AN EVALUATIVE STUDY OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM OF PUNJAB GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION DEPARTMENT FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF SCHOOL SYSTEM

Naseer Ahmad[1], Dr. Muhammad Hameed Nawaz[2]

ABSTRACT:

The aim of the present study was to evaluate the monitoring system of Punjab Government in education department for the improvement of school system. The main objective of the present research was to evaluate the role of monitoring and evaluation system for the recruitment and accountability of teacher and provision of missing facilities at school level. It was descriptive study and survey design in nature and it was conducted in Gujranwala division. Data was collected from 6 DMOs, 84 M&E As, 81 Head teachers, and 432 SSTs via self-developed questionnaire who were selected by applying simple random sampling technique. The collected data was arranged, coded, and entered into computer for analysis. Inferential and descriptive statistics was applied to analyze the data with help of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS, version 20.0) software. After analysis it was found that teachers are being accountable by monitoring their academic performance, attendance, rewarding system and by fostering transparent practices in school education department under monitoring and evaluation system of Punjab government. Moreover teachers are being recruited via passing NTS examination and by observing demonstrating lesson and their quality education. For the provision of missing facilities, the monitoring system of government although present and update the actual condition/facts of the basic required facilities of each school on website/ webpage continuously yet it does not highlight the actual need of the school for the betterment of the infrastructure of schools.
Key Words: Monitoring & Evaluation System, Government of the Punjab, Improvement of School System

Introduction

Monitoring and evaluation is the essential part of all the projects programs which checks past's progress and lacking to improve in present and future. Monitoring and evaluation plays important role in the entire sector such as health, education etc. as far as the school based management is concerned human resource development is a challenging situation. The competing requirements for the school development should be dealt with iron hand and this will be possible only by the school head and the role of the teacher is to take control of the teaching and learning process of the class. The stakeholder as in the parents and students should be taken into consideration and the management of the school should meet the requirements of the society. In the continuous changing world the management team should look curiously towards the changing world and introduce new curriculum new teaching styles, by doing so the school can manage the challenges faced by the students when they are the useful part of the divergent society. The correct information of the changing world should be at ready hand of the Head so he or she could take appropriate decisions timely and correctly. For a better insight of the effectiveness and efficiency of the learning of the student the system of monitoring and evaluation will help the stakeholders and a proper feedback will be provided.

---

    i.   PhD scholar, SST Education Department
    ii.   Associate Professor, university of Lahore

Monitoring and Evaluation System on the school is mainly concerned with the school's internal affairs, this system is designed to meet the requirements of the managers of the schools on priority basis. (Gaventa, & McGee, 2013) Finally, the main objective of all the effort to build thus system is to provide the school management the proper information timely and correctly. The department of education also uses the information for the insight working of the schools and its management. Monitoring & Evaluation System is an integral part of the QA and Accountability System. (Gill. Lerner, & Meosky, 2016). Hoyos (2014) define monitoring as it is continuous assessment which gives early indications of progress in fulfilling the objectives. Monitoring assist timely decision making, ensure accountability, and provide foundation for evaluation. Evaluation is a systematic measurement of performance of an on-going project or program at certain interval or a completed project or program. Garcia (213) stated that evaluation aims to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability (Sera & Beaudry, 2014) Monitoring and evaluation plays important role in all the projects, programs, and policies. As every education system includes policies, objectives, planning, and implementation, monitoring and evaluation is important to check the progress towards meeting objectives. Monitoring ensured what worked or failed whereas evaluation checks relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of education policy, plans and strategies, educational projects and programs (Mtetesha, 2015).

Statement of the Problem

It was an evaluative study of the Monitoring and evaluation System of Punjab Government in Education Department for the Improvement of School System.

Research Objectives

The researcher formulated the following objectives:

  i. To find out the transparency and accountability occurred in education department after implementation of monitoring and evaluation system of Punjab government.
  ii. To find out the cultural change took place in the education department regarding teacher recruitment on merit with the help of implementation of the monitoring and evaluation system of Punjab government.
  iii. To find out the provision of missing facilities in the education department with the help of the monitoring and evaluation system of Punjab government.

Research Questions

  i. To what extent teachers are being accountable after the implementation of monitoring and evaluation system in education department?
  ii. To what way teachers are being recruited on merit after the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation system?
  iii. How monitoring and evaluation system helped the education department for the provision of missing facilities in schools?

Research Methodology
Research design

It was descriptive research based on survey design.

Population

For the present study population comprised all 810 secondary school head teachers, 5130 secondary school teachers, 6 DMOs, and 147 Monitoring and Evaluation Assistants in the academic year of 2017-2020

Sample

Sample for the present study was comprised all (6) DMOs, all (84) M & E As, and 81 Head Teachers and 432 SSTs who were selected by applying simple random sampling technique. Therefore, sample was comprised 603 respondents who were selected from Gujranwala division.

Research Instruments

For the collection of data from the respondents, researcher employed self-developed questionnaire to collect the information about monitoring and evaluation system of government of Punjab to improve schools system at secondary level. There were 5 items to measure each area (teachers' accountability, teachers' recruitment, and provision of missing facilities) which were based on five points Likert Scale.

Pilot testing of the instruments

Research instrument was validated by the experts and research committee. After their approval, it was pilot testing by 2 DMOs, 5 M&E As, 10 Head teachers, and 25 SSTs who were not included in the sample. The responses of questionnaire were coded and entered into computer. Cronbach Alpha was applied to find out the internal consistency coefficient by using SPSS software (20.0 version) to sure the reliability of the questionnaires. After making some changes in it was applied for final data. The computed final alpha reliability of questionnaire was 0.88 which shows that items in the questionnaire were highly correlated.

Data Collection

Data was collected by self-approached by using self-developed questionnaire.

Procedure of the Data collection

Initially the researcher collected the list of all DMO, M&EAs, Head teachers, SSTs, from PMIU. After that the researcher shares his consent with all above mentioned respondents. After their approval, the researcher conducted a meeting in DMO office at district level to collect the data from DMO and M&EAs and then visited personally all selected secondary schools form the collection of data from head teachers and SSTs regarding monitoring and evaluation system. This process was started from 19th of September 2018 to 20th February 2019.

Data Analysis

The collected data was arranged codded and enter into computer for analysis. To analyze the data, inferential and descriptive statistics was applied by suing SPSS software (version 20.0).

Results and Finding

The following table disclose that the computed F-value is 15.79 which is greater than the table value (4.15) at df (5, 602) and the computed sig value=.000 which is less than p-value=0.05. It shows that significant district wise difference exist among the opinion of respondents about teachers' accountability the component of government's monitoring system. The computed F-value is 8.358 which is greater than the table value (4.15) at df (5, 602) and the computed sig value=.083 which is greater than p-value=0.05. It shows that significant district wise difference exist among the opinion of respondents about the teachers' recruitment the component of

government's monitoring system. The computed F-value is 1.961 which is less than the table value (4.15) at df (5, 602) and the computed sig value=.000 which is less than p-value=0.05. It shows that no significant district wise difference exist among the opinion of respondents about provision of missing facilities under government's monitoring system Therefore, it is concluded that district wise respondents had the different opinion about teachers' accountability and recruitment under monitoring and evaluation system but respondents of all districts had the same opinion about the provision of missing facilities to the school under Punjab government monitoring system.

To determine further as respondents of which district had different opinion about teachers' accountability and recruitment under monitoring system, Post Hoc, Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) test was applied in.

Table 1a. *Analysis of the Variance for the analysis of to determine district wise similarity or differences among the opinion of respondents (Gujrat=131, Gujranwala=125, Narowal=58, H. Abad=42, Sialkot=135, and M.B. Din=112)*

M&E system		SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.
Teachers' accountability	Between Groups	877.947	5	175.589	15.079	.000
	Within Groups	6951.665	597	11.644		
	Total	7829.612	602			
Teachers' recruiting	Between Groups	588.488	5	117.698	8.358	.000
	Within Groups	8406.706	597	14.082		
	Total	8995.194	602			
Provision of missing facilities	Between Groups	108.285	5	21.657	1.961	.083
	Within Groups	6594.401	597	11.046		
	Total	6702.687	602			

Post-Hoc analysis to find out district wise group of respondents due to difference occur among the opinion regarding role of monitoring and evaluation system

The following table expose that respondents of the Gujranwala had different opinion about teachers' accountability while respondents of the Gujranwala and Hafiz Abad had different opinion about teachers' recruitment under monitoring system than the respondents of others districts.

Table 1b. *Post-Hoc analysis to find out district wise group of respondents due to difference occur among the opinion regarding role of monitoring and evaluation system*

M&E System	(I) Districts	(J) Districts	M D (I-J)	Std. E	Sig.
Teachers' Accountability	Gujranwala	Gujrat	2.354(*)	.420	.000
		Narowal	4.143(*)	.537	.000
		Sialkot	1.419(*)	.417	.001
		M.B. Din	2.797(*)	.447	.005
Teachers' Recruitment	Gujranwala and Hafiz Abad	Gujrat	.971(*)	.462	.036
		Narowal	2.919(*)	.590	.000
		Sialkot	1.065(*)	.458	.020

Determining similarity or differences among the opinion of respondents (DMOs, M&Es, Head Teachers, and SSTs) regarding role of Monitoring System.

The following table disclose that the computed F-values range from .539-1.567 which are less than the table value (5.48) at df (3, 602) and the computed sig values range from .196- .656 which are greater than p-value=0.05. It shows that no significant designation wise difference exist among the opinion of respondents about teachers' accountability, recruitment and the provision of missing facilities to school level under government's monitoring system. Therefore, it is concluded that DMOs, M&E As, Head teachers, and SST had the same opinion about teachers' accountability, recruitment and the provision of missing facilities to the school level under government's monitoring system.

Table 2. *Analysis of the Variance for the analysis of to determine similarity or differences among the opinion of respondents (DMOs=6, M&EAs=4, Head Teachers=81, and SSTs=432) regarding role of Monitoring System*

M&E system		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Teachers' Accountability	Between Groups	39.748	3	13.249	1.019	.384
	Within Groups	7789.864	599	13.005		
	Total	7829.612	602			
Teachers' recruiting	Between Groups	24.224	3	8.075	.539	.656
	Within Groups	8970.970	599	14.977		
	Total	8995.194	602			
Provision of missing facilities	Between Groups	52.207	3	17.402	1.567	.196
	Within Groups	6650.480	599	11.103		
	Total	6702.687	602			

Frequency and percentage of the responses (DMO, M&Es, HTs, and SSTs) regarding role of Monitoring and Evaluation system for teachers' accountability

It is indicted in the following table that the computed t-value of all statement No.1-5 of DMOs is (6.220-8.696), M&E As is (26.227-41.175), HTs is (24.195-49.246) and SSTs is (55.136-90.140) which is greater than table value (2.24-2.71) at 5,83, and 406 df and computed sig value for all statements is 0.000 which is less than the p-value=0.05, which shows that mean value of the all statements of the DMOs, M&E As, HTs and SSTs is significantly higher than the cut point. It shows that all respondents were agreed with the statements regarding teachers' accountability under monitoring system. Majority of them were agreed with the statements and said that teachers are being accountable throughout the education sector e.g. their academic performance, attendance on monthly bases and even proper appreciation and depreciation system for teacher is also introduced under monitoring system. Moreover monitoring and evaluation system fostered transparent practices for teacher in school education department. It is concluded that according to the majority of the DMOs, M&E As, HTs, SSTs, monitoring and evaluation system of Punjab government playing an important role in the teachers' accountability regarding their academic performance, attendance, rewarding system by fostering transparent practices for them in school education department.

Table 3. *Frequency and percentage of the responses (DMO=6, M&Es=84, HTs=81 and SSTs=432) regarding role of Monitoring and Evaluation system for teachers' accountability*

S#	Statements	Respondents	$\overline{x}$	Std.D	t
01	Teachers being accountable throughout the education sector under monitoring system.	DMOs	4.17	.408	6.220
		M&Es	4.30	.967	40.746
		HTs	4.25	.968	40.246
		SSTs	4.23	.946	90.140
02	Teachers are being accountable for their academic performance under monitoring system.	DMOs	3.50	1.378	8.696
		M&Es	4.15	.925	41.175
		HTs	3.92	1.244	28.859
		SSTs	3.92	1.031	76.672
03	Monitoring system evaluate teachers' attendance on monthly bases	DMOs	3.67	1.033	7.906
		M&Es	3.45	1.206	26.227
		HTs	3.43	1.215	25.858
		SSTs	3.47	1.269	55.136
04	Proper appreciation and depreciation system for teacher is introduce under monitoring system.	DMOs	3.33	1.033	6.742
		M&Es	3.77	1.057	32.728
		HTs	3.75	1.040	33.052
		SSTs	3.65	1.069	68.936
05	Monitoring and Evaluation system fostered transparent practices for teacher in school education department.	DMOs	3.33	1.211	6.943
		M&Es	3.77	.998	34.650
		HTs	3.54	1.339	24.195
		SSTs	3.51	1.282	55.155

Sig=.000, df=5, 83, 105, and 406

Frequency and percentage of the responses (DMO, M&EAs, HTs, and SSTs) regarding role of Monitoring and Evaluation system for teachers' recruitment

It is indicted in the following table that the computed t-value of all statement No.1-5 of DMOs is (6.708-13.558), M&E As is (28.205-39.096), HTs is (26.581-37.749) and SSTs is (59.336-82.131) which is greater than table value (2.24-2.71) at 5,83, and 406 df and computed sig value for all statements is 0.000 which is less than the p-value=0.05, which shows that mean value of the all statements of the DMOs, M&EAs, HTs and SSTs is significantly higher than the cut point. It shows that all respondents were agreed with the statements regarding teachers' recruitment under monitoring and evaluation system. Majority of them were agreed with the statements and said that strict merit system for appointment of new educators introduced under monitoring and evaluation system of the Punjab government through passing NTS examination and to the new recruiting educators to improve the standard of education in public schools. Moreover, although quality of teachers' education is the core value for recruiting educators under monitoring and evaluation system of Government yet majority of them disagree with statement and said that new educators are not being recruited via observing demonstrating lesson. It is concluded that according to the majority of the DMOs, M&EAs, HTs, SSTs, monitoring and evaluation system of Punjab government playing an important role in the teachers' recruiting via passing NTS examination and observing their quality education but not observing demonstrating lesson to improve the standard of education in public schools.

Table 4. *Frequency and percentage of the responses (DMO=6, M&Es=84, HTs=81 and SSTs=432) regarding role of Monitoring and Evaluation system for teachers' recruitment*

S#	Statements	Responents	$\overline{x}$	Std.D	t
01	Strict merit system for appointment of new educators introduced under monitoring and evaluation system of the Punjab government	DMOs	3.83	.983	9.550
		M&Es	3.61	1.172	28.205
		HTs	3.67	1.264	26.581
		SSTs	3.66	1.232	59.887
02	Quality of teachers education is the core value for recruiting educators under monitoring system of Government	DMOs	4.17	.753	13.558
		M&Es	4.14	.971	39.096
		HTs	3.96	.963	37.749
		SSTs	4.09	1.005	82.131
03	Awareness about teachers quality instruction is the basic principle of recruiting educator of the monitoring system	DMOs	3.83	.983	9.550
		M&Es	3.88	.999	35.610
		HTs	3.82	1.282	27.329
		SSTs	3.74	1.162	64.913
04	Observation of demonstrating lesson for recruiting new teacher is the key indicator of monitoring system for teacher's selection	DMOs	2.90	1.095	6.708
		M&Es	2.94	1.068	33.810
		HTs	2.11	1.053	35.747
		SSTs	2.75	1.274	59.336
05	To improve the standard of education in public schools, NTS examination for recruiting educator was introduced under Government monitoring system	DMOs	3.67	.816	11.000
		M&Es	4.12	1.080	34.956
		HTs	3.90	1.178	30.372
		SSTs	3.94	1.164	68.205

Sig=.000, df=5, 83, 105, and 406

Frequency and percentage of the responses (DMO, M&Es, HTs, and SSTs) regarding role of Monitoring and Evaluation system for the provision of missing facilities

It is indicted in the following table that the computed t-value of statement No.1-5 of DMOs is (5.397-7.000), M&E As is (15.175-37.557), HTs is (16.074-29.190) and SSTs is (32.65-66.923) which is greater than table value (2.24-2.71) at 5,83, and 406 df and computed sig value for all statements is 0.000 which is less than the p-value=0.05, which shows that mean value of the statements No.1-4 of DMOs, M&EAs, HTs and SSTs is significantly higher than the cut point. It shows that all respondents were agreed with the statements regarding provision of missing facilities under monitoring system. Majority of them were agreed with the statements and said that there is an appropriate mechanism to identify and to provide missing facilities to the schools monitoring and evaluation system of government. Moreover, actual condition/facts of the basic facilities of school is presented and website but all respondent disagree with statement No.5 and said that for the betterment of the infrastructure of school, monitoring system do not highlight the actual need at school level. It is concluded that according to the majority of the DMOs, M&EAs, HTs, SSTs, although actual condition/facts of the basic required facilities of each school are presented and updated on website/webpage continuously yet monitoring system do not highlight the actual need of the school for the betterment of the infrastructure of schools

Table 5. *Frequency and percentage of the responses (DMO=6, M&Es=84, HTs=81 and SSTs=432) regarding role of Monitoring and Evaluation system for the provision of missing facilities*

S#	Statements	Respondents	$\overline{x}$	Std.D	t
01	Monitoring system has appropriate mechanism to identify missing facilities in schools	DMOs	3.50	1.225	7.000
		M&Es	3.79	1.019	34.058
		HTs	3.85	1.207	29.190
		SSTs	3.80	1.120	66.923
02	Monitoring and evaluation system of government has suitable mechanism for the provision of missing facilities at school level	DMOs	4.00	1.549	6.325
		M&Es	4.08	.996	37.557
		HTs	3.02	1.066	28.389
		SSTs	3.97	1.197	65.792
03	Actual condition/facts of the basic facilities in school is presented by monitoring system	DMOs	3.83	.983	9.550
		M&Es	3.64	1.094	30.527
		HTs	4.04	1.303	25.272
		SSTs	3.77	1.156	51.564
04	Monitoring system updated the requirement of each school on website/webpage continuously	DMOs	2.67	1.211	5.394
		M&Es	3.63	1.297	25.664
		HTs	3.61	1.308	20.500
		SSTs	3.44	1.347	32.665
05	For the betterment of the infrastructure of school, monitoring system highlighted the actual need at school level	DMOs	2.67	1.862	5.836
		M&Es	2.43	1.467	15.175
		HTs	2.46	1.409	16.024
		SSTs	2.35	1.451	54.661

Sig=.000, df=5, 83, 105, and 406

Conclusion and Discussion

The aim of the present study was to evaluate the Monitoring System of Punjab Government in Education Department for the Improvement of School System. Conclusion was drawn from the findings. It found that district wise respondents had the different opinion about teachers' accountability and recruitment under monitoring system but respondents of all district had the same opinion about the provision of missing facilities to the school under Punjab government monitoring system and the respondents of Gujranwala had different opinion about teachers' accountability while respondents of the Gujranwala and Hafiz Abad had different opinion about teachers' recruitment under monitoring system than the respondents of others districts but designation wise (DMOs, M&EAs, Head teachers and SSTs) no difference was found in the opinion of all respondents about the role of monitoring system of education. According to the opinion of the majority of the DMOs, M&E As, Head teachers and SSTs there is great extent transparency and accountability for teachers in education department after the implementation of monitoring and evaluation system of the Punjab government for the improvement of education system. According to them monitoring and evaluation system of Punjab government is playing an important role in the teachers' accountability regarding their academic performance, attendance, rewarding system by fostering transparent practices for them in school education

department. For the recruitment of teachers, there was a time when they were appointed on the bases of just interview and social culture has had a influence on it. Now after the implementation of monitoring and evaluation system of Punjab government, according to the majority of the DMOs, M&EAs, Head teachers and SSTs there is teachers are being recruited monitoring and evaluation system is playing an important role in the teachers' recruiting via passing NTS examination and by observing demonstrating lesson and observing their quality education to improve the standard of education in public schools. Under this system teachers are being recruited via passing NTS examination and by observing demonstrating lesson and observing their quality education and totally on merit bases. There is zero tolerance of political or any other influence on merit. Moreover missing facilities in schools remained everlasting issues in school since beginning days. Lots of effort had made in different era to come up this challenge to reduce this issue but in this era, the government of the Punjab had made an effort to address this challenge. According to majority of the respondents (DMOs, M&EAs, HTs, SSTs) mentoring and evaluation system of Punjab government play an important role to provide missing facilities in schools. This system make effort to reduce this challenge by presenting and updating the actual facts of the basic required facilities of each school on websites or page continuously but according to the majority of the respondents although actual condition/facts of the basic required facilities of each school are being presented and updated on website/webpage continuously yet monitoring system do not highlight the actual need of the school for the betterment of the infrastructure of schools. Teachers are the core person education and are quality provider, in the present research it was fond that teachers are not being recruited by observing their demonstration lesson, education administration of education should observe demonstrating lesson of the new appointed educators along with other necessary measure. Moreover monitoring and evaluation system should highlighted the actual need of the school so that proper measure should be taken for the betterment of the infrastructure of schools.

References

Fox, J. (2015). Social accountability: What does the evidence really say? World Development, 72, 346-361.

Fuchs, T., Woessmann, L., (2007). What accounts for international differences in student performance?A re-examination using PISA data. In: Dustmann, C., Fitzenberger, B., Machin, S. (Eds.), The Economics and Training of Education. Physica-Verlag HD, pp. 209–240.

Gaventa, J. & McGee, R. (2013).The impact of transparency and accountability initiatives. Development Policy Review, 31(S1), 3-28.

Gaventa, J., & McGee, R. (2013). The impact of transparency and accountability initiatives, Development Policy Review, 31(S1), 3-28. Gigler, B., &Bailur, S, (Eds) (2014).

Gigler, B., &Bailur, S. (Eds.). (2014). closing the feedback loop: Can technology bridge the accountability gap? Washington, DC: World Bank.

Gill, B., Lerner, J., &Meosky, P. (2016). Reimagining accountability in K-12 education: A behavioral science perspective. (HKS Faculty Research Working Paper Series No. 16-018). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University

Global economy development, (2017).information for accountability: transparency and citizen engagement for improved service delivery in education systems.

Hanushek, E.A., Raymond, M., (2005).Does school accountability lead to improved school performance? J. Policy Anal. Manag. 24 (2), 297–329.

Hines, E. W. (1996). Building condition and student achievement and behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Hoyos, R., Garcia-Moreno, V. A., &Patrinos, H.A. (2015). The impact of an accountability intervention with diagnostic feedback: Evidence from Mexico. (Policy Research Working Paper No. 7393). Washington, DC: World Bank.

IEAG. (2014). Independent Expert Advisory Group on a Data Revolution for Sustainable Development. A world that counts: Mobilizin the data revolution for sustainable development.

Joshi, A. (2013). Do they work? Assessing the impact of transparency and accountability initiatives in service delivery. Development Policy Review, 31(S1), 29-48.

Joshi, A. (2014). Reading the local context: A causal chain approach to social accountability. IDS Bulletin, 45, 23-35.

Ladd, H., 2001. School-based educational accountability systems: The promise and the pitfalls. Natl. Tax J. 54 (2), 385–400.

Leeper, et. al. (1968). Good schools for young children: A guide for working with three, four and five year old children. London: The Macmillan Company.

Lindsay Read Tamar ManuelanAtinc, (2017).information foe accountability:transparency and citizen engagement for improved service delivery in education system

Loeb, S., Cuhna, J., (2007). Have assessment-based accountability reforms influenced the career decisions of teachers and principals?. The Urban Institute, the Urban Institute Working Paper.

Madden, H. D., &Flanigan, J. L., Richardson, M. D. (1991). Teacher absences: Are there implications for educational restructuring? A paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association in Lexington, KY, November 13-15, 1991.

McGuffey, C.(1982).Improving educational standards and productivity. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 237-288. Report, 10, (1).

McGuffey, C.(1982).Improving educational standards and productivity. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 237-288.

Mizala, A., Romaguera, P., Urquiola, M., (2007). Socioeconomic status or noise? Tradeoffs in the generation of school quality information. J. Dev. Econ. 84 (1), 61–75.

N Dee, T., Jacob, B., (2009). The impact of No Child Left Behind on student achievement. National Bureau of Economic Research, NBER Working Paper No. 15531.o. 7393). Washington, DC: World Bank.

National Academy of Education. (2005). *Implications for NAEP of research on learning and cognition.* Stanford, CA: Author.

National Children's Reading Foundation. (2009) Engaging Stakeholders Including Parents and the Community to Sustain Improved Reading Outcomes.