic goals in access, quality, and student well-being, we can enhance program implementation and drive better outcomes in teaching, learning, and school governance. Hatry (2017) highlights the importance of data-driven decision-making, which underscores the guide's role in helping schools connect M&E processes with access, quality, and student well-being.

Table 22

Test of Relationship between the level of effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation processes and the level of applicability of the proposed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan guide in enhancing the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) process of Projects, Programs, and Activities

Monitoring and Evaluation Process	Applicability of the Proposed M & E Plan Guide			
	Relevance and Alignment with School Goals	Feasibility and Usability of the M&E Plan	Clarity of the M&E Plan Guide	Impact on Program Improvement
Data Analysis	0.093	-0.028	-0.16	-0.019
Monitoring Plan	0.066	-0.081	-0.114	-0.006
Evaluation Plan	0.155	-0.073	-0.124	0.069
Statistical & Analytical	0.147	-0.117	-0.119	-0.002
Project Management	0.095	-0.048	-0.139	-0.028
Report Writing	0.151	-0.002	-0.098	0.045
Time Management	0.094	-0.051	-0.108	0.003

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

In Table 22, we see the results of examining the relationship between how effective the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) processes are and how applicable the proposed M&E plan guide is. The findings show that none of the correlation coefficients are statistically significant, which is clear from the lack of asterisks. The correlation values fall between -0.160 and 0.155, suggesting that the relationships between the components of the M&E process and various aspects of the M&E Plan Guide are weak to very weak. This means that the hypothesis claiming a significant relationship between the effectiveness of the M&E process and the applicability of the M&E Plan Guide doesn't hold up against the data. Even though both the M&E process is rated as highly effective and the M&E plan guide is seen as very applicable, the absence of a significant correlation hints at a disconnect. It seems that schools might already have robust internal M&E practices, and while the proposed guide is certainly valuable, it hasn't been fully integrated or utilized to enhance these existing processes. In the school context, the principles outlined in the book resonate with the challenges faced by Candelaria West District, where

administrators and educators are tasked with optimizing M&E processes despite tight budgets and operational constraints. The study findings suggest that while the M&E guide is indeed highly applicable, there are areas—like pinpointing implementation gaps and maintaining long-term improvements—that need some fine-tuning. Bamberger et al. (2019) point out that using simplified, efficient M&E templates can assist institutions in bridging these gaps by offering structured, user-friendly tools for evaluation. This ensures that even schools with limited technical know-how or evaluation infrastructure can set up effective monitoring systems.

When it comes to school programs, projects, and activities, there's a clear need for building capacity and aligning efforts. School leaders and staff could really benefit from focused training or workshops that show them how to effectively use the proposed guide to enhance and standardize important monitoring and evaluation (M&E) processes, such as planning evaluations, analyzing data, and reporting results. By addressing this gap, we can make sure that the strengths of current practices are not only maintained but also optimized through the structured support offered by the M&E guide. This would lead to more consistent and data-driven decision-making across various initiatives. In Candelaria West District, for instance, the M&E guide is seen as very relevant, but it hasn't been fully woven into the existing school practices yet. UNESCO's (2017) focus on structured training and professional development highlights the need for schools to have targeted workshops on evaluation planning, data analysis, and reporting. The findings of the study indicate that while the guide offers valuable frameworks, school leaders and staff might need additional capacity-building to effectively implement these principles, ensuring that M&E processes are consistent, standardized, and aligned with their strategic goals.

3. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion, the following recommendations were offered. Improve time management by employing structured scheduling strategies such as time-blocking. Teachers or program coordinators can set aside certain times for data gathering, analysis, and report writing. Setting realistic deadlines and breaking down projects into smaller chunks helps to avoid delays, minimize stress, and increase workflow efficiency. Create clear and concise report writing guidelines by establishing standardized templates with guiding prompts so that teachers and program coordinators may shorten the reporting process and maintain uniformity in structure and format. Providing specific rules for summarizing findings, utilizing precise language, and minimizing extraneous details will result in more coherent and meaningful reports. Integrate writing and time management training sessions. By holding focused workshops on effective writing and time management tactics, teachers and program coordinators can improve their capacity to synthesize data while documenting efficiently. Training programs should emphasize clear thinking organization, logical report structure, and effective deadline management. Future researchers can help make evaluation procedures more efficient and impactful by investigating innovative methods for improving time management and report writing in M&E frameworks. By performing comparative studies on best practices in diverse educational contexts, they can uncover effective models that improve documentation clarity and streamline reporting workflows.

References:

- Abdullah, A., Tunas, B., & Entang, M. (2021). Inclusive education program development: program evaluation. *JHSS (Journal of Humanities and Social Studies)*, 5(2), 203-207. <https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v5i2.3913>
- Ablasa, L. (2024). Parental involvement in learners' education: significance, benefits, and barriers. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(3). <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0033>

- Agbenyo, F., Wisdom, N., & Akanbang, B. A. A. (2021). Stakeholder Perspectives on Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation in Educational Projects in Upper West Region, Ghana. *Journal of Planning and Land Management*, 2(1), 50-64. <https://sddubidsjplm.com/journal/index.php/jplm/article/view/34>
- Aithal, P. S. and Aithal, S. (2020). Analysis of the indian national education policy 2020 towards achieving its objectives. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3676074>
- Akkuş, M. and ÇINKIR, Ş. (2022). The problem of student absenteeism, its impact on educational environments, and the evaluation of current policies. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 9, 978-997. <https://doi.org/10.52380/ijpes.2022.9.4.957>
- Almeida, M. V. (2020). A risk assessment model for high-rise school building project in metro manila, philippines. *International Journal of GEOMATE*, 18(69). <https://doi.org/10.21660/2020.69.5728>
- Alonzo, E. S., Abad, R. M., & Salinas, E. R. (2020). "Barriers to Effective Child Advocacy Programs: Lessons from the Field." *Philippine Journal of Education and Social Research*, 14(1), 45-58. doi:10.1016/j.pjesr.2020.05.003
- Beasley, J. J. and Ieva, K. P. (2022). School counselors and principals serving as co-conspirators for antiracist program evaluation. *Professional School Counseling*, 26(1c). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759x221134671>
- Bamberger, M., Rugh, J., & Mabry, L. (2019). *RealWorld evaluation: Working under budget, time, data, and political constraints*. SAGE Publications.
- Career Insights (2022). 10 Monitoring And Evaluating Skills and How To Improve Them
- Carillo, C. S., & Janer, S. S. (2022). Involvement of Teachers in School Programs. <https://uijrt.com/articles/v4/i2/UIJRTV4I20010.pdf>
- Chukwu, C. L., Mezieobi, D. I., Uguwanyi, B. E., & Okpoebo, C. C. (2019). Monitoring and evaluation on effective delivery of social studies for improved academic performance. *Review of European Studies*, 11(1), 175. <https://doi.org/10.5539/res.v11n1p175>
- Darling-Hammond, L.(2013). Diversity, Equity, and Education in a Globalized World.

- DepEd Order No. 29 s. 2022. Adoption of the Basic Education Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/DO_s2022_029-corrected-copy.pdf
- Etges, A. P. B. d. S., Grenon, V., Lü, M., Cardoso, R. B., Souza, J. S. d., Neto, F. J. K., ... & Félix, E. A. (2018). Development of an enterprise risk inventory for healthcare. *BMC Health Services Research*, 18(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-018-3400-7>
- FELIX, E. C. S., PACULAN, M. A. P., GALULUDAN, I. D., GALWAK, M. Y., & ALACDES, F. U. (2024). Significance of basic statistics in educational research: graduate student perspectives. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 146(1). <https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001461420246268>
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2017). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. Pearson.
- Galante, M. and Hardy, A. (2020). *What Is Project Management? Definitions, Examples & More*
- Glassdoor Team (2021). *Project Management Skills: Definition and Examples*
- Gonzales, A. M., Beringuela, K. A. O., Rudio, D. A. S., Cantalejo, J. A. S., Bautista, R. I., Olipas, C. N. P., ... & Villegas, A. C. A. (2023). Project learn: the development and assessment of a cross-platform tutor finder. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 1(4), 15-27. [https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2023.1\(4\).02](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2023.1(4).02)
- Greenhaus, D. K. (2017). *Equity, Equality, and Access to Quality Education*. Casio
- Hatry, H. P. (2017). *Performance measurement: Getting results*. Urban Institute Press.
- Indrayani, I. and Hidayati, D. (2023). Smart library utilization strategy to enhance teachers' reading interest in elementary schools. *Jurnal Fundadikdas (Fundamental Pendidikan Dasar)*, 6(2), 167-181. <https://doi.org/10.12928/fundadikdas.v6i2.9177>
- Javed, M. L., Inayat, M., & Javed, M. N. (2021). Monitoring and Evaluation System in Education: An Overview of Elementary Schools. *Review of Applied Management and Social Sciences*, 4(4), 837-847. <https://ramss.spcrd.org/index.php/ramss/article/view/187>

Kappa Delta Pi Record. 49. 113-115. 10.1080/00228958.2013.819186.

Kariuki, James G (2014).An exploration of the guiding principles, importance and challenges of monitoring and evaluation of community development projects and programmes.International journal of business and social science, 5(1),PP. 143-170.

Kroll, A. and Moynihan, D. P. (2017). The design and practice of integrating evidence: connecting performance management with program evaluation. Public Administration Review, 78(2), 183-194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12865>

Latta, L. (2019). Equity in Education: Defining Equity, Equality, and Standardization

Mahardhani, A. J. (2023). The role of public administration in improving the quality of education services in primary schools. Indo-MathEdu Intellectuals Journal, 4(2), 1370-1381. <https://doi.org/10.54373/imeij.v4i2.363>

Marasigan, N. V., & Casalme, R. V. (2019). Examining the role of extracurricular activities in pupil development. International Journal of Recent Innovations in Academic Research, 3(6), 103-107. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Nora-Marasigan/publication/363436457_Citation_Nora_V_Marasigan_and_Rizza_V_Casalme_2019_Examining_the_Role_of_Extracurricular_Activities_in_Pupil_Development/links/631c52c30a70852150e2b415/Citation-Nora-V-Marasigan-and-Rizza-V-Casalme-2019-Examining-the-Role-of-Extracurricular-Activities-in-Pupil-Development.pdf

Matara, P., Mwikali, F., & Mutisya, M. (2022). MONITORING AND EVALUATION FOR EDUCATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDMUND RICE FOUNDATION AUSTRALIA NAIROBI COUNTY. Journal of Entrepreneurship and Project Management, 7(1), 46-70.

Meyers, D. C., Durlak, J. A., & Wandersman, A. (2012). The quality implementation framework: a synthesis of critical steps in the implementation process. American Journal of Community Psychology, 50(3-4), 462-480. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-012-9522-x>

Msezane, S. B. (2019). School evaluation: approaches, frameworks, and indicators. Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69902-8_8-1

Muhibbin, A., Patmisari, P., Naidu, N. B. M., Prasetyo, W. H., & Hidayat, M. L. (2023). An analysis of factors affecting student wellbeing: emotional intelligence, family and school

- environment. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 12(4), 1954. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i4.25670>
- Muwanguzi, E., C.D., S., & Edward, K. (2023). An analysis of community engagement in higher education: a conceptual exploration. *British Journal of Education, Learning and Development Psychology*, 6(3), 120-129. <https://doi.org/10.52589/bjeldp-jx4kjgwo>
- Navarta - Sánchez, M. V., Ambrosio, L., Portillo, M. C., Ursúa, M. E., Senosiain, J. M., & Riverol, M. (2020). Evaluation of a psychoeducational intervention compared with education in people with parkinson's disease and their informal caregivers: a quasi - experimental study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 76(10), 2719-2732. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.14476>
- Nurjanah, A., Salsabila, I. N., Azzahra, A., Rahayu, R., & Marlina, N. S. (2024). Artificial intelligence (ai) usage in today's teaching and learning process: a review. *Syntax Idea*, 6(3), 1517-1523. <https://doi.org/10.46799/syntax-idea.v6i3.3126>
- Nuland, S., Korthagen, F., & Lunenberg, M. (2016). Program Evaluation and Review Technique (PERT) in Educational Planning: Identifying Implementation Gaps. *Educational Planning Journal*, 23(4), 45-62.
- Nyamazana, A. (2020). Critical skills and attributes needed for a career in Monitoring and Evaluation
- Ortiz, J. A. & Quimio, A. A. (2020). Assessing the Effectiveness of Monitoring and Evaluation in DepEd Projects: Lessons from the Field. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 99(1), 23-41. DOI link / URL
- Osiesi, M. P. (2023). Assessment, evaluation and monitoring of teaching and learning in nigeria primary schools: challenges and implications for teachers. *Utamax : Journal of Ultimate Research and Trends in Education*, 5(1), 70-81. <https://doi.org/10.31849/utamax.v5i1.12571>
- Palingcod, R. (2022). Implementation of DepEd Support Programs: Basis for an Enhanced Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 3(5), 458-467. <https://scimatic.org/storage/journals/11/pdfs/468.pdf>
- Paquinol, B. T. and Cabigas, M. E. A. (2023). Educational supervision and teachers' performance of el salvador city division. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 129(1). <https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001291720235255> Perspectives of School Middle Leaders in Singapore positive action. *Educational Psychology*, 41(8), 1003–1023.

Patton, M. Q. (2017). Principles-focused evaluation: The guide. Guilford Press.

Purcell, J. W. (2017). Community - engaged pedagogy in the virtual classroom: integrating eservice - learning into online leadership education. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 11(1), 65-70. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21515>

Rachmawati, F., Ramadhani, H. D., & Nurhidayah, A. S. (2023). Project delay risk assessment. *IPTEK the Journal for Technology and Science*, 34(1), 60. <https://doi.org/10.12962/j20882033.v34i1.16263>

Sari, Y. I., Sumarmi, S., Utomo, D. H., & Astina, I. K. (2021). The effect of problem based learning on problem solving and scientific writing skills. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(2), 11-26. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.1422a>

Scheerens, J. (2016). Educational effectiveness and ineffectiveness. A critical review of the knowledge base, 389. <http://ndl.ethernet.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/40796/1/538.Jaap%20Scheerens.pdf>

Scriven, M. (2016). The logic of evaluation. Cambridge University Press.

Sepulveda, A. (2020), The Digital Transformation of Education: Connecting Schools, Empowering Learners, UNESCO report.

Soncin, M. and Cannistrà, M. (2022), "Data analytics in education: are schools on the long and winding road?", *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 286-304. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRAM-04-2021-0058>

Tekkwo, I. (2020). The influence of Monitoring and Evaluation on Project performance. *re-JIEM (Research Journal of Islamic Education Management)*

UNESCO. (2017). A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000248254>

UNESCO. (2021). Building capacity for effective education monitoring and evaluation. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

- Valido, A., Robinson, L. E., Woolweaver, A. B., Drescher, A., Espelage, D. L., Wright, A. A., ... & LoMurray, S. (2023). Pilot evaluation of the elementary social-emotional learning program sources of strength. *School Mental Health*, 15(2), 528-539. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-023-09567-0>
- White, R. M. and Shin, T. S. (2016). School-wide mediated prosocial development: applying a sociocultural understanding to inclusive practice and character education. *Multicultural Education Review*, 8(4), 213-229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615x.2016.1237418>