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M&E Main objectives

• Strengthen the Educational System’s Results-Based Management.

• Strengthen the decision makers through evidence-based findings during the planning cycle.

• Provide an internal accountability reference in terms of performance and achieving planned results.

How???????????
Performance Indicators in M&E System

Total number of indicators 88

Quantitative
48

Qualitative
35

Process
5
The M&E System deals with the Indicators from three perspectives:

- Measuring the indicators reality, answering the *(what?)* by using Qualitative and Quantitative tools
- Analyzing the cause *(why?)*
- Suggesting recommendations *(how?)*
Figure 1: Adjusted Net Enrollment Rate (NERA) for the Basic cycle in Palestine.
Figure 2: Degree of 4th Grade Students' Acquire Moral Values and Attitudes
Figure 3: Knowledge Patterns Degree of representation in the curricula of the Arabic Language, Mathematics and Science disciplines for the 4th grade (basic).
Out of 31%, we found that 91% of the student’s time in classroom is spent in responding to the teacher’s requests, 7% in initiation of ideas and questions, 2% indirect speech
Figure 5: Distribution of questions that teachers raise in the classroom

- Memorization: 65%
- Application and Use of Knowledge: 17%
- Higher Order Thinking Skills: 13%
- Metacognitive questions: 3%
- Affective Questions: 2%
- Metacognitive questions: 3%
Utilization of Educational Technology:
Findings indicate that 70% of classes do not utilize any type of teaching tools.

Figure 6: Percentage of classes that utilize Digital, Non-digital, and Specialty Teaching Tools in the Basic Education Phase

- Specialty Teaching Tools: 7.0%
- Non Digital Tools: 18.0%
- Digital Tools: 6.0%
Figure 7: Percentage of students who actively use computers during computer lab

- Baseline 2014: 36.5%
- Target 2019: 70%
**Figure 8: Participation of students, personnel, and schools in initiatives and creative activities**

- **Schools**: 29.8%
- **Personnel**: 10.6%
- **Students**: 6.6%
Figure 9: Percentage of actual achievement compared to planned results for evaluation and reform of Basic Cycle curricula
Figure 10: percentage of Secondary cycle students exposed to various types of violence in school.
Evaluation of the EDSP III and Annual Plans (AWPB) 2014 according to specific evaluation criteria

There is a weakness in the design of the EDSPIII in accordance with the RB approach: it was found that 50.2% of program objectives of EDSPIII did not define the intended change they should produce.
Figure 10: Degree of Equity in projects’ distribution among schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>% of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-2)</td>
<td>27.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5-6)</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7-8)</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9-10)</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11-12)</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13-18)</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fragile Areas Indicators:
Covers all fragile areas (Area C, Jerusalem, Hebron, and all schools affected by Israeli violations) regardless of their location.
Figure 12: Student Dropout Rate in Schools Exposed to Violations in comparison to dropouts in northern districts during 2013/2014

- Dropout Rate in Areas Exposed to Violations: 2.2%
- Dropout Rate in Northern Districts: 0.9%
M&E team encourages all of you to use this report for your own policy dialogue, planning and decision making.