



Digest - Day 3: Wednesday, 23 February 2022

Presentation 1: What are the issues relating to pedagogical support practices and devices?



The presentation aims to paint a picture of proximity support at each level of the education system: the central, deconcentrated and school levels, without forgetting the roles of initial training or TFPs.

Link to YouTube video:

<https://youtu.be/AAg8q5HtRME>

[Link to the narrative PDF](#)

At the level of teachers, the concerns are

- The rural/urban inequity they experience in terms of individualised support,
- The failure to identify their needs,
- Their perception of coaching as a compliance check that may lead to a sanction rather than a result-oriented pedagogical coaching.

As far as the directors are concerned, various factors appear to be obstacles to their role as supervisors: on the one hand, this position is not always clear and/or defined, and on the other hand, the workload that falls to them in administrative, pedagogical and social terms, as well as the lack of specific training, also appear to be significant obstacles.

For local supervisors, the administrative burden, the lack of resources and the lack of training and methodological guidelines to ensure this pedagogical support are all concerns that were raised.

Finally, the central level has to juggle with various issues, in particular: the training strategies of the TFPs, which are more or less in line with the sectoral policy, or the difficulties of monitoring/accompanying their own training, to name but a few.

The presentation also addresses the topic of **grouped coaching** as a lever for strengthening teachers' skills, as well as the difficulties related to **the lack of linkage between initial and in-service training**.

---

## Presentation: 2 The experience of Senegal in the experimentation of Professional Practice Analysis Training Groups (PPATG)

---



Link to YouTube video: <https://youtu.be/u8j7ucyGoRk>  
[Link to the narrative PDF](#)

The presentation highlights the response envisaged by Senegal to strengthen the effectiveness of pedagogical support mechanisms. This response aims to set up **Professional Practice Analysis Training Groups (PPATG)** targeting :

- School headmasters, because the Senegalese education system delegates a great deal of local support for teachers to school headmasters;
- Inspectors, a body in which there are significant differences of opinion on issues related to compliance monitoring of teachers.

The idea is to offer a **space for sharing and reflection "among peers"**, allowing one to take the necessary step back and analyse one's teaching practices. These groups should make it possible to highlight the difficulties encountered by the actors in their work routines and then to collectively construct new professional gestures, to put them into practice and to collectively evaluate their effectiveness in order to be better prepared to face similar situations in the future.

This initiative involves both a group of practitioners, who are involved in analysing and experimenting with professional practices, and a group of facilitators, who accompany and analyse the work with a view to identifying the conditions for successful changes in posture.

The presentation also seeks to explain how this approach differs from the other mechanisms already in place within the Senegalese system:

- In-service training schemes: because the development of professional skills here takes place in a way that enables educational supervisors to analyse and evaluate their own practices through sharing and exchange with their peers engaged in the same collective reflection process.
- Coaching: because it is not a question of coaching individual or collective educational supervisors whose needs are known in advance.

---

The answers to the questions asked today are attached to this email.

# APPENDIX: Questions/answers following the presentations on day 3

This document summarises the main questions raised by the discussions at the end of the presentations, as well as the answers provided.

## Questions related to the first presentation

Three themes related to the strengthening of pedagogical support systems emerged from the discussions. These are :

- The positioning of the tasks and roles of educational support,
- Limitations and opportunities of identifying teachers' support needs,
- The collaboration of the different levels of the Ministry in the steering of the pedagogical support policy.

### Theme 1: Positioning the tasks and roles of educational support

This theme encompasses the mission of the support staff (including the school headmaster) and the place and effectiveness of the so-called grouped support bodies (pedagogical coordination unit, pedagogical days, etc.).

The participants questioned the effectiveness of **the pedagogical support bodies**.

Participants raised a number of concerns about the pedagogical support bodies, including the fact that :

- That they tend to focus on preparing for professional exams, rather than on dealing with difficulties encountered in their classroom practice;
- That the training topics proposed are not sufficiently adapted to the reality they experience in their classrooms.

*"In relation to CAPED, the problem comes from the fact that the supervisors themselves do not master the way to accompany these bodies, they do not master this innovation. How do you want CAPED to be effective?"*

In the face of these questions, many other contributions made it possible to **return to the role of the director** and the complexity of his or her positioning to facilitate the expected changes.

*"In Côte d'Ivoire, primary school headmasters who are pedagogical supervisors are appointed by primary education inspectors and take up their duties as school headmasters without any prior training. How can they easily ensure the supervision of teachers in the classroom?"*

*"At the same time, the director, through all his functions, has a pedagogical, social and administrative role. How can all this be done by one person? It's all too heavy!"*

Finally, other participants **questioned the very relevance of the missions** of the educational support staff.

*"The diagnosis indicates a low contribution of accompaniment, does this not confirm the position of the teachers who expressed themselves in favour of abolishing the accompaniment missions?"*

*"The question of the value of the targets' supervision also arises: do the targets really feel the need to be supervised? if not, why not? is it linked to the content of the supervision? does the supervision not meet their needs?"*

Failing the abolition expressed by some, an avenue to explore could be that of **repositioning the missions of pedagogical support**. This repositioning implies a change in the posture of supervisors, which must be supported. This issue will be the subject of specific attention in the context of the EFAIDS experiment in Senegal, supported by the UNESCO IIEP and presented during the morning session.

*"Achieving the objective assigned to pedagogical support and facilitating the emergence of a reflective teacher requires a change of posture on the part of the support staff."*

*"For the supervisor, there is a need to focus more on observation through a few focal points in order to better direct the teachers' gaze and encourage the reflective practitioner."*

## **Theme 2: Limitations and opportunities of identifying teachers' needs**

The issue of collecting teachers' training needs was also raised by the participants: they pointed out that the collection mechanisms used do not allow for the **real needs of teachers** to be brought to the fore.

*"Who defines the training needs of teachers? Are they consulted to ensure that these are their real training needs? The information given by teachers on their difficulties must be taken into account in order to define support strategies. One cannot give the same medicine to several patients without a prior diagnosis."*

The diagnoses show that **the challenge is linked to the conditions in which these needs are collected**. There are certainly tools, but they mainly allow the collection of general needs or intentions, which are not always linked to classroom realities.

It was noted that in the discussions, the initial training bodies were hardly mentioned as having a role to play in the collection and analysis of needs. However, involving them in the process could make it possible to move away from the vertical approach (from the Ministry to the schools or from the schools to the Ministry) which, on its own, does not seem sufficient. They can in fact constitute a laboratory for innovation.

## **Theme 3: Collaboration between the different levels of the Ministry in the management of the pedagogical support policy**

The participants highlighted the **difficulty of linking** the guidelines issued by the central level with the needs expressed by the field in terms of pedagogical support.

*"How can both approaches (top down and bottom up) be used to achieve quality in the context of management?"*

*"On this articulation of the two chains of communication, I can say that we cannot wait for the exploitation of the reports by the central level to act on the ground. There is no point in waiting for the"*

*reports to come back, we must try to make the most of the advice from the reports that are already available and move forward.*

One area for improvement identified lies in **supporting the change in attitudes at each level**: while the Ministry is responsible for the broad guidelines, it must learn to leave sufficient room for manoeuvre to those in the field so that they can experiment with new support methods. Conversely, at the field level, the challenge would be to encourage pedagogical supervisors to be the actors of their own change.

## Questions related to the first presentation

### 1. On the configuration of EIOPCs

Participants questioned the configuration of EIPAs.

It is important to remember that this configuration is not locked in: while Senegal has chosen to target school headmasters and inspectors, it is entirely possible to envisage working with groups that include other categories.

However, care should be taken to favour groups made up of professionals of the same hierarchical level, as the success of the exercise depends on trust between the participants.

### 2. On the positioning of EIPAs in relation to the central level

The central level was involved from the outset in designing the strategic orientations of EIPA. However, its experimentation is carried out in a quasi-autonomous manner in relation to the central level, the central idea being to create conditions favourable to a change in the posture of the supervisors from that of a compliance controller to that of a reflective practitioner.

### 3. On scaling up

The question of scaling up after the experiment was raised.

*"I would like to draw the attention of my brothers in Senegal to the risks involved in the idea of "formalising the informal". Niger has had this experience. But the CAPEDs, whose origins go back to the spontaneous grouping of teachers to prepare for professional diplomas, were abused and distorted when the state wanted to formalise them.*

The above remark calls for a point of vigilance concerning the generalisation of experiments in general.

At this stage, none of the experiments supported by the Programme are at the stage of generalisation. However, the challenge of generalisation has already been anticipated, which is why particular attention is paid to the conditions for success of the experiments before they are proposed to the Ministry's action plan. The aim is to prevent the results produced on a small scale from being considered as recipes that can be replicated without taking the context into account.