USAID | SENEGAL
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

MID-TERM ASSESSMENT OF THE USAID/SENEGAL MIDDLE BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

July 2006

Prepared by
Karen Tietjen, Senior Education Assessment Specialist and Team Leader, USA
Diane Prouty-Harris, Ph.D., Senior Education Evaluation Specialist, USA
Maguette Kane Diop, Community Participation/Girls' Education Specialist, Senegal
Papa Baidaly Sow, Ph.D., Education Policy Specialist, Senegal

For
DevTech Systems, Inc.
1700 N. Moore St., Suite 1720
Arlington, VA 22209 USA
Tel: 703/312-6038
Fax: 703/312-6039
http://www.devtechsys.com
devtech@devtechsys.com

Contract No. EDH-I-00-03-00002-00
Cognizant Technical Officer: Pape Sow

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by DevTech Systems, Inc.

MID-TERM ASSESSMENT OF THE USAID/SENEGAL MIDDLE BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

Final Report under
Contract No. EDH-I-00-03-00002-00

Submitted to:
USAID/Senegal
Dakar, Senegal
CTO: Pape Sow

Submitted by:
DevTech Systems, Inc.
1700 N. Moore St., Suite 1720
Arlington, VA 22209 USA
Contact: Isabel Dillener
Email: idillener@devtechsys.com
Phone: 703-778-2641
Fax: 703-351-8184

Assessment Team

Karen Tietjen, Team Leader, USA
Diane Prouty-Harris, Ph.D., USA
Maguette Kane Diop, Senegal
Papa Baidaly Sow, Ph.D., Senegal

July 2006

DISCLAIMER
The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

DEVTECH

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements **iii**
Acronyms **iv**
USAID/Senegal SO and Results Framework **v**
Executive Summary **vi**

Section I

Chapter 1: Introduction **1**
A. Background and Description of Program
B. Purpose of the Evaluation and Summary Research Questions
C. Approach, Methodology and Limitation
D. Organization of the Report

Section II

Chapter 2: Increased Access to Middle School (KIR 1) **3**
A. More Middle Schools Constructed and Rehabilitated (SIRs 1.1 and 1.2)
B. School Operations and Accessibility
C. School Leadership and Management: The Principal
D. Increased Awareness of Communities to the Importance of Middle Schooling, especially for Girls (SIR 1.3)
E. "…especially for Girls" (SIR 1.3)

Chapter 3: Improved Learning and Teaching Environment (KIR 2) **22**
A. Access to Teaching and Learning Materials (SIR 2.1)
B. Improved Learning Environment (SIR 2.2)
C. Improve In-Service Training (SIR 2.3)
D. Improved Access to ICT (SIR 2.4)
E. Access to Life Skills Training (SIR 2.5)

Chapter 4: Increased Participation of Local Government and Communities in Education Management and Financing (KIR 3) **29**
A. Increased Local Financing for Middle School (SIR 3.1)
B. Effective Functioning of School Management Committees (SIR 3.2)
C. Effective Education Planning at the Regional Level

Chapter 5: Program Management **41**
A. USAID Program Management
B. PAEM Project Management

Chapter 6: Monitoring and Evaluation **44**

Section III

Chapter 7: Summary Analysis and Conclusions **48**
A. Access
B. Teaching and Learning Environment
C. Local Government and Community Participation in School Financing and Management
D. Overarching Issues
E. Conclusions

Chapter 8: Lessons Learned and Recommendations **57**
A. Lessons Learned
B. Recommendations

List of Annexes

Annex 1: **Scope of Work**
Annex 2: **References**
Annex 3: **Methodology and Work Plan**
Annex 4: **Contacts (Dakar)**
Annex 5: **Detailed Recommendations**
Annex 6: **Data Table completed by PAEM**
Annex 7: **Instruments**

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to express its appreciation for the assistance it received during the preparation of this report from the many individuals involved in the implementation of PAEM. The DEMSG Director Leopold Faye and his staff, especially Alexandre Diop, Yolande Faber, and Ibrahima Ndour, not only provided valuable information and insights into the program and education in Senegal, but helped collect data for this report.

At USAID, Pape Sow, Education Officer, guided the team's efforts and worked tirelessly to respond to its logistical needs, ably assisted by Administrative Assistant Mathilda. Lisa Franchett, Program Officer, clarified the purpose of the evaluation and was extremely helpful in framing questions and sharing insights about field data. Sounka Ndiaye, M&E Specialist, was a valued field team member. Drivers Abdoulaye Faye, Ben Lawson, and Mamadou Ndiagye transported the field teams safely.

PAEM staff greatly facilitated the evaluation, coordinating field visits and serving as field team members. Larraine Denakpo, PAEM Chief of Party, and PAEM technical experts Djbril Diouf, Oumar Diongue and Idrissa Dieng responded readily to information requests and shared their thoughtful views on project's big picture, as well as the nuts-and-bolts of implementation. Field visits in each region were guided by PAEM's Regional Coordinators Latyr Diouf (Fatick), Aminata Djigo (Tambacounda), and Saddick Sall (Kolda), who worked hard ensure that appointments were made, schedules met and questions answered.

We would like to acknowledge the contribution of the Ministry and USAID personnel, and PAEM staff members who assisted the evaluation team in the collection of data in the field. The information gathered in the field forms the basis for much of what is shared in this report and we especially want to thank them for their hard work and contributions. Moreover, we want to thank all the participants at the two workshops for their enthusiasm, diligent work, and helpful input.

Finally, our appreciation must be extended to all the regional Ministry staff, local government representatives, CGE members, parents, and other community leaders who so willingly gave of their time to answer our questions. Special thanks must also be given to the school directors, staff, teachers and students at the 12 schools who allowed the team to disrupt their day and graciously stayed long after the closing of school to answer all our questions.

ACRONYMNS

AED	Academy for Education Development
APE	Association of Parents and Students (ASSOCIATION DES PARENTS D'ELEVES)
CBO	Community Based Organization
CE	Education Commission (COMMISSION D'EDUCATION)
CEM	(COLLEGE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT MOYEN)
CGC	Community Management Committees (COMITE DE GESTION COMMUNAUTAIRE)
CGE	School Management Committee (CONSEIL DE GESTION DE L'ETABLISSEMENT)
CPI	Pedagogical Advisors (CONSEILLER PEDAGOGIQUE)
DESMG	Directorate of Middle and General Secondary Education (DIRECTION DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT MOYEN SECONDAIRE GENERAL)
DPRE	Directorate of Planning and Education Reforms (DIRECTION DE LA PLANIFICATION ET DE LA REFORME DE L'EDUCATION)
DRH	Director of Human Resources (DIRECTION DES RESSOURCES HUMAINES)
FASTEF	FACULTE DES SCIENCE ET TECHNOLOGIE D'EDUCATION ET DE LA FORMATION
FOSCO	Student Association (FOYERS SOCIOCULTUREL)
IA	Regional Inspectorate (INSPECTION D'ACADEMIE)
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IDEN	Deprartmental Inspectorate (INSPECTION DE L'EDUCATION NATIONALE)
IGEN	Curriculum Department (INSPECTEUR GENERALE D'EDUCATION NATIONALE)
IRs	Intermediate Results
IS	Subject Inspectors (INSPECTEUR DE SPECIALITE)
IVS	School Life Inspector (INSPECTEUR DE VIE SCOLAIRE)
KIR	Key Intermediate Results
MOE	Ministry of Education
ONG/NGO	Non-government organization
PAEM/	PROJET D'APPUI A L'ENSEIGNEMENT MOYEN SECONDAIRE
CLASSE	Children's Learning Access Sustained in Senegal
PDDE	PLAN DEPATEMENTAL DE DEVELOPPEMENT DE L'EDUCATION
PE	School improvement plan (PROJET D'ETABLISSEMENT)
PRDE	PLAN REGIONAL DE DEVELOPPEMENT DE L'EDUCATION NATIONALE
PRF	Regional Training Unit (POLE REGIONAL DE FORMATION)
SCOFI	Association of Women Teachers for the Schooling of Girls (ASSOCIATION DE FEMMES ENSEIGNANTES POUR A SCOLARISATION DES FILLES)
SIR	Sub-Intermediate Results
SO	Strategic Objective
SOAG	Strategic Objective Agreement
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

USAID SENEGAL EDUCATION SO: RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Education Objective

INCREASED ACCESS TO AND IMPROVED QUALITY OF MIDDLE SCHOOL BASIC EDUCATION, ESPECIALLY FOR GIRLS

Key Intermediate Results

1- Increased access to middle schools

2 - Improved teaching and learning environment in middle schools

3 - Increased participation of local governments and communities in education management and financing

Intermediate Results

1.1- More middle schools constructed

1.2- Improved physical infrastructures in targeted existing middle schools

1.3- Increased awareness of communities to the importance of middle schooling especially for girls

2.1- Increased access to educational materials in targeted middle schools.

2.2- Improved classroom environment and teaching methods

2.3- Increased and organized in-service training for teachers

2.4- Increased access to new information and communication technologies

2.5- Increased access to life skills training

3.1- Increased local financing for middle schools

3.2- Effective functioning of School Management committees

3.3- Effective education planning at Regional level

11/9/2006

Executive Summary

USAID's education strategy targets middle school education, seeking to "*increase access to and improve quality of middle basic education, especially for girls.*" Now in its third year, its program (PAEM) comprises 3 key intermediate results: (1) *increasing access to middle schools, especially for girls, (2) improving the teaching and learning environment in middle schools, and (3) increasing the participation of local governments and communities in management and financing.* The purpose of this mid-term assessment is to review the middle school program progress to date and identify areas for improvement that will facilitate the attainment of planned results, as well as guide the MOE and USAID in developing a program for supplemental basic education funds

Key Successes

Overall the program has made significant strides in achieving program objectives. In terms of expanding access, PAEM appears to have increased new enrollments in middle school by 6,040 students, accounting for about 10 percent of the aggregated middle school enrollment. The PAEM program is advantageously placed to have a major impact on the development of middle schooling, and educational development in general in Senegal. The creation of "rural middle schools" has filled a niche, serving disadvantaged communities that normally stand last in the queue for schooling. PAEM has developed a highly participatory, cost-effective and viable process and model for school construction. AED succeeded in completing the construction of 30 middle schools six months ahead of schedule.

The PAEM schools are staffed with young 'volunteer' teachers who receive much lower salaries than tenured teachers. In contrast to teachers in many other African countries, the volunteer teachers have relatively good subject mastery. While generally untrained, most of the volunteer teachers are highly motivated and enjoy their teaching. As a result of their generally high level of commitment, teacher absenteeism appears to be relatively low. Volunteer teachers present a tremendous potential asset to the educational system because of their dedication and willingness to teach in remote areas.

In order to improve the quality of education in middle school, PAEM worked with the MOE and a group of local consultants to develop a set of in-service training modules that could be used with both volunteer teachers as well as tenured teachers. Most recipients thought the content of these modules was excellent. Furthermore, some of the pedagogical techniques introduced in the training can be seen in the classroom. Teachers and school principal both point to the critical role PAEM has played in leveraging positive relationships between teachers and their students. PAEM has made a vital contribution in the overall support to teachers by promoting transversal pedagogy.

PAEM developed two training modules for principals and delivered it to more than 440 middle school principals in the country. For most principals, this was the first management training they had ever received and they found the content extremely useful. As a result of their participation in these workshops, the principals' association has been revitalized and has been instrumental in developing performance standards for principals.

In order to facilitate maximum collaboration between AED and MOE staff, PAEM's offices are located in the Ministry of Education. The Chief of Party and her staff have established a very close and effective working relationship with the Ministry of Education. The Ministry is pleased with the partnership to date and the results that it has produced. It often refers to PAEM as a model program.

Key Recommendations

The mid-term assessment includes a total of 23 detailed recommendations (see pg. 57). The executive summary presents abbreviated versions of twelve recommendations deemed most critical.

1. USAID should assist the Ministry to conduct a study and analysis of the number of disciplines that can be supported in the middle school curriculum, assessing the demand for teachers, specialized skill sets and other inputs in light of the resources available for Middle School.
2. The DEMCG should create a unit that is dedicated uniquely to middle school education, and is in charge of coordinating the policies and programs related to its development and delivery.
3. Selection criteria for school construction and rehabilitation should NOT be based on the availability or proximity of an electrical grid, access to water, or telephone coverage. These criteria would eliminate the communities that most need the "colleges de proximité."
4. PAEM's community sensitization component (delivered by TOSTAN) should be redesigned to focus directly on education and the schools, rather than diffused across the sectors.
5. IVS and IDEN need training so they can actively facilitate community support and participation. A checklist of measurable indicators to evaluate community participation and determine if they are meeting basic requirements and standards should be developed.
6. PAEM should develop a comprehensive approach to girls' education addressing policy and institutional issues as well as creating accessible and girl-friendly schools. This should include an orientation to senior-level Ministry officials on strategic planning to address gender issues and support girls' education, and to ensure that Ministry officials fully understand both the constraints and options for increasing girls' educational participation.
7. The Ministry with PAEM support should develop a "vacataire" policy and development program that address career path issues, incentive packages, deployment strategies, training approaches, etc.
8. Principals should be included in all the teacher training modules on pedagogy. In order to underscore and reinforce transversal pedagogy, a whole-school approach to training should be undertaken for select modules. All school personnel should be trained at the same time so that professional exchange, mentoring, peer coaching and a "circle of quality" approach is strengthened..
9. PAEM should collaborate with FASTEF to develop a complementary fast-track training program for "vacataires". The training should include a collection of step-by-step how-to guides on setting up a class at the beginning of the academic school year.
10. The IVS, with PAEM support, should develop a checklist of measurable indicators (i.e. norms and standards) for determining the effectiveness of CGEs, based on discussion and feedback with the DEMCG, regional IVS, CGEs, and others relevant groups.
11. As it enters the second phase of the project, PAEM should cultivate a "big picture" perspective that includes working with the Ministry and other partners on policy and institutionalization issues, in order to ensure model adoption and sustainability.
12. PAEM should develop a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan.

Conclusions

USAID is not only addressing an area of great need, but it is pioneering an approach to middle school education, a level that is assuming greater importance and priority in educational development throughout Africa. A great deal of progress has been made within a short time in developing and implementing the middle school model, especially given the modest level of resources and personnel available. PAEM is still at an early stage of implementation and must take care to address the issues that threaten all projects going to scale. To make the transition PAEM must focus on institutional and policy issues critical to sustainability. As the project expands the lack of definition could be highly problematic and risks doing three things that signal trouble: trying to do too much; being unclear about the direction in which they're going; and attempting to do things in too short a period of time.

Key Findings Organized by Intermediate Result

1. Increased Access to Middle School (KIR 1)

More Middle Schools Constructed and Rehabilitated. To date, and six months ahead of its estimated 3.5 year schedule, PAEM has completed the construction and renovation of the specified 30 schools in the target regions. PAEM schools have been optimally situated to serve those least likely to have access to middle schooling, based on a participatory process of site selection for school construction and rehabilitation. The design of the newly constructed and rehabilitated schools is attractive, provides a comfortable learning environment, and is one in which the local communities appear to take pride. To the best of their ability, communities have met their school construction obligations. Utility access has proved a stumbling block for PAEM schools and compromises several aspects of PAEM's approach to support quality teaching-learning and sound management in middle schools. Early signs of disrepair, deterioration and neglect are evident. PAEM's current school rehabilitation model is not adequate to meet school needs. It is unclear whether the PAEM 4-classroom model offers sufficient capacity to accommodate student enrollment.

School Operations and Accessibility. The PAEM schools are fully functional in terms of serving students and being integrated into the MOE system. They suffer equally with other government schools in the lack of adequate resources, materials, and support. The PAEM schools currently have the required teachers, although most of the teachers are newly recruited "vacataires" with no more than a year or two of university education and little, if any, teacher training. Relatively little is known about this cadre of teachers—such as their backgrounds, skills/competencies, their motivations and future commitment to teaching—that allows for accurate planning and support. Teachers are now paid on time, although they must travel to the regional center to collect pay checks, resulting in two-three days of absence per month per teachers. Schools had received only a small number of text books from the government, although orders had been prepared and submitted to IA. The MOE has provided 800,000 FCFA/term to all the schools, which includes provision for some maintenance and repair. The PAEM schools have been included in the various school inspection visits, but this does not mean that they are frequently visited by different types of inspectors (either the IVS, the IS or the CPIs). PAEM schools could be better organized and prepared to increase their accessibility to students**.**

School Leadership and Management. Principals in PAEM schools are serving as principals for the first time. Principals define their role mainly in terms of administration and management. They are less likely to include pedagogical leadership and community participation. However, principal interaction and initiatives with the community at large is limited and mainly mediated through the CGE and the Rural Council. Principal support of improved teaching-learning has primarily been focused on providing the appropriate conditions and materials to make the environment in which students and teachers operate more comfortable and supportive, rather than through direct intervention into the teaching-learning process. Principals generally support teachers by attempting to provide an environment conducive to teaching, largely defined by the provision of physical inputs. Principals are not comfortable with providing pedagogical leadership to teachers. Principals at the PAEM schools played an important role in fostering the teacher "esprit de corps." Principals do not routinely receive either orientation to their post or training as principals. They underscore the need for more practical, example-based training in school operations, especially financial management**.**

Increased Awareness of Communities to the Importance of Middle Schooling, especially for Girls. Although community members seem generally aware of the importance of middle schooling and of girls' education, there is no baseline on pre-project knowledge, attitudes or perceptions on which to assess to what extent this is attributable to the PAEM awareness-building activities. Communities were successfully mobilized to support school construction, but they are less active and diligent in providing on-going school support. Community efforts to support the school are less often focused on sustained activities aimed at improving the quality of schooling or school life of teachers and students, although

examples do exist. So far the schools themselves have not been very proactive in directly generating community support or interest. The "pre-packaged" community mobilization approach and model used to build awareness, including girls' schooling, and community participation does not appear to be suited to effective, on-going and sustainable long-term school support by the community. Tostan did not focus directly on education and school-community relations, but took a more oblique approach by centering its activities on village development The CGCs—put in place by Tostan—do not respond directly to education needs, adds an unnecessary layer of community coordination, and contribute to confusion about the role and purpose of the CGE. The Tostan model—as currently configured—is not suitable for replication by the Ministry of education as it expands its middle school program.

"…especially for Girls". Communities are aware of the need to send their girls to middle school, but there is no evidence that demonstrates that changes have occurred in attitudes about middle school education for girls. Most school principals and teachers have a very limited understanding of what constitutes a "girl-friendly" school or how to go about making it so. Despite the physical improvements, schools may not be especially "girl friendly." Other than the proximity of the school to their homes, girls did not identify any physical features of their schools as significant factors contributing to a "good school". Most schools and communities have not initiated special programs/interventions to assist girls. MOE policies do not support the on-going schooling of girls. Although the MOE human resources department states the female teachers should serve as role models and mentor girls, no policy framework or program has been put in place to increase their ranks.

2. Improved Learning and Teaching Environment

Access to teaching and learning materials. Neither teachers nor students in PAEM schools have books Limited access to textbooks and other learning materials drive their use. There are no libraries; nor are there reference or recreational reading books. Classrooms are sterile and physically un-stimulating learning environments. Teachers do not make their own instructional materials. There doesn't appear to be awareness that communities can support schools by providing teaching and learning materials or in-kind resources to make instructional aids.

Improved learning environment. The mostly young teaching force is highly energetic and they do a good job. Vacataires present a tremendous potential asset to the educational system. Although there is a semblance of equality in the classroom the evidence suggests schools do not provide equitable learning environments for all students. Teacher talk and rote learning dominates teaching. The rapid-fire rote questioning patterns most teachers used are a poor gauge of student higher order cognitive skills and processing and inadequate to effectively evaluate student performance. Teachers lack the training and experience to know whether their students are mastering content and if they aren't what must be done to compensate. Teachers need "learning by doing" if implementation of student-centered and student-directed learning is going to take hold. Most teachers have subject matter mastery. Pedagogical techniques introduced in the training can be seen in the classroom. Students engage in their learning but are not highly active or directed learners.

Improved in-service training. Once deployed, teachers are on their own. Thus in-service training and support is essential. PAEM based the design of its teacher training module on the development of professional norms, but did not conduct a needs assessment. Most recipients think the content of the modules and training materials are excellent, but there is little evidence they are able to implement all but the most rudimentary components of the module into their daily teaching Training follow-up is very limited and sometimes non-existent. The MOE units charged with teacher support generally visit schools at most once per term. There is no structured mechanism to multiply and share learning; nor are there any incentives to do so.

Improved access to Communication Information Technology (CIT). CIT demands are high; skills are low; and the means are limited. The number of computers supplied to the schools may not be sufficient to

meet the demand of both teachers and students. Access to CIT may not necessarily improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Access to life skills training. PAEM has not supported or been involved in the development of an integrated life skills program by the MOE.

3. Increased Participation of Local Government and Communities in Education Management and Financing

Increased local financing for middle school. The local government and community financing component of the USAID strategy (and PAEM project) is not sufficiently defined and developed, making it difficult to assess whether financing has increased or if steps have been taken to support increased local financing. The regional and rural councils were not able to substantiate that their budget allocations to education had increased. Both Regional and Rural Councils have directed education-designated funds and other resources to middle schools, but Rural Councils have been more closely involved in PAEM school support. Local government support is constrained by multiples factors: (1) lack of funds/resources, (2) legal barriers, (3) lack of planning capacity and technical understanding of how to address priority needs. Since the initial community contributions of labor and materials to school construction, the most significant and consistent community support has been channeled through school fee payment. A lack of transparency and understanding of the school budget, finance and expenditure by community members—including parents—may inhibit future and increased community support of the PAEM schools. A nascent source of community financing is partnerships with local business enterprises or NGOs.

Effective Functioning of School Management Committees. The CGEs have been in operation only a few months, although most have met several times. The CGE are not necessarily representative of the school community. Full participation of some members may be stymied by status differentials, lack of literacy and French language skills, and gender. The school principal and teachers appear to be placed to exert the greatest influence on and even dominate the CGE. The CGEs have not yet forged a unified "identity." The CGEs understand their role in ensuring good school operations, primarily by administering the school budget and responding to the physical needs of the school/students and teachers, but have a limited view of their role in school management. Most CGEs are basing their support activities on the development of the "projet d'etablissement," and until this document is in place respond primarily on an as-needed basis to requests and activities initiated by the school principal. CGEs believe that they have no authority over school staff. The CGEs have acted to support needy students and plan to respond to student needs that may prevent their access and participation in school, rather than their performance. The CGEs are not yet included in all school planning functions and financial decisions, and are largely unaware of how the state budget allocation to the school is being spent. The CGEs have not yet been active in fund raising. The "projet d'etablissment" as currently conceived and administered may limit the scope of the school improvement activities undertaken by the CGE and could discourage CGE enthusiasm. CGEs have participated in the established school meetings and have held consultative meetings on the development of the "projet d'etablissment," but they believe that their need to consult the community is limited as they represent the community. PAEM training has jump-started the operationalization of CGEs. CGEs emphasize their need for additional training in financial management and in planning.

Effective education planning at the regional level. There is no evidence in the three target regions that effective, participatory and bottom-up planning ("la planification ascendante") for education is taking place. The "projet d'etablissement" supported by PAEM does not appear to offer a complete school-based planning model. It is not apparent that either USAID or PAEM has developed a comprehensive plan to support effective planning within the target regions.

4. Program Management

USAID Program Management. USAID and PAEM have developed a collaborative working relationship that would benefit from greater structure. USAID does not seem aware of the gaps or divergences between its Strategy and results framework and the work that PAEM is doing. USAID risks undermining its program for middle schools by using PAEM as a convenient contract mechanism for off-project activities. By continuously adding activities to the education program, USAID could seriously erode the coherence, quality and conceptualization of its education program. USAID needs to revisit and re-emphasize its understanding with the Ministry that while USAID seeks to expand middle schooling through PAEM, it also aims at supporting the Ministry to develop a viable approach or model for middle school education that the MOE will use throughout Senegal.

PAEM Project Management. PAEM has demonstrated a high level of commitment to GOS ownership and participation. This collaborative approach could be strengthened by expanding the constituency. PAEM is space-challenged because of a decision to work in the MOE along side MOE counterparts. The program was designed to minimize overhead costs and maximize the use of local expertise and has succeeded in achieving these goals. However, the consequences of this is that the scope of work for the COP is over-charged and the PAEM teams is somewhat understaffed. PAEM needs to make more and better use of international technical assistance. Staffing according to the PAEM project components or the Results Framework does not necessarily make sense, and can limit the types of approaches generated and their effectiveness. PAEM has not made use of existing materials, many developed under USAID programs.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation

The current Performance Monitoring Plan developed by PAEM is not adequate to meet the myriad data, research and assessment needs of the project, the MOE, and USAID. There is a disconnect and imperfect alignment between the Mission Results Framework and PAEM's PMP that may lead to misunderstandings, complicate implementation and confound evaluation. PAEM does not have a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan, and lacks both the personnel and expertise to manage it. PAEM has not established a proper basis for pre-, mid-term, and post-project comparisons, which could undermine its credibility as a viable model for middle schooling. Data collection and reporting systems are fragile and problematic. PAEM has established an internal, quality control system that is poised to provide formative information and useful feedback on specific activities (such as training), but as structured does not provide the valid and reliable data needed for M&E. The performance indicators that PAEM has included in its PMP are neither sufficient nor adequately defined. PAEM prepares informative quarterly reports. However, although not a Cooperative Agreement requirement, preparation of an Annual Report would be useful to address overall impact.

6. Summary Analysis and Conclusions

Has enrollment increased in middle school been increased? Has girls' educational access increased? PAEM appears to have increased new enrollments in middle school by 6,040 students, accounting for about 10 percent of the aggregated middle school enrollment The PAEM program is advantageously placed to have a major impact on the development of middle schooling, and educational development in general in Senegal. The creation of "ecoles de proximite" has filled a niche, serving disadvantaged communities that normally stand last in the queue for schooling. PAEM has developed a cost-effective and viable process and model for construction, but this appears to work best for new school construction. PAEM may have been successful in leveraging community participation in initial school construction, but its community mobilization approach and program should be rethought. Concerns and aspirations about girls' education are expressed in project documents, but little of practical value has been done so far to address these needs. Notably absent from the USAID education strategy is a focus on sound school management and the leadership role of the principal (apart from the pedagogical support he can provide teachers). PAEM has recognized this lacunae and has filled an important niche with the development of a

school operations manual, principal standards and norms, and leadership training. PAEM has not yet developed a program to guide the development of the Inspectorate of School Life (IVS).

Has learning improved? Effectively determining what students have learned and mastered is a complex process and it is premature to expect any evidence of learning gains Anecdotal evidence from conversations with teachers indicates students are performing better and understand what they are being taught. Although there are proxy measures that can provide information about student performance and achievement PAEM has not established a basis for their use. The only reliable measure of student assessment is a criterion-referenced student achievement test, but the MOE doesn't use this kind of test.

Are teachers teaching better? Teachers and school principal both point to the critical role PAEM has played in leveraging positive relationships between teachers and their students. Although both parents and the students claim their teachers are doing a good job they have a limited understanding of what teachers should be doing. PAEM has made a vital contribution in the overall support to teachers by promoting transversal pedagogy. Although PAEM has been instrumental in the development of teacher norms and standards they have no "meat" and lack any kind of measurable definition or identifying characteristics.
PAEM has not yet put in place a system to support teachers or students. PAEM's plan to provide increased access to teaching and learning materials through ICT has failed to materialize Neither PAEM nor the MOE has a structured system in place to assess what is working at the classroom level.

Are local governments and communities more involved in school financing and school management?
PAEM has successfully put in place and activated CGEs. The approach to the "projet d'etablissment" is only partially developed and not thoroughly thought through, which could compromise its viability and dim community interest. PAEM has not developed a program to develop the planning/financing capacity of the local governments and educational authorities in the regions.

Overarching Issues. Because of the push for a quick start up and the consuming demands of construction, PAEM has designed several of its interventions and activities without proper baseline data and analysis. Although there is an overall project template driving major activities, there does not appear to be a master plan that details the entire activity over the life of project PAEM has not yet addressed two critical areas that will affect the middle school model's viability and sustainability—policy and institutional development.

Conclusions. USAID is not only addressing an area of great need, but it is pioneering an approach to middle school education, a level that is assuming greater importance and priority in educational development throughout Africa. A great deal of progress has been made within a short time in developing and implementing the middle school model, especially given the modest level of resources and personnel available. PAEM is still at an early stage of implementation and must take care to address the issues that threaten all projects going to scale. To make the transition, PAEM must focus on institutional and policy issues critical to sustainability. As the project expands, the lack of definition could be highly problematic and risks doing three things that signal trouble: trying to do too much; being unclear about the direction in which they're going; and attempting to do things in too short a period of time.

Section I

Chapter 1: Introduction

A. Background and Description of Program

In 2003, USAID/Senegal launched its six-year strategic plan for education aimed at assisting the Government of Senegal achieve its objective of ensuring universal basic education (grades 1through 10) for its school-aged children by 2017. Although the percentage of children enrolled in primary school had increased to 70 percent in 2000, only 21 percent of school-aged children were enrolled in middle school. Participation in middle school was constrained by a variety of factors, including: poor student performance and high drop-out in the last years of primary school, insufficient number of middle schools and classrooms to absorb qualified students, inefficient use of available teachers and resources to expand school places, irrelevant curriculum, and policies that alienated the school from the community, depressing the demand for middle schooling, especially for girls. Rural areas, in particular, were underserved by both public and private sectors.

USAID's education strategy (2003-2009)[1] specifically targets middle school education, seeking to "*increase access to and improve quality of middle basic education, especially for girls.*" Targeting the underserved regions of Fatick, Kolda and Tambacounda, its program comprises three areas of interventions or key intermediate results:

1. *Increasing the physical and management capacity of (and demand for) middle schools*: through the construction of new and the rehabilitation of existing middle schools, increasing community awareness of the importance of middle schooling, especially for girls, and mobilizing community involvement in education.
2. *Improving the teaching and learning environment in middle schools*: through increased access to learning materials, improved classroom management and teaching methods, increased in-service teacher training, and access to information and communication technologies and life skills training.
3. *Increasing the participation of local governments and communities in management and financing*: through the mobilization of local government and community resources, development of school management committees, and improving the planning capacity within the targeted regions.

In August 2003, USAID awarded a cooperative agreement to the Academy for Educational Development (with associates) to implement its middle school strategy through the "Projet d'Amelioration de l'Enseignment Moyen" (PAEM).[2] PAEM's primary partner is the Directorate of General Middle School and Secondary Education (DEMSG) in the Ministry of Education (MOE), and it works closely with several central education institutions implicated in middle school support. At the regional levels, its partners include the regional (IA) and departmental (IDE) education authorities and the regional and rural councils, as well as the principals, teachers, students and communities at the project schools.

The PAEM approach (or model) is intended to bring together the critical elements for providing accessible, good quality and sustainable middle schooling to children in remote and rural communities. To date, PAEM has built and/or renovated 30 middle schools in rural communities intended to provide an opportunity to students to stay in their home environment while benefiting from better learning conditions and instruction. Principal and teacher training aims to implant learner-centered teaching practices and a supportive environment at the school. Community mobilization and the development of school management committees (CGE) are expected to result in greater community ownership and support for the school, better management, and increased responsiveness and financing from local government and

[1] The Mission is currently updating its strategy, but the 2003-2009 strategy served as the basis for this evaluation.
[2] PAEM encompasses cooperative agreement for the Children's Learning Access Sustained in Senegal (CLASS) and Senegal's Improved Teacher Training (SITT).

educational authorities to school needs. Ultimately, it is expected that the fully-developed and tested PAEM model will be adopted by the MOE and expanded to regions throughout Senegal.

B. Purpose of the Evaluation and Summary Research Questions

PAEM is now completing its third year of operation. The purpose of this mid-term assessment is to review the middle school program progress to date and identify areas for improvement that will facilitate the attainment of planned results, as well as guide the MOE and USAID in developing a program for supplemental basic education funds. The evaluation addresses 53 research questions,[3] subsumed under six key questions:

1. Is the program achieving expected results (at the SO, KIR and SIR levels)?
2. Is the approach (or model) sufficient to achieve the expected results and how might it be modified?
3. Are the current implementation approached effective and how might they be improved?
4. Should the Mission expand the present program and, if so, with what modifications)?
5. Should the Mission expand into additional regions or work in urban areas?
6. What, if any, additional program components should be added?

C. Approach, Methodology and Limitation

The evaluation was carried out by a core 4-person team in May/June 2006. The approach was participatory. The team was assisted in data collection, interpretation and preliminary analysis by representatives of USAID, the MOE, PAEM, and other stakeholders. Two stakeholder workshops were held: the first (1 day) to discuss the objectives, purpose and approach of the evaluation prior to data collection, and the second (2 days) to present the findings, discuss their implications and solicit recommendations. Data collection methods included:

- Document review including: USAID Strategic Objective Agreement for CLASS, USAID Education Result Framework (2003-2006), USAID annual reports, the AED proposal for PAEM, PAEM quarterly Reports and work Plans, PAEM training modules and materials, PAEM internal evaluations and activity reports, and Ministry of Education documents relating to the 10-year education program (PDEF).
- Individual and group interviews with staff at: USAID, PAEM, DEMSG, other MOE units, and implementing partners.
- Comparative data tables for PAEM and non-PAEM schools, with key quantitative impact and output variables, prepared for IA and PAEM completion.
- Visits to three regions and 9 PAEM schools, 3 non-PAEM schools where: interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with regional (IA and PRF) and departmental (IDE) education authorities, regional and rural councils, regional community organizations, school principals, CGE members, teachers, students, parents and local community members; 2 classroom observations were conducted in each school; and classrooms and school facilities inspected.

The week-long field visits were made by three 4-5 person teams, including an evaluator and USAID, PAEM and MOE representatives, and facilitated by the PAEM regional coordinator. An initial day was spent with various regional level groups; one day was spent at each school. The school sample called for 2 PAEM-constructed schools, 1 PAEM-rehabilitated school, and 1 non-PAEM school [4]per region. Survey instruments, interview guides for the various groups, and classroom observation forms were developed and used by each team. The evaluator synthesized the information and developed PowerPoint

[3] See Scope of Work in Annex 1. Note that the Mission eliminated questions pertaining to Islamic schooling.
[4] Non-PAEM schools refer to those schools that had not received interventions other than the principal training module and the teacher training module for first-year teachers and vacataires provides to all schools in the regions.

presentations. Based on the discussion and feedback of the second workshop, a detailed list of recommendations was left with the Mission. The final report was prepared in the United States.

The lack of available quantitative data (including baseline data) for the calculation of many student and teacher indicators and the inaccessibility of PAEM classroom observation data[5] constrained analysis of program impact on student and teacher performance. Neither the scope of the evaluation nor its timeframe permitted a program-wide quantitative survey or visits to every PAEM school.[6] Site selection for the evaluation team visits was based on purposive sampling (rather than random) to capture a range of PAEM experience in a variety of situations. Consequently, most quantitative data (e.g. teacher classroom behavior) collected from these schools is not presented as statistically representative of the entire program, only indicative. Nonetheless, it should be noted that nearly one-third (9 of 30) of the PAEM schools were visited. Primarily, qualitative methods—individual and group interviews—were used to collect information about the program. The advantage of this method is that it provides insight into attitudes, perceptions and reasons for behaviors from a wide variety of stakeholders in a short period of time. The major limitation is that behaviors are reported (rather than observed), respondents are not necessarily representative of the population, and responses are subject to interviewer interpretation. These shortcomings were substantially mitigated by using semi-structured interview protocols, requiring respondents to provide examples, and triangulating data from multiple sources. Numerous interviews—both individual and group—were conducted at each site with a variety of informants. The information from like sources at the various sites was compared (e.g. interviews with 12 principals) and contrasted with information provided from other sources (e.g. 12 CGEs, 12 parent groups, 12 student groups). Overall, little variation was found and clear patterns emerged. Deviations are noted in the text. The second workshop allowed the team to vet the data with a broad range of stakeholders.

D. Organization of the Report

The report is organized into three sections. Section 1 (above) introduces the evaluation, including background, purpose and methods. Section 2 comprises three chapters that present findings and analysis for the three Key Intermediate Results (Access, Teaching-Learning, and Local Government and Community Participation), as well as chapters on Program Management and Monitoring and Evaluation. Section III concludes with an overall assessment of impact and effectiveness, lessons learned and recommendations. Annexes are appended in two files: (1) Annexes 1-6 include the scope of work, work plan/methodology, references, contact, detailed recommendations and PAEM data table and (2) Annex 7 includes the various instruments developed by the survey.

Section II

Chapter 2: Increased Access to Middle School (KIR 1)

In order to expand access to and enrollment in middle schools, the USAID strategy calls for addressing both supply-side and demand-side constraints. It aims at redressing the physical shortage of middle school places, increasing the demand for middle schooling, and creating an environment favorable to girls' educational participation, most particularly their access and retention. Its program—as implemented through PAEM/CLASSE—comprises three areas of intervention: (1) the construction of new middle schools, (2) the renovation/rehabilitation of existing middle schools, and (3) the mobilization and involvement of the school community in school support and in their children's education. A fourth area addressed by PAEM--but not included in the USAID strategy--is improved school leadership and management, including school principal development.

[5] PAEM indicates that it has conducted classroom observations (1) as part of its internal teacher training follow-up and (2) as part of the internal SITT evaluation, conducted in March 2006.
[6] This type of data is generally collected as part of the program M&E or as an empirical research study.

A. More Middle School Constructed and Rehabilitated (SIRs 1.1 and 1.2)

- Have middle schools been constructed and rehabilitated as specified?
- Were viable construction/rehabilitation models and procedures developed
- Was a rational site selection process and criteria followed for locating the schools?
- Were community contribution and involvement targets in school construction met?

School construction and rehabilitation has been a primary focus of and pacing item for the first two years of the PAEM, which predicates its "whole school" approach—including most of its activities for improved teaching-learning and increased local participation in education financing and management—on the existence of new or physically improved middle schools. **To date and six months ahead of its estimated 3.5 year schedule, PAEM has completed the construction and renovation of the specified 30 schools in the target regions.** Eighteen new middle schools have been constructed (six per region), representing 15 percent of middle schools in Fatick and Kolda and 21 percent in Tambakounda. Twelve existing middle schools have been rehabilitated (4 per region).

PAEM established a rigorous monitoring and supervision system, employing a project engineer and site supervisors to oversees all aspects of construction/renovations and verify contractor compliance with specification at each major stage. Most of the school construction and renovation has been completed on schedule, although this did not always correspond to the beginning of the school year. The rehabilitated schools and even some new schools operated at other locations before the construction/renovation was completed. Overall, construction had not impinged on school operations or shortened the number of operating days. School schedules were more likely to be disrupted by student strikes, community events (e.g. Gambola), or inclement weather.

Although all the PAEM schools are in use, at least half of the nine PAEM schools visited reported that some construction/renovation tasks remained outstanding or repairs had to be effected. In order to deal with such issues, PAEM requires that its contractors redress problems following a final inspection visit one year after the completion of school construction/renovation (and bases final payment on this.) However, some problems impede school operations or security and require more immediate attention. For example, some schools reported that the windows did not fit well or could be opened from the outside, undermining security. One school paid to rectify problem with windows from its own limited budget, rather than waiting the 12 months for the contractor to fix. Other schools—specifically in Tambakounda—could not secure the wooden office and cabinet doors, which had warped out of alignment. Elsewhere, contractors had installed more tractable metal doors. Several new schools suffered from cracked cement walls and floors, and security gate hinges that had failed, which may indicate either contractor malfeasance or design flaws.

PAEM schools have been optimally situated to serve those least likely to have access to middle schooling, based on a participatory process of site selection for school construction and rehabilitation. Candidate locations for school construction or renovation are rural and/or remote communities that have been un-served or underserved in the provision of education, especially middle and secondary schooling. They have been identified by the Ministry of Education school map as priorities. PAEM has focused its efforts on creating "écoles de proximité." aimed at reducing the travel time and distance for the greatest number of students in catchment areas. Nevertheless, the distances of villages (ranging from 5 to 18) served by the school were not insignificant: the most distance villages were located about 18 km from the school, with the majority falling between 3-7 km.

Site selection criteria were further refined to include engaged local leadership, community willingness to provide land and support the school, and the existence of local community based organizations. PAEM

followed a participatory process for school construction and site selection that brought together local community members, local governing bodies (the regional and rural councils), and local education authorities (IA and IDEN). Site selection was open, transparent and based on objective criteria, in contrast to reports of some influential communities that had "jumped the queue" in the past (or continued to exert pressure on the regional Council, charged with school map management). Field visits yielded only one report of disgruntlement with site selection, although it should be noted that most community-based interview participants were those who lived within the villages immediately surrounding the school. Those on the periphery may feel differently.

The design of the newly constructed and rehabilitated schools is attractive, provides a comfortable learning environment, and is one in which the local communities appear to take pride. In consultation with the Ministry of Education, PAEM developed a new school model that appears to be more affordable and cost-effective than those planned by either the Ministry or built by other donors (e.g. JICA). PAEM indicates it was able to reduce the cost of a new school to—on average--$250,000 by eliminating several non-essential "whistles and bells," such as houses for the principal and security guard, requiring the community to contribute land (and some materials), and instituting a rigorous competitive bidding process. Although the School Construction Directorate provided some input in developing cost estimates for utilities and the DEMSG has endorsed the model, it is less clear whether it has been wholeheartedly accepted by the Ministry of Education, which several sources report favors more extensive infrastructure. If so, MOE reservations about the model need to be resolved before proceeding with more school construction. PAEM has made its plans and specifications available to other donors (e.g. World Bank), which are interested in replicating the model, but so far are under no official obligation to use it.

The new school model comprises: 4 classrooms equipped with "table-bancs" and blackboards; 1 multi-purpose room; 1 library/ICT room; an administrative block with offices for the principal, a secretary, and a "surveillant" and teachers' conference room; 2 sex-segregated latrine blocks; and a security wall enclosing the school grounds. The rehabilitated schools are based on the same model, although cost considerations reduced the number of new classrooms to two. Visits to "non-PAEM" schools provided testimonial to the effectiveness of several design elements of the PAEM model. In stark contrast to the bright and attractive PAEM schools, the "non PAEM" school classrooms were dark and exposed to the elements, their toilet facilities inadequate (e.g. 2 latrine posts for 800 students at one school), and their grounds unprotected by boundary walls, allowing unauthorized vehicles, passers-by and animal to disrupt classes, impede school activities and threaten security.

Table 2.1 : Field Visit Observations on School Infrastructure

Features	New PAEM Schools N=6	Rehab'd PAEM Schools N=3	Non-PAEM Schools N=3
Boundary Wall	06 (100%)	03 (100%)	00
Doors and windows	06 (100%)	03 (100%)	02 (66%)
Sex-segregated toilets	06 (100%)	03 (100%)	01 (33%)
Running Water	04 (66%)	02 (66%)	01 (33%)
ElectriICTy	01 (16%)	01 (33%)	02 (66%)
Telephone	00	00	02 (66%)
Library/ICT	03 (50%)	00	01 (33%)
Sports Equipment	02 (30%)	02 (66%)	01(33%)

Source: Field Visit Data

The infrastructure improvements provided through PAEM are considered by the school community the most important factor in improving the teaching-learning conditions at the school (less than quality inputs such as teacher training or materials). That students and teachers have comfortable and weatherproof surroundings with adequate seats is paramount. At rehabilitated and non-PAEM schools, principals, teachers, parents and CGE members indicated that additional classroom construction was a priority. They noted that the onset of the rainy season disrupted the school schedule because not only could classes not

be conducted in the temporary shelters, but the table-bancs and other materials in these shelters had to be stored in the new or renovated classrooms. Consequently, many indicated that the teachers had to accelerate the teaching schedule in order to complete the curriculum before the rains. A principal at a newly constructed school in Kolda said that the new classrooms extended the school year by 4 months! Principals and teachers felt that these improvements made their job easier, and a few expressed appreciation for the administrative block housing their office and the teacher room. Several principals pointed to the proximity, latrines and boundary wall as being particularly attractive to girls (although not as important as the school proximity which was emphasized by parents). Primary school girls touring a new school in Kolda declared they were going to study hard so they could be admitted to the PAEM school.

No such mention or praise was offered for the multi-purpose room or library/ICT room, possibly because both remain unequipped. At present, the former appears to be used only sporadically for meetings or by students between classes; the latter was generally locked, although principals, teachers and students were excited at the prospect of computers and other ICT equipment promised by the project and eager for its arrival.

Although all school community members interviewed were pleased with the basic design of the new schools, several additional infrastructure needs were noted: handicapped access, lodging for a security guard, health room, school canteen, student "foyer" or shelter, and student lodging. Some schools had undertaken some of these improvements on their own initiative, but not always with the best results. Some structures are poorly built or ill-placed on the school grounds; others—such as open cisterns for storing water and wells—posed health and safety hazards. Schools would benefit from some guidance in both the design and placement of these structures, so that the PAEM model's utility is not degraded.

To the best of their ability, communities have met their school construction obligations. Community contribution to and involvement in the construction of the school is an important element of the demand-driven approach for school placement. In return for school construction or rehabilitation, communities (including local government) agree to (1) provide the land, (2) contribute materials and labor for construction, and (3) ensure utility access. All are reported to have met the first two conditions associated with construction: men, women and children from the surrounding villages hauled sand, carried water, cleared brush, erected temporary shelter for building materials, etc. At several schools, a security guard was engaged to guard the construction materials.

Utility access has proved a stumbling block for PAEM schools and compromises several aspects of PAEM's approach to support quality teaching-learning and sound management in middle schools. Many schools lack water, electricity and telephone service that were to have been supplied by the community. According to project data, of the 30 schools constructed or rehabilitated, only 12 have running water, 17 are expected to have electricity soon, and 1 has a telephone. At present, only one school has all three.

Simply from a hygiene standpoint, access to water is important, but the lack of water poses a particular problem for PAEM schools, whose toilet blocks require a water source (unlike pit latrines). In some schools, the toilets were inoperable and closed; in others, they were filthy. One school had purchased two buckets for each classroom: 1 for drinking water and the other to wash the blackboard. Another had purchased a hose. Given that part of the project's strategy to attract and retain girls was predicated on the availability of toilets, particularly for those who do not live in the immediate neighborhood, the lack of functioning toilets constitutes a potential constraint (although it should be noted that no girl students--or their parents--indicated that it had affected their attendance.)

A key element of PAEM's program to improve teaching-learning and school management—and one greatly anticipated by school staff, students and community members-- is the provision of ICT equipment

(computers, printers, copiers, projectors, and internet access) and a dedicated room has been included in the design. The lack of electricity and phone stymies this approach and has left the schools bereft of the instructional materials called for in the USAID Education Strategy (Intermediate Result 2.1). To compensate, principals and teachers spend a disproportionate amount of time traveling to make copies of instructional materials or perform other administrative tasks. PAEM has currently ordered ICT equipment for the 17 schools with electricity, but nearly half the schools are likely to remain without these resources during the upcoming academic year.

The communities have had varying success in providing the required utilities, although it appears that all have made a "good-faith" effort. They are often hindered by the lack of a nearby electrical grid or telephone service coverage. Telephone service is also delayed by the cumbersome application process, which requires a signed letter by the Prime Minister's office. Water lines may have to cut across roads to reach the school, involving other government authorities. Many communities require additional assistance—financial, technical and/or political—in order to provide the required services. However, in several cases, the Ministry of Education has been dilatory in following up with promised support. Alternative sources of water and power—solar cells, generators, borehole wells, etc.—may provide solutions and help the schools realize their potential.

Early signs of disrepair, deterioration and neglect are evident at some of the newly constructed or rehabilitated schools. While many of the problems noted during the field visits will be addressed by the contractor at the one-year anniversary of construction completion, this is only a one-time solution. Leaking roofs, failing paint and broken windows will inevitably be chronic problems. None of the schools has developed--or even considered developing--a budgeted plan for routine maintenance or repair, although these are line items in the state-supplied school budget.. Most schools effect repairs on an ad hoc basis, which nearly guarantees that PAEM schools will soon resemble the dilapidated non-PAEM schools.

Schools are not being kept clean. Sanitary blocks, in particular, are extremely dirty and pose a health risk. At one school, the principal shut down the toilets until they could be cleaned. Schools have adopted various stratagems for cleaning: some hire outside help, some assign tasks to students (with girls generally assigned sweeping and toilet cleaning tasks), and some enjoy community-organized assistance. At a few schools, the local women's association has taken on cleaning tasks. At one school, the enterprising girl students agreed to clean the toilets, in return for boys contributing to a student activity fund. In general, however, schools have not developed a regular cleaning schedule negotiated and put in place at the beginning of the school year.

By default, oversight for maintenance and cleaning seems to be considered solely the principal's responsibility; CGE members did not include these among their mandated tasks. PAEM has not yet developed a maintenance manual and cleaning guide or provided training to principals, CGEs or communities about school upkeep, although it indicates it plans to do so. Most logically, these considerations should have been included among the conditions for community support at the time of school site selection, and training and materials provided prior to school hand-over.

PAEM's current school rehabilitation model is not adequate to meet school needs. Initially PAEM estimated that its rehabilitation program would be limited to basic repairs (e.g. roof replacement) and upgrades of existing school infrastructure. However, ultimately a more extensive program—largely demanding new construction--was required. Most "existing" schools were either housed in temporary structures (often operating out of structures located throughout the community) or were in an advanced state of decrepitude, not amenable to simple repairs. Due to budget considerations, a modified new school model was used. The rehabilitated schools have supplemented their two new classrooms with several (as many as eight) temporary classrooms made of woven mat walls and thatch, which are viable only during the dry season and always uncomfortable. Some schools—Salemata in Tambakounda, for instance—

continue to hold classes in off-site structures. The repercussions for the school and its students are negative: the academic year may be truncated, overcrowded conditions in the new classrooms could harm instructional quality, off-site instruction compromises teacher supervision and student security, or some unfortunate students (and teachers) may continue to suffer untenable conditions. Any of these scenarios compromise the "whole school" approach promulgated by PAEM.

It is unclear whether the PAEM 4-classroom model offers sufficient capacity to accommodate student enrollment in the short- and medium term. In contrast to the rehabilitated schools, the newly constructed schools visited had not (yet) constructed any temporary classrooms. For the moment, the new classrooms—both at the new and rehabilitated schools--are able to accommodate the student numbers (per class), but most are nearing capacity, as evidenced by the few seats left unoccupied. [Only in Tambacounda did it appear that enrollments fell significantly below school capacity.[7]] Moreover, several newly constructed schools indicated that as they added the upper grade levels, they would be hard-pressed for space and would require additional classrooms. Discussions with principals and project field staff did not yield a very clear picture of school capacity, with estimates varying considerably.

PAEM faces two challenges: not only must it plan for existing pent-up demand for middle schooling, it must also contend with the results of its own and other's efforts to increase demand for middle schooling and improve retention. Further, as participation in primary school increases, so does the pressure for entry to middle school. A quick review of national middle school enrollments shows that between 2000 and 2005, middle school students have increased by 67 percent (adding 125,725 students) compared with the 26 percent growth rate of the previous six year (1994-1999). The gross enrollment rate grew by nearly 8 percentage points, from 24 percent to 32 percent.[8] It is likely that the PAEM schools will reflect to some extent these accelerated growth patterns, which mean that the construction and rehabilitation models—as currently configured—may soon be overwhelmed by the influx of students within the school catchment area. Another potential demand on PAEM school capacity mentioned by school officials was the enrollment of students transferring to the PAEM schools from more crowded urban schools, but whose families live outside the catchment area. In one extreme case, a woman living in suburban Dakar relocated to her native village of Fongolimbi in order to enroll her children in the PAEM school. For both planning (i.e. number classrooms) and implementation (i.e. number of teachers) purposes, it is important that PAEM and the Ministry have a better idea of the enrollment growth rates in the targeted regions.

B. School Operations and Accessibility

- Are the middle schools functioning and operating as required by the Ministry of Education?
- Are sufficient numbers of teachers in appropriate subject areas in place?
- Have they been oriented and are they being paid on time?
- Has the MEN provided operating budget and other resources as promised or required?
- Have the school been included in IA and IDEN routine inspection and support activities?
- Are school organized to optimize their accessibility?

The PAEM schools are fully functional in terms of serving students and being integrated into the MOE system. They suffer equally with other government schools in the lack of adequate resources, materials, and support. In contrast to donor experience elsewhere in Africa, the Ministry of Education

[7] Field visits found that some schools had classes of fewer that 30 students. Explanations provided attribute this under-enrollment to the quota set by the Ministry for passing the admission exam.

[8] See "Rapport économique et financier 2005" (16 avril 2006), prepared by Pr. Abdoulaye Diagne, Consortium pour la Recherche Economique et Sociale, for Programme Décennal de l'Education et de la Formation, Direction de la Planification et de la Reforme de l'Education, Ministère de l'Education, République du Sénégal.

has honored its commitment in supporting the PAEM schools by deploying teachers, including the PAEM schools on the various inspection visit rosters, and providing the state-mandated budget.

The PAEM schools currently have the required teachers (with a few exeptions), although most of the teachers are newly recruited "vacataires" with no more than a year or two of university education and no teacher training. The MOE had deployed most of the teachers to the schools on time, although in a few cases a teacher may have arrived a month or two after the beginning of the school year. (For example, one school lacked a Physical Education teacher; another a Science Teacher for whom the qualified principal substituted). In some schools, additional staff has also been provided, such as "surveillants" or "gestionnaires." Nonetheless, schools indicate that if they add another grade level, they will require more teachers, particularly at the upper levels where subjects (and specialized teachers) seem to proliferate, based on the current MOE model for middle schooling. However, given the multiple demands on MOE resources for middle school expansion and the shortage of trained in teachers in specialized areas (e.g. Spanish) willing to be deployed to rural and remote locations, the viability of the middle school curriculum—with its large number of disciplines—is questionable. Furthermore, in some instances, staff may be better utilized to meet expressed needs. For example, the physical education teacher may be well-placed to deliver some of the life skills or health modules envisaged by the USAID strategy.

The vacataires are the "lynchpin" in the MOE strategy of middle school expansion, as few senior "fonctionnaire" teachers are willing to be deployed to either the more distant regions or remote "école de proximité" locations. The youthful vacataires—with limited employment opportunities and no family responsibilities--offer a ready and more affordable solution. Hiring decisions are reportedly based on level of education, as opposed to mastery of subject matter and language skills appropriate to middle school. Although most vacataires observed seems to be comfortable with the subject matter (at least in the predominant lower grades), some did not demonstrate the skill levels required, possibly the result of politically-influenced hiring decisions reportedly taking place in some areas. Others were clearly challenged by teaching, not having received any prior teacher training. (See Chapter 3).

Relatively little is known about this cadre of teachers—such as their backgrounds, skills/competencies, their motivations and future commitment to teaching—that allows for accurate planning and support. Discussions with the DEMSG reveal that their future planning is based on a series of assumptions that may not hold true, for example: that most vacataires will remain within the teaching profession and even at the same school, that they will be able and willing to complete the requisite university degree to become a "fonctionnaire" and follow a conventional career path, that the MOE will have the resources to deal with this if and when they do, and that as their numbers grow their demands for more compensation or better conditions will not.

Moreover, the viability of the initial "pre-service" training offered by FASTEF to the new teachers is problematic. First, very few vacataires enter the classroom having participated in this training; only two were encountered in the schools visited in Kolda. FASTEF staff report that the waiting list is long, and some teachers have been waiting up to six years. Secondly, the training model used does not seem to be tailored to either the vacataire academic skill level or the immediate challenges they will face in rural schools. It is apparently the same given to regular teacher trainees, only in an accelerated format (45 days over 2 years v. 6 months over two years), with the initial phase focusing on the theoretical. For regular teacher trainees, this is followed by classroom practice with frequent visits from FASTEF teacher trainers. However, the vacataires are deployed—in theory--to classrooms with no practical possibility of FASTEF support and very likely with no experienced teachers as colleagues (except the principal). The result is that most vacataires face their students armed simply with the knowledge they derived from their own experience as a student.

Nonetheless, the young men (and the few young women) appear to have fully entered into the life of the school and the community. Most appeared enthusiastic and motivated, despite the problems they mentioned (e.g. no advance pay, limited housing options, no teaching materials). How long this will last is another open question. Unless the MOE views these young teachers as transient and cycling through the system every two-three years, it will have to be prepared to deal with growing frustrations, complaints, and –inevitably—strikes.

After some administrative glitches teachers are now paid on time, although they must travel to the regional center to collect pay checks, resulting in two-three days of absence per month per teachers. Schools have made different arrangements to deal with this. One school staggers the days the teachers are allowed to travel, so the director can take the class; another school's director has been authorized to collect the teachers' pay and redistribute; another provides student assignments to cover the day missed and reschedules classes on weekends or after school for catch-up. In general, it appears that teacher attendance was high. This does not mean that teachers are never absent, but rather that their excuses are considered legitimate. Research both in the U.S. and abroad generally concludes that teacher absence, despite attempts to compensate, has an adverse effect. It was beyond the scope of this evaluation to determine the actual impact of teacher absence on learning. However, some teachers and students indicated that many students—particularly those living at a distance--could not attend the "make-up" classes.

Few schools had received any text books from the government, although orders had been prepared and submitted to IA. Even when books do arrive, they are not sufficient in number, as the orders were generally prepared two years earlier and the student numbers have increased beyond the original estimates (this from rehabilitated schools). New teachers struggle without teacher guides and books; few students--an estimated 50 to 80 percent--have textbooks. Many principals have scrambled to supplement the teacher materials by offering their own materials to same subject teachers, asking colleagues in other subjects for photocopies of their materials, and carefully building a small library of reference materials for teacher use. One principal—with approval of the CGE—had set aside a portion of the school budget for photocopying materials, and this year has seen that all his teachers have basic materials. A major reason cited for frequent principal absences (in one case, an astounding two weeks per month) from the school was the need to go into town to make photocopies of teaching materials. Another principal regularly approached the Regional Council with the request for materials every time he was in town, but received school uniforms for the girls instead, which he felt was not a priority need.

The MOE has provided the 800,000 FCFA/term to all the schools, which includes provision for some maintenance and repair. (See above.) Schools have also made different provisions for security. Nearly all have hired a "gardien", whose wages are subsidized either through the school budget or through the Conseil Regional.

The PAEM schools have been included in the various school inspection visits, but this does not mean that they are frequently visited by either the IVS, the IS or the CPIs. In Kolda, some schools have not yet received visits from the regionally-based IVS or the CPI, although it was noted that the English teachers in Kolda had participated in a workshop held there by the CPI. In Fatick, some schools have received multiple inspector visits, and others none at all. From a school management standpoint, it is imperative that the schools be visited at least once per semester by the IVS, but with only two per region, this is unlikely.

PAEM schools could be better organized and prepared to increase their accessibility to students. While the PAEM schools may offer students a place at the school, this does not mean that the schools are easily or readily accessible or welcoming to all. Most challenged are: (1) students living at a distance, (2) handicapped students, and (3) girls, although most school communities—staff, CGE, parents and community members—focus solely on the barriers presented by distance.

Despite the relative proximity of the PAEM schools, many students in the school catchment areas still live at a great distance from the school, in some cases up to 19 kilometers. Most students make the 3-7 km. trip on foot at least twice a day, although the schools do not keep records with this data. The school timetable (i.e. hours of operation), which is the same for urban and rural areas, may exacerbate the hardships and challenges faced by these students. The 8 am starting time is difficult for some students to meet despite early departure from home. The long afternoon break—between 1pm and 4 pm—may be suitable for school staff and students living close to school to return home for lunch and repose, but those who can't feasibly return home must wait idly at the school, often without lunch and in uncomfortable surroundings. Others may return home for lunch but skip the late afternoon session. The school closing time of 6 pm ensures that some student will have to make their way home in the dark. Certainly, these students are unlikely to participate in extra-curricular activities or tutoring sessions. School personnel believe that the school timetable is immutable, although some ME representative indicate that each community could work with the IA/IDEN to establish an optimal timetable.

The barriers presented by distance are a major preoccupation of the school communities. Several school communities have attempted to broker lunch and lodging arrangements for students, and a few schools mentioned providing bikes to good students who live at a considerable distance. Many suggest building and operating school canteens to serve lunch and dormitories to lodge the most distant students, which may be proposed in the schools' "projet d'etablissement." However, several negative reports were heard about the failure or shortcomings of these interventions in the past, so it is not clear that new initiatives will offer improvement or achieve greater success. Neither the MOE nor the project has developed any "how-to" guidance for schools or communities on these interventions or other best practices. Moreover, a clearer idea is needed at the school community level of the exact number of students requiring these services and the extent to which their families would be able and willing to subsidize them.

Only one school community mentioned the problems faced and needs of physically handicapped students. This was a non-PAEM school that had used a grant to purchase bicycles for it handicapped students to facilitate travel to school. However, both DEMSG and project personnel pointed out that future construction design should make the school more handicapped- accessible with ramps and other design modifications, and that the issue be addressed in community awareness programs.

C. School Leadership and Management: the Principal

- What is the professional profile of a PAEM school principal?
- How do principals define their role?
- How do principals provide "leadership"—with the community, students and teacher?
- What training and support do principal receive?

Principals in PAEM schools are serving as principals for the first time. The PAEM school principals are inexperienced in their role as school leaders. In both the newly constructed and rehabilitated schools, it was the principals' first post. Nearly all have been assigned to the schools within the last two years (one rehabilitated school principal had been in place since 2003/2004). Most have 20 years or more experience as teachers, although prior to PAEM, none had received training in school leadership and management. Only in one PAEM school did the principal have any assigned teaching duties, although all indicated that on occasion they substituted for teachers in their subject area, or filled in until the teacher post had been filled. All the PAEM and non-PAEM school principals interviewed were men. Reportedly, only one project school is headed by a woman (and a vacataire).

Principals define their role mainly in terms of administration and management. They are less likely to include pedagogical leadership and community participation. The principals' definition of their

role was to "ensure the good operation of the school," focusing primarily on administration, personnel supervision and financial management. Most often mentioned were teacher management (attendance, payment), student attendance and discipline, orienting and leading the CGE (particularly developing the projet d'etablissement), and reviewing the cahier de text. Least often mentioned was providing pedagogical leadership to the teachers and ensuring student welfare. Principals do not prepare any synthesis reports that would allow overall analysis of school trends on, such as: teacher and student attendance, trends in grade and student performance, etc. Reporting is defined by administrative needs.

Principals in both the PAEM and non-PAEM schools demonstrate a basic understanding of PAEM goals and approach. They underscore its emphasis on increased access and retention, especially for girls, and indicate that its approach differs from other schools in that it aims to involve a variety of actors in the "vie scolaire," including the community, parents, students, local authorities, and village associations. Although as new principals, they say they have no basis of comparison for identifying new professional demands associated with PAEM, they do point to their work with the CGE (leading and "encadrement") as something that did not exist in schools where they had previously been. Even the non-PAEM school principals pointed to this as an "innovation" introduced by PAEM. They also say that they have to interact with the community more than previously.

However, principal interaction and initiatives with the community at large is limited and mainly mediated through the CGE and the Rural Council. The involvement of the principal with the community seems to vary by school and also by issue. Overall, the principals are more likely to work through the CGE members, who have ties to various constituencies in the community (e.g. APE, women's associations), or interact with the President or representatives of the Rural Council (particularly to resolve the issues surrounding water and electricity). Many have said that they are not prepared to act until the 'projet d'etablissement" is fully developed. An exception is when the principal is pursuing some benefit for himself or his teachers, such as asking for land for a teacher lodging or food for teacher lunches. Although principals have seemed willing to work with a variety of community groups, they have not taken a lead in enlisting the group's assistance. For example, the principal at a school in Kolda is working closely with World Vision on the management of a school garden, but it was the Rural Council that initiated the activity.

The principals do not arrange formal meetings with the community, although community members (other than those represented on the CGE) may be present at general assemblies held at the beginning and end of the school year. Principal interaction with the community is largely informal and varies with the individual. Some principals appear to have actively taken part in village life (playing sports, attending ceremonies) as they settle into the community, while others have not. Principal-parent interactions may not be infrequent, but it does not appear that most principals seek out the interaction, except in cases of discipline and extreme absenteeism. A few parents regularly visit the school and talk to the principal, but the interactions are largely courtesy-based and the principal directs the parent to consult with the teachers about the student's work.

Principal support of improved teaching-learning has primarily been focused on providing the appropriate conditions and materials to make the environment in which students and teachers operate more comfortable and supportive, rather than through direct intervention into the teaching-learning process.

Some initiatives of activities mentioned by school principals to support or manage students include:

- Improving student learning by supporting the creation of "cours de renforcement" for students (not only weak ones), but the initiative has primarily been taken by the teachers who offer the courses on Wednesdays and Saturdays. Although the courses are appreciated, a fair number of students are excluded because (1) of distance (the courses are generally held at the school) and (2) price (many—

but not all—charge between 1000 and 5000 CFA per month/student). In one school the principal wanted the teachers to charge fees, but the teacher decided to offer the course free-of-charge. The principals do not supervise the tutoring sessions.

- Addressing student health needs by arranging for the village nurse to visit the school, and provided a "cahier de sante" to students who complain that they are ill, so they can obtain a free medical consultation and medication (if available). The principal of one school, without running water, has made sure that clean drinking water (with a little Javel added) is available to students. Girls are more often absent than boys because of their periods.
- Managing student attendance by locking the school gates after classes have begun. Although principals have indicated that student punctuality was initially a problem, they have dealt with by making clear that tardiness from students who lived relatively nearby would result in not being admitted to the class and requiring a meeting with the principal. Student that must travel a considerable distance to school are exonerated. Principals maintain a student attendance register, but –contrary to expectations--student attendance is considered very high at the schools.
- Improving student morale: Few principals or schools have specifically identified this as an activity. One principal has attempted to foster this by starting an inter-school sports competition and creating a school project for students (a garden).

Principals generally support teachers by attempting to provide an environment conducive to teaching, largely defined by the provision of physical inputs. Many have bought/copied materials and teacher guides. One principal claims he motivates teachers by "giving them the freedom" to conduct their classes as they wish, rather than intervening. Another principal arranged for an ONG to provide lunch ("popote") for the teachers. Another principal asked the CGE to pay for their transport expenses to a seminar held by the CPI. Principals point to the importance of sharing information (generally referring to administrative directives from the IA) with the teachers, but this is generally done through informal channels, rather than organized staff meetings. Since principals and teacher live in close proximity, often sharing lodgings, most principals say that they do not need to arrange for formal meetings. Given that most principals and teachers are new to their jobs and to the communities in which they now work, it appears that they have formed tight collegial bonds. In many cases, the principal seems to play a paternal role for the young teachers, providing both guidance and reassurance.

Principals primarily manage and evaluate teachers based on external indicators of performance, rather than direct observation. Evaluation criteria include: maintaining their cahier de texte, their attendance, marking student homework assignments, and lack of student and parent complaints. The "cahier de textes" seems to be the major management tool of the principals in terms of both teacher attendance and performance. Principals are supposed to review the Cahier at least on a weekly basis, but in several instances it appears that this was done much less frequently (perhaps every 6-8 weeks). Principals did not attempt to assess whether the teachers were acting on the skills and "contract" they signed following Teacher Motivation training, because (1) they expected inspectors to do it and/or (2) they were not familiar with the module's techniques and contents. However, a few noted that the teacher motivation training had result in better teacher rapport with students, fewer student-teacher conflicts, and higher comfort level of teachers with their role in the classroom.

Principals are not comfortable with providing pedagogical leadership to teachers. Principals seldom visit classrooms, and almost never (except in the non-PAEM school in Kolda) observe teachers delivering lessons (perhaps once or twice per year). They count instead on the feedback of inspectors, although such visits are infrequent. Some principals say that they are not skilled in pedagogy (despites years of classroom teaching) and that they are qualified only to provide guidance in their subject area. Principals have no classroom observation guides that they could use for both observation and later feedback with the teacher. Principals may participate in the "cellule pedagogique" in their subject area, but generally do not participate in those for other subjects.

Principals at the PAEM schools played an important role in fostering the teacher "esprit de corps." The predominately inexperienced, young cadre of vacataires looked to the principal for professional guidance and support. In many cases, the principals were not accompanied by their families and shared lodging with the vacataires. The principals seemed to play a paternal role for the young teachers, providing both professional and personal support.

Principals do not routinely receive either orientation to their post or training as principals. They underscore the need for more practical, example-based training in school operations, especially financial management. PAEM trained all CEM principals—450—in Senegal in Leadership, including those at existing and newly created schools. This was the first training they had ever received as principals. (It seems that the ME has discontinued training once provided to principals.) In addition, PAEM school principals have participated in the CGE training modules, thus far offered by the project. [One principal in Kolda said he had not been informed about the leadership course.] All declared that the training clarified their understanding about their roles and responsibilities, and have been able to apply it to their work (e.g. Tableau de bord). All say that they need more training: particularly in financial and materials management and development of "projet d'etablissement", and that it include more practical examples. They also say that they are ill- equipped to guide their teachers in using "pedagogie transversale" as they did not participate in the teacher training modules.

The Leadership training was informed by and in part based on the principal performance norms and standards developed by PAEM and the DEMSG. This is an important piece of work that could serve as both a basis of training and professional evaluation, but in its present form may present several problems. Most of the "indicators" are not defined in either actionable or measurable terms (e.g. Indicator 3.1.3 "optimize use of work time") that can be used as guidance by the inexperienced principal or serve as objectively verifiable measure of performance by inspectors. Several also appear to be redundant and not linked to the norms and standards developed for teachers. The school principals interviewed were aware of the norms (it was included in their training materials), but accorded it very little significance in the conduct of the duties except as a general coda. It is unclear the extent to which principals nation-wide and their unions were consulted or buy into the norms and their potential applications, although potential allies exist in the School Principals Association. CGE and community member were unaware of the norms.

The ME has not provided the principals—either in the PAEM or non-PAEM schools—with any written guidance or manuals. However, through PAEM, "Le Guide du Chef D'Etablissement," has been updated, expanded and distributed to all principals. The principals also have been provided with the manual associated with the "Leadership" training module and a collection of official texts and decrees issued by the ME. Both the PAEM and non-PAEM school principals interviewed expressed appreciation for the materials, but indicate that it is not sufficient for their needs. (Moreover, the CD-ROM format prevented some from easily accessing the materials, as they had to either travel to a distant cybercafe or go to the nearest lycee to access.) They say that they require a more comprehensive school operations/management handbook that provides specific guidance, procedure and tools (e.g. forms) associated with their assigned tasks. They require practical "how-to" guidance, with examples and step-by-step instructions.

Although the regional IVS are intended to support the principal in school management, only about half the principals have received a visit from the IVS (there are only two per region.) They are more likely to receive a visit from the IDEN inspector, although these are not frequent (except in the Kolda department where the IDEN inspector is also the PAEM CGE facilitator). Principals indicate that instead they generally turn to their local partners—the CGE, the APE, and teachers—for guidance and help with management problems. Several principals belong to the Collectif des Chefs d'Etablissement, a professional organization. Some say that they have turned to these colleagues for practical guidance and assistance in dealing with problems at the school.

Most principals have some familiarity with computers and their use. Some participated in the TIC training provides by PAEM. Others feel they can get by. Most would like more specific training on applications, and on usage of the equipment that will be supplied by PAEM.

D. Increased Awareness of Communities to the Importance of Middle Schooling, especially for Girls (SIR 1.3)

- What evidence exists that communities' awareness, attitudes and behaviors have changed favorably towards middle school education, especially for girls?
- Who is most active in the community?
- Has the model for building community awareness and mobilization been effective?

Community awareness building and mobilization is expected to serve two purposes: (1) to ensure the demand for middle schooling, especially for girls, and (2) to provide on-going support for the school.

Although community members seem generally aware of the importance of middle schooling and of girls' education, there is no baseline on pre-project knowledge, attitudes or perceptions on which to assess to what extent this is attributable to the PAEM awareness-building activities. Community members interviewed were certainly cognizant that awareness-building activities had taken place (led by Tostan, see below), but relatively few had participated in them even though they lived close-by. Retrospective estimates are that about 30 persons per school community participated in the discussions ("causeries") held in the village where the school is located; participants were most often members of local women's organizations. Interviews with parents and various community member organization representatives did not indicate that their attitudes toward schooling had changed appreciably as a result of the PAEM sensitization activities, as it appears that they were already favorably disposed toward schooling their children, including their daughters. In fact, all the parents interviewed had either transferred their children from other schools to the PAEM schools or enrolled immediately upon their completion of primary school. Not a single parent indicated that he or she had been persuaded to enroll a previously out-of-school child or to allow a child to remain in school. Parents and community members felt it was important that all children—including girls--be educated, but could not explain why or name constraints specific to girls' educational participation. (The lack of a near-by school and/or reliable boarding facilities was cited for both boys and girls, but early marriage and pregnancy were not.) Rather than an appreciation of the benefits of schooling itself, the most frequently mentioned motivation for schooling girls was the USAID-funded scholarship program, which—in conjunction with the availability of an "ecole de proximite"—may suggest that lack of awareness of schooling and unwillingness to enroll children is not so much a barrier to educational participation for the children in the PAEM communities as are the means of accessing it.

Communities were successfully mobilized to support school construction, but they are less active and diligent in providing on-going school support. Awareness and appreciation of schooling is supposed to translate into community support of education in general and the PAEM schools in particular. As part of the school site selection process, PAEM (not Tostan) oriented and mobilized communities to participate in school construction and rehabilitation, enlisting the involvement of a broad number of community groups and dignitaries—the CGC, the village head, the sous-prefect, the Rural Council, the Reginal Council, the IDEN and IA. For communities, the quid pro quo for school construction or renovation was meeting specific obligations: providing land, preparing the site, supplying basic materials (water, sand), ensuring security of building materials, and providing utility hook-ups. Although the communities organized themselves to provide support, their input was carefully choreographed by PAEM field coordinators and engineers. As noted earlier, all the PAEM school communities fulfilled these obligations, with the exception of the utilities.

Community members said they were proud to have contributed to school construction, and expressed a sense of ownership in the school. However, ownership has not necessarily transformed into accountability for its continued support. With the completion of school construction, community involvement and support of the school is less organized, more sporadic, and occasionally quixotic, varying with the school. Most representative of community participation in school support to date is continued infrastructure improvement, such as temporary classroom construction, reclaiming discarded table-bancs, planting of trees, and digging of wells or cisterns (in attempt to deal with the lack of water). At several schools, a security guard has been provided by the either the rural or regional council. At some schools in their second year of operation, parents and students were mobilized by the principal or CGE to clean or spruce up the school in preparation for "la Rentree." As discussed earlier, some schools have benefited from regular cleaning support. Occasionally, some communities have balked at or been dilatory in providing some promised additional services. At one new school, the community had not yet provided additional land promised for a playing field. At another, it tried to take away the lodging it had provided the principal and teachers until the Rural Council President intervened.

Although still early in the project, community efforts to support the school are less often focused on sustained activities aimed at improving the quality of schooling or school life of teachers and students, although examples do exist. At some schools, women's groups have presented programs on reproductive health and hygiene to the students. In Wassadou in Kolda, with the assistance of World Vision and at the instigation of the PRC, the school and local women's group have established gardens inside the school grounds at on its periphery and will share both the profits and the produce. At other schools arrangements have been brokered with local families to either provide lunch or lodging to student from more distant villages. One village has reportedly established a school cantine, although no specific information was available. In some instances, needy students have benefited from community assistance: for example, a local association paid the school-associated expenses of an orphaned girl for several months. Teachers have also received community support in the form of lodging and—in one case— meals to tide them over until they were able to access their first salary payment.

Organized local community groups are the means of channeling community support, rather than individual community members. Generally, the support provided by the community to the school either through (1) community-based organizations, such as the Groupements de Promotion des Femmes (GPF), l'Association des Parent d'Elèves (APE), des Comités de Gestion Communautaire (CGC), and les Foyers Socioculturel (FOSCO), a student association, or (2) local governing authorities at Rural and Regional Councils. Discussions with representatives of the different groups reveal that few have prepared a school needs analysis and action plan, nor have they formally consulted with each other. Instead their response has been to immediate perceived needs or requests from the school principal. Since most of the community groups are represented on the school management committee (CGE), it is expected that in the future their interventions and activities will respond to priorities identified by the school with their input. Apart from the APE (whose purpose is by definition school support), women's associations have so far been most active in providing supporting support to PAEM schools.

So far the schools themselves have not been very proactive in directly generating community support or interest. Both principals and CGE members have said that they are not prepared to act until the 'projet d'etablissement" is fully developed, the exceptions being requests for assistance with infrastructure, utilities, and other "emergencies" (e.g. cleaning toilets.) Although several principals and CGE members did describe their vision of the school as the center of the communities, the communication and outreach activities were largely confined to organized school meetings, such as those for "la Rentree" (1) and after the Compositions (one per term when parents come to pick up the students' report card.) These, of course, would mainly be of interest to parents, and not the community at large.

Most school-community communications take place through the CGE representatives reporting back to their respective constituent groups, although the information they have may be limited as principals do not prepare overall school diagnostic reports or fully disclose budget information about the state-allotted budget. Principals do not post budgets, reports or other school-related materials for general public review. They say that, depending on the individual, they will make certain materials available. Most were very much against posting attendance records of either teachers or students, saying that it would invade their privacy. They do not send their end-of-year report to the Rural Council and IA/IDEN (as required).

A few school have attempted to "give back" to the community, but this is not yet a well-developed concept. Some principals have organized sports competitions between schools to which the public has been invited, and when inter-school travel is cost prohibitive—as is generally the case for "ecoles de proximite"—they have arranged competitions between students and community members. The young vacataires appear to have readily integrated into the community, visiting student in their homes and receiving visits from student at their own lodgings.[9] Community members, especially parents have noted and appreciate the efforts of the energetic young teachers to help students by organizing free remediation courses ("cours de renforcement") and study groups.[10] Some have even bought candles and lanterns for students to use to study by at night, and several plan to undertaken commissions to purchase book over the school break. Student associations have planned dances ("soirees dansantes"), which have in some case involved the community as well as generated some controversy about their appropriateness. The use of school plays, recitals, festivals, literacy course or other school-provided services as means of generating community interest and placing the school at the center of associative life was for most schools a novel idea.

The "pre-packaged" community mobilization approach and model used to build awareness, including girls' schooling, and community participation does not appear to be suited to effective, on-going and sustainable long-term school support by the community. TOSTAN, a Senegal-based NGO well-known for its work with communities, was in charge of this component which was initiated with school site selection. Tostan employed its existing program and materials, which aim at developing the leadership capabilities among the adult population, focusing particularly on women. Led by Tostan "animateurs," PAEM mobilization activities included: some formalized training on the rights of children and girls, informal discussions, and development of a Community Management Committee (CGC or "Comite de Gestion Communautaire"). It may have also done some training in literacy and numeracy, but this is unclear and indicative of the general confusion concerning Tostan activities, which concluded last year. Representatives interviewed at both the Tostan field offices (in Tambacounda) and central headquarters were unable to fully respond to the evaluator questions, and seemed unable to distinguish between on-going Tostan community development activities (and associated results) and the 18- month program undertaken for specifically for PAEM. Conflation of the two programs may also explain why Tostan continued to work beyond the contract termination date and submit its reclama for additional expenditures.

Tostan did not focus directly on education and school-community relations, but took a more oblique approach by centering its activities on village development. It focused on health and sanitary issues, including those which affect girls' educational participation which it believes is the 'foundation for education." For example, discussions addressed the health risks associated with early marriage and pregnancy with the somewhat optimistic expectation that the enlightened parents would therefore decide to enroll their daughters in school as their only alternative. (It is not.) It did not, however, provide any practical guidance on how to support these girls once they were at school or how to deal with girl students

[9] While this interaction is laudable, it also is potentially risky, if not closely supervised by more mature school staff , parents and community members.

[10] Not all "cours de renforcement" are free. Teachers at some schools are reported to charge hefty fees, ranging from 500-10,000 per month per student.

who were either already married or mothers. The Tostan representative's claim that it had caused communities to revise the exclusionary pregnancy policy mandated by the ME was not borne out in discussions with parents, CGE members, or school principals. It does appear that the health/sanitation focus did bear fruit in a few communities, where local women's association took charge of cleaning the schools.

Nevertheless, this limited focus excludes all sorts of immediate schooling issues that confront communities, parents, students and schools, such as transport, school cantines, lodging, learning materials, etc. Tostan indicates that it did not employ any of the PLA/PRA techniques to help communities undertake problem diagnosis, priority identification and solution building or develop these skills. Also missing was a "menu" of ideas for community support activities developed for middle school, which is especially important in communities where experience with schooling and community involvement in education are limited. While the Tostan approach appears to take the long view of community development, a program developed specifically for community mobilization and support of middle schooling (whether for the school, its staff or its students) would have been a more effective use of the limited 18-month time frame.

The CGCs—put in place by Tostan—do not respond directly to education needs, adds an unnecessary layer of community coordination, and contribute to confusion about the role and purpose of the CGE. As part of its village development strategy, Tostan creates Comités de Gestion Communautaire (CGC), consisting of about 15 community-selected (not elected) representatives from different community-based groups. The CGCs are charged with identifying community needs and organizing community efforts to address them, regardless of sector, although there are—in theory--sector-specific sub-committees. While this approach offers many advantages in terms of overall village development by creating an activist and coordinating body, it seems less suitable for addressing the needs of PAEM schools and students for several reasons.

First, schooling—especially middle schooling—is not necessarily a CGC priority; it stands in the queue with other sectors. Most CGC interviewed identified other needs that take precedence over education (such as water and health). Indeed, a summary review of the CGC action plans (conducted by PAEM) indicates that the top three (of six) activities proposed by the CGC are vaccination campaigns, health information dissemination, and reforestation, not school or student priorities.

Second, the role and mandate of the CGC appears redundant in many respects with that of the CGE, in respect to middle schooling. Originally, PAEM intended that the CGC would help ready future CGE members to work in a committee and learn how to develop action plans, while school construction was underway. However, in reality, many CGE members do not sit on the CGC (despite Tostan's claims that all do), CGEs already existed (although inactive) at the rehabilitated schools, and the rapid new school construction process meant that there was very little time for CGC set-up, training and action plan development before an actual CGE was in place. The result has been confusion about the role of the CGC and the CGE in regard to middle school support, exacerbated by Tostan's apparent misunderstanding of the role of the CGE. The Tostan representative indicated that the CGE was merely an administrative body and that it was directed, guided and motivated ('impulser") by the CGC. In reality, the CGE is expected to–in consultation with the community—identify school needs, develop solutions and coordinate implementation. It is the CGE that will decide how community resources should be used to support the school, not the CGC. While the CGC may have a role in support of the PAEM school, it has not been adequately defined.

Finally, the CGCs have received some training in community mobilization, but they have not developed the skills needed to develop school support action plans. In fact, only one CGC (in Maka Kanone in Fatick) was able to actually produce an action plan for supporting the PAEM school. Tostan indicated that it now had a coordinator to work with the CGCs and would continue to train them, possibly in micro-

finance activities to provide the resources for their activities. This, however, would be done outside the PAEM contract, which ended in December 2005.

The Tostan model—as currently configured—is not suitable for replication by the Ministry of education as it expands its middle school program. In addition to the short-comings discussed above, Tostan has not developed modules or materials that ME personnel could deliver themselves. It did not respond to the DEMSG's request to develop a training program for ME personnel. Whereas the ME appears to accept that building community awareness and participation in schooling is an important ingredient in middle school expansion, governance and quality, it has not been provided with the tools to do so. As it is unlikely that The ME would out-source future community awareness and mobilization activities, it is essential that an effective, focused and realistic program be developed for delivery by ME personnel, especially at the IDEN-level.

E. "…especially for Girls" (SIR 1.3)

- Has community awareness increased about the need to send girls to school?
- Have schools and communities acted to support girls schooling?
- Are schools a more supportive environment for girls?
- Have policies been promulgated to support girls?

Communities are aware of the need to send their girls to middle school, but there is no evidence that demonstrates that changes have occurred in attitudes about middle school education for girls. Parents, teachers, school principals and community leaders all spoke of the need to send girls to school, Most of them cited reasons that demonstrated a basic understanding of the social and economic benefits of schooling girls. It was clear they wanted to provide a supportive environment for girls to do well. However, when pushed to provide clarification on how this could be accomplished almost everyone struggled to identify anything that went beyond making sure girls were enrolled, attending school on a regular basis, and "participated" in the learning activities.

Most school principals and teachers have a very limited understanding of what constitutes a "girl-friendly" school or how to go about making it so. While the majority strived for equality, few thought in terms of equity. Underlying stereotypes driving what women and men, and girls and boys do are not challenged and continue to reinforce (and reproduce) traditional gender-based role taking. One example that underscores how attitudes and belief-systems are driving "girl friendly" practices and policies was the response of a teacher when asked what he does to support the learning of girls and make it a more "girl friendly" environment: *"I don't call girls to the board during certain periods of the month."* Although this teacher's intentions were good, the underlying assumption driving his decision making was not only unjustifiable it was discriminatory as well.

Most school principals have established a non-official policy of allowing girls back into school once they have had a baby, believing the value of completing her education outweighed the bad example she might set other students. One school has even allowed the pregnant girl (if married) to remain in school during her pregnancy. In most cases, the principals had not consulted the CGE. Nevertheless, the schools and principals had not yet developed a policy to deal with the case of a girl student impregnated by either a teacher or fellow student. Few were inclined to discipline or bring sanctions against either the teacher or students, but believed that it was best worked out privately and that the principal would play the role of mediator. Almost unanimously, the preferred solution was that the father marries the girl and/or pay for her further education. In one case, the principal indicated that his first concern was to protect his teacher, rather the girl student.

Despite the physical improvements, schools may not be especially "girl friendly." Although girl students admitted to and described harassment by boys to the interviewers (once the criteria were defined), most school staff and CGE members declared that no appreciable harassment of girls took place at their school, although they limited their definition of harassment to outright physical abuse by either students or teachers. They did not see the need to take a pro-active role in insuring that the school, but believed that their intervention was predicated on the girls presenting the complaint to them. At one school where a boy had touched a girl's breast, the boy was expelled for 2 days. The principal also asked the one female teacher there to talk to the students about this. The principal at this school indicated he passed all "gender" problems to a new 22 year old female vacataire although she had had no training in this kind of counseling or subject area expertise. In several schools, principals and teachers assigned girls cleaning tasks, explaining that they were best suited to the job and confirming stereo-types.

Nonetheless, girls say their teachers support them and their schools are "good" places for girls to attend. With few exceptions, girls at the PAEM schools indicated their schools are better schools to attend than other schools in the area. Almost all of the girls mentioned their teachers were kind and were more responsive to their questions. There was, however, no notable difference in the responses of the girls at the non-PAEM school. Girls in non-PAEM schools also stressed the positive interaction that existed between them and their teachers and their school was a "good" school for girls. Since a few teachers at non-PAEM schools attended the motivation training hosted by PAEM this may have influenced the way teacher's interacted with their students. Anecdotal evidence of changes in teacher behavior are the only documentation that exists since no baseline data was collected to substantiate changes that occur as a result of the PAEM teacher training.

Other than the proximity of the school to their homes, girls did not identify any physical features of their schools as significant factors contributing to a "good school". Girls are acutely aware of the increased safety associated with shorter walking time, but most girls indicated they would have attended school elsewhere if the PAEM schools did not exist and would probably have boarded with a village family. Although this addressed the safety issue in terms of not having to walk to and from school each day, students—girls and boys—who lived with village families were in an extremely vulnerable situation. Heavy work demands placed upon them that kept them away from their studies. They are also expected to be responsible for their own food preparation—a difficult situation both in terms of the time available to prepare food as well as the availability of food and cooking materials—contribute to a poor daily diet and sleep deprivation.

Girls mentioned having separate toilets as something that was good---not because of the need for privacy but because their bathrooms were not as dirty as the boys. Indeed, in one school, the boy's bathroom was so filthy—their toilets were dangerous because the feces and urine embedded in the floor had made it too slippery to walk on so the boys were using the girls' toilets instead of their own. No one—the girls, the boys or the school staff—thought this situation was inappropriate and needed to be corrected. Indeed, everyone assumed the girls would accommodate the boys and the boys should not be held accountable for their actions that led to an unusable sanitary block.

Most schools and communities have not initiated special programs/interventions to assist girls. In general, school staff thought that the scholarship programs were sufficient to inspire and insure girls' educational participation. Other than the scholarships, little has been done by the project, communities, schools or Ministry to directly address factors that prevent girls from enrolling and attending school or doing well in school. In a few schools, the principal had invited the local health post nurse and/or mid-wife to come talk to the school to talk about family planning (most often to boys and girls). In two others (including a non-PAEM school), girls living at a distance from the school had been provided with bicycles. Generally, however, school activities are not planned with the particular constraints facing girls in mind. For example, most of the reinforcement classes to help students take place after school when girls are expected to be home helping their mothers. Although most teachers try to work around these

time commitments, the time girls have to engage erodes away leaving them little discretionary time for these or other after-school activities.

A key factor influencing what took place (or didn't take place) to leverage increased enrollment and participation of girls rests on the lack of effective community mobilization and participation. Although Tostan provided preliminary community development activities targeting awareness and construction activities, the absence of efforts to steer communities in activities focused on school quality and the day-to-day schooling experiences of girls, meant more substantive factors preventing the full participation of girls to be addressed. Overall, efforts would benefit from a holistic approach based on a strong analytical framework that supports all decision-making.

MOE policies do not support the on-going schooling of girls. The official pregnancy policy states that girls who are pregnant must leave school and are not allowed to return after the birth of the child. In addition, the policy does not support the on-going education of girls who marry while still in middle school. Although the implementation at the school level is frequently more supportive of on-going schooling opportunities for girls who are pregnant or in early marriages, there is no legal recourse a girl can take if her school does not permit her to stay if she's pregnant or married or to return after the birth of the child. The psychological impact of the stated policy is tremendous and holds considerable sway in terms of cultural norms, mores and practices. A concerted effort needs to be undertaken to revise the policy and make it more in tune with current trends for a less punitive policy. In addition, efforts need to be undertaken to sensitize parents, teachers and students on the broader issues of accountability and responsibility for both the girl and the boy (who fathered the child). Current attitudes that prevail in which boys are not responsible for their actions and should not be held to the save level of accountability as the girl do little to foster more progressive gender attitudes in general.

Although the MOE human resources department states the female teachers should serve as role models and mentor girls, no policy framework or program has been put in place to increase their ranks. There were very few women teachers and no women school principals leaving a tremendous void in the number of women who can mentor girls and serve as a positive role model to the girls. Despite consistent evidence that demonstrates the positive impact of increasing the number of women in the classroom and schools, there appears to be no coordinated effort on the part of the ministry to positively discriminate to recruit more women and deploy them to schools in the rural and remote areas. Conversations with ministry officials underscore a clear resistance to perceive this as any kind of real issue. In one conversation with central Ministry officials, we were told "*this is not an issue"* and all attempts to explore ways the representation of women might be increased and their deployment to PAEM schools might be increased were dismissed as being "*impossible to implement*" in Senegal. Responses appeared to be driven, at least in part, by cultural perceptions of what was appropriate for women and girls, men and boys. Because of the ideational boundaries associated with these kinds of reasons they are much harder to address but often are the cornerstone for long-term sustainable change.

Current efforts to address girls' education appear to be "tinkering" on the edges and do not constitute any significant kind of institutional change. Although this does not necessarily reflect the lack of a political will, the government needs to be more aggressive in the development and implementation of measures to increase the number of women teachers and school principals. Despite consistent evidence that demonstrates the positive impact of increasing the number of women in the classroom and schools, there appears to be no coordinated effort on the part of the ministry to positively discriminate to recruit more women and deploy them to schools in the rural and remote areas.

> *Q:"What are you doing to recruit more women teachers and school principals?"*
> *A:"This isn't a problem. There are plenty of women teachers in this region—we don't need to take any special measures to recruit more women."*

Chapter 3: Improved Learning and Teaching Environment (KIR 2)

PAEM has a package of interventions to improve teaching and learning which include the following: increased access to teaching and learning materials; improved learning environment; improved in-service; improved access to ITC; and access to life skills. The SITT program which is integrated into the PAEM, focuses on teacher and school principal training and consists of a series of modules for teachers, school principals and ministry personnel.

A. Access to teaching and learning materials (SIR 2.1)

- Do the teachers and students have textbooks?
- Who supplies the textbooks
- Do the teachers have and use instructional teaching aids?
- Are there maps, globes, science and sports equipment?
- Do teachers use and make their own teaching aids?
- Do communities assist the schools in obtaining instructional materials?
- Are there libraries and reference and recreational reading materials in both English and French?

Neither teachers nor students in PAEM schools have books. Although the ministry officially supplies both teacher and student textbooks, most of the schools have inadequate supplies of both the student textbooks and teacher guides and programs. Indeed, most schools lack textbooks for many of their classes in all subjects and some have none. Even at the best resourced school, the student:textbook ratio was 2:1 for one subject area 4:1 in another and a 7-8:1 student:textbook ratio in yet another. Despite the ministry's explanation on why there are no textbooks at newly constructed PAEM schools—the lag time in the planning cycle between the order for the textbooks and the official ministry recognition of the new schools--even rehabilitated and non-PAEM schools have significant shortages in certain subject areas or class levels. At these older schools they've have the opportunity to stockpile textbooks received over the years. But many if not most of the textbooks in their storerooms are badly worn with broken bindings, loose pages and covered with smudges from years of hard use. These textbooks have probably exceeded their planned life cycle but the schools closely guard them as a prized possession and even the ones that are no longer closely aligned with the official curricular program are stacked on shelves in storerooms ready to be used as needed. Other kinds of learning and teaching aids are also in scarce supply. There are no manipulatives or tactile learning materials for students or teachers to use such as models nor are there three-dimensional objects or templates of thing such as geometric shapes. There are a few maps and globes but nothing else to reinforce learning or to make lessons more vivid and grounded. Science equipment is none existent. Most schools have mats and a few soccer balls for physical education and for use during the recreational time between classes or before and after school. Teachers also go to stores to buy or photocopy reference materials when they go to town to pick up their salaries. These are limited because there seldom is a budget to pay for the items and are most often reference materials to use in their teaching.

Limited access to textbooks and other learning materials drive their use. Most of the schools allow students to take the textbooks home. Teachers implement a sharing scheme in which one students gets the book one week and another student another week until all students have the chance to take the book home and complete the assignment. This constraint limits the amount of study and homework options students have since the sharing cycle can take weeks to complete because of the shortage of textbooks. Concerns about the availability and limited supply of textbooks also cause hoarding in some cases. In more than one school principals had a "private" stash of unopened textbooks still in their plastic wraps even though many classes in their school had none for student use. Instructional aids fare the same fate. Whether they are concerned about breaking something or aren't in the habit of using them because of their scarcity,

instructional aids sit on shelves or on top of cabinets covered with dust. Lack of materials also affects what happens in the classroom, as teachers try to compensate for no learning materials:

Mlle Wade stands with her back to the students drawing geometric shapes on the blackboard for her 5th year class. After twenty minutes there are four different shapes sketched on the board. Throughout this period the students have sat quietly at their desks while doing nothing patiently waiting their teacher to finish her drawing.

There are no libraries; nor are there reference or recreational reading books. Other than the limited supply of textbooks students have access to no books. Schools do not have reference and recreational books nor do they have any kind of magazines, newspapers or other reading materials. Although students are probably taught "about" books—how they're formatted and how they're organized and how to use different kinds of books—it's doubtful any students have had much opportunity to scan through any reading materials and orient themselves in the format and structure used in reference materials, and fiction and non-fiction works of literature. Reading for information or pleasure is a luxury most students have never experienced at school and probably few of them have had the opportunity at home

Classrooms are sterile and physically un-stimulating learning environments. Inspiration in teaching and learning isn't limited to what teachers and students read, say and do. Colorful classrooms with walls adorned by instructional aids are a powerful teaching and learning medium. Not only does it provide space for teachers to post learning aids to reinforce what's being taught, walls also provide a way for teachers to foster a warm, reinforcing environment. Intellectually stimulating materials—posters, student work, even "educational graffiti" can jumpstart students' creative and cognitive processes. It also reinforces that classrooms are "kidspace" a place where students enjoy going to learn and a place that is "theirs". Using walls to reinforce learning lends itself well to non-subject based learning strategies such as study skills or meta-cognition strategies which students can use in problem solving. None of this was in evidence in classrooms and in only a few classrooms was anything placed on the walls and most of these postings were not related to any specific learning activity.

Teachers do not make their own instructional materials. The mostly young and inexperienced vacataire teaching force staffing most PAEM schools is a potential valuable asset to the educational system. But their youth and inexperience is a liability in terms of having a cache of teacher-made instructional materials. Even more experienced teachers do have a large stock of their own teacher-made aids in large part because of the limited resources and press of time. But their well seated knowledge of both the curricular program and the subject content affords them an advantage when teaching because they have well-rehearsed "past performances" to call on. They have prepared lesson plans they can access, they have a "mental library" of real-life experiences for linking new learning with old and they have teacher manuals, guides and programs which many of the vacataires do not have. In school after school teachers voiced the desire to learn more about making their own instructional materials although they raised concerns about having the resources to do this. Many teachers hoped the ICT would be the answer to their teaching needs and anticipated using both the internet and photocopier to fill the gap and supplement the meager resources they did have available to them now. In some classrooms—particularly in English and French classes which lend themselves more to creative writing assignments--teachers have students make their own reading materials including short stories and poetry. But this was not a common practice although one that needs to be encouraged.

"You have to be innovative if you want to do a good job and you have to make it yourself. Otherwise, there's nothing out there."-- a math and science teacher nearing retirement

There doesn't appear to be awareness that communities can support schools by providing teaching and learning materials or in-kind resources to make instructional aids. Parents provide their children with notebooks, pens in various colors of ink, compasses, rulers, protractors and erasers (although in

many cases these items are shared among the students). Some students have a sack or backpack to carry their supplies and textbooks. In a very few cases parents have purchased textbooks for their children but this appears to be very rare.

B. Improved learning environment (SIR 2.2)

- Are classrooms a positive learning environment?
- What indications are there of improved teaching and learning?
- Do teachers use student-centered teaching? Are teachers gender sensitive?
- Do teachers develop effective lesson plans?
- Do teachers pose appropriate questions?
- Do teachers demonstrate content mastery?
- Are students active learners and engaged in their lessons?
- What is done to support student learning?

The mostly young teaching force is highly energetic and they do a good job. Teacher-student interaction is generally cordial and respectful (i.e. teachers use positive reinforcement, aren't harsh when students give wrong answers, call students by name, call on girls and boys relatively equally). Although their classes don't demonstrate evidence of being student-centered, teachers foster a positive learning environment and have dedicated themselves to their teaching and their students. Questions to teachers about what "student-centered" means generated little that went beyond answers to "provide positive feedback" and "encourage students to participate" which translates to the number of times boys or girls are asked questions or called to the board. Although teachers have "equal" interaction with girls and boys there is little evidence they have a more a more substantive understanding of what a "supportive" learning environment means for all students and particularly for girls and struggling students.

Vacataires present a tremendous potential asset to the educational system. It is notable most of the vacataires are highly motivated and enjoy their teaching although many are frustrated at the lack of instructional materials, teaching supplies and the total absence of instructional support they receive. Generally vacataires present "adequate" lessons and some of them even demonstrate excellent lesson planning and presentation skills and with additional support and training promise to be exceptional teachers. During interviews and focus groups with the teachers, some of the older and more experienced ones appeared cynical about changes and almost dismissive of "student-centered" learning approaches and other changes being introduced by PAEM. On more than one occasion they insisted they "knew all of this before" but when asked to elaborate on certain aspects were unable or reluctant to provide any information. In contrast, vacataires seemed almost exuberant about the opportunity to learn more and implement the changes in their classrooms.

Although there is a semblance of equality in the classroom the evidence suggests schools do not provide equitable learning environments for all students. When asked about ways to support student learning, or the learning of girls in particular, teachers respond they "ask them more questions" or "give them more work". Beyond a quick review of the work in student cahiers, providing individualized assistance to students having difficulty understanding or comprehending the lesson doesn't happen. There was little evidence teachers were cognizant of their responsibility and accountability for student comprehension and the need to evaluate their own teaching performance by the questions they ask and the student responses they get back. Nor do they understand the need to re-teach what students haven't mastered. Teachers do not recognize they need to provide a secure environment for girls free from hazing and ridicule, equal work assignments for all students—girls and boys—(e.g. cleaning the sanitary blocks are the sole responsibility of women and girls as is the sweeping of classrooms). In general, when asked about the school experiences of girls, teachers were supportive if not defensive of "cultural" norms and appear reluctant to change patterns or ways of doing things.

Teachers lack a profound understanding of the educational constraints girls grapple with and do not realize the impact this has on their opportunity to study or engage in leisure or recreational activities. Both teachers and students acknowledge girls have a more difficult time in school because of their domestic obligations after school. Review of daily schedules for boys and girls in Fatick highlight the difference in time girls and boys need to complete their work obligations; boys frequently play football after school. In contrast, girls go to bed later than boys, arise at the same time and require almost twice the amount of time as the boys to complete their daily tasks. Students who live a long distance from the school and board with a village family also have very little time to study and complete homework because of work demands from the family they board with. These students are the most time-deprived students in the school and struggle with difficult circumstances since they must provide for and prepare their own meals in addition to their after-school chores.

Teachers want their students to do well. Many of the teachers have organized clubs at their schools to reinforce learning in certain subjects particularly in science, math and French. Many teachers offered after-school or weekend tutoring and remediation courses. Generally, these are offered for free or for a nominal charge. However, there appears to be no formulized system regulating when or where the supplemental classes are taking place or how much the classes cost. Nor is there any supervision of the after-school activities. Sometimes students go to the teachers houses for help—a practice that is potentially high risk and should be discouraged given the immaturity of both the teachers and students.

Teacher talk and rote learning dominates teaching. Over 80% of the questions teachers asked required rote answers and the classroom learning activities didn't engage students in problem solving, application, analysis, synthesis or evaluation. The dictée predominated in nearly all the classes observed although this was largely driven by the lack of textbooks. There was some evidence teachers were trying to use the more innovative teaching techniques introduced in the motivation training, but unless the teacher was highly motivated and persistence to design a lesson that married the introduction of content information through creative use of seatwork, lecture and board work, they are "stuck" like Velcro to the blackboard writing or dictating what students must copy into their notebooks. In general, the teaching in the classrooms that were observed, remains teacher-directed and lacks any strong evidence teaching is student centered. The following table provides an overview of behaviors observed in the three regions:

Table 3.1: Observed Classroom Behaviors

Observation	PAEM	Rehabilitated	Non PAEM	Total
Level of Questioning (% questions observed relating to..)				
• Rote	80%	80%		
• Higher order	20%	20%		20%
Grouping Patterns				
• Large group teaching	89%	91%	78%	86%
• Small Group	0%	0%	0%	0%
• Peer Tutoring	.5%	0%	0%	.5%
• Individual Instruction	10.5% (TN)	9% (TN)	22% (TN)	13.5%
Lecture	55%	15%	85%	52%
Learning Activities	45%	85%	15%	48%
% of time the teacher talks	74%	80%	65%	74%
% of time the students talk	25%	20%	35%	26%

The rapid-fire rote questioning patterns most teachers used are a poor gauge of student higher order cognitive skills and processing and inadequate to effectively evaluate student performance. Most teachers identify student responses to questions as a key method to evaluate student performance. However, the questioning patterns many teachers use are unlikely to provide for more than a rudimentary overview of student performance. Individual seat work seldom responds to individual student needs; nor

is it an effective tool to measure student comprehension since the activities seldom involve higher order thinking skills. Most teachers did not use prior knowledge and life experiences to scaffold new learning with old and class activities and exercises seldom were student-centered and failed to encourage collaboration, problem solving or student-directed learning.

Teachers lack the training and experience to know whether their students are mastering content and if they aren't what must be done to compensate. On-going formative assessment is a mystery to most of the teachers. Student notebooks are collected only a few times during the school year and other than a quick purview of their notebooks as they slip down one aisle to another (although very few effectively circulate in their classrooms**)**, calling students to the board to complete a problem or asking them to answer a question, there is no strategic and continuous form of student assessment. Evaluation procedures are a key measure a teacher uses to identify patterns in learning and identify concepts their students are or are not mastering. Teachers rely on students to "raise their hands" if they don't understand or to monitor their own learning and comprehension which in and of itself is an oxymoron.

Teachers need "learning by doing" if implementation of student-centered and student-directed learning is going to take hold. Teachers want to try the techniques they learned in the training but lack the skills and understanding to be able to do this. For instance, large group instruction rules classroom teaching and learning activities despite training on different kinds of grouping patterns. Their attempts to use grouping patterns after the training often failed to produce the desired results. Teachers complained the difference between "learning" about it in the training and "doing" it in their classrooms represented too big of a "learning gap". They also thought they lacked instructional materials they felt were essential to effectively implement these instructional techniques. However, in those cases where teachers used them successfully they were very positive about the impact it had on student learning—which was later confirmed by their students. The students said they were more engaged, they enjoyed what they were doing and they even thought the group learning helped slower students do better.

Most teachers have subject matter mastery. There are notable exceptions however and in some cases teachers are mis-educating the students to the point students are derisive in class when aware the teacher makes mistakes. Teachers also use level appropriate language in their teaching and activities are level-appropriate based on the student's skill set and cognitive level of development.

Pedagogical techniques introduced in the training can be seen in the classroom. Teachers frequently cited the need to make classrooms a more positive learning environment as one of the most important concepts learned in the training. They identified ways they've fostered this such as being more accepting of the students' questions and answers and to encourage them to be more active in their learning. In most classrooms teachers identified the objectives for the lesson at the beginning of the class period--another technique they were taught in the training. Although they are identifying the lesson objectives they need to better understand the process of using an "anticipatory set"—a reason for the learning--as a teaching and learning tool for the students. Identifying objectives is a good start but teachers need to take the next step in terms of clarifying what the performance objectives are for the students for objectives (what will mastery of the content "look" like), determine how mastery will be evaluated and what needs to be done to make the teaching and learning process more student-directed.

Students engage in their learning but are not highly active or directed learners. Most students don't ask questions of the teacher other than for clarification and even those are limited. Traditional turn taking fosters engagement that puts the teacher in charge of selecting who answers questions which often favors students near the front of the class or the better students. It was noted that when students call out or volunteer answers boys are more aggressive and likely to do this than girls. Since more students than can be called on clamor to answer questions or get called to the board because of their more aggressive turn-taking, boys are more active than girls. Girls, however, are more likely to study together after school in groups in their homes. Better use of both seat and board work would foster more active and aggressive

turn-taking but classroom activities particularly seatwork is limited to exercises that don't foster performance based learning, reinforce meta-cognition or generate more student-directed learning skills.

School principals are lifelines for the vacataires. Some of the vacataires voiced they are posted to the rural schools with "empty hands" forced to fend for themselves and would not be able to do their jobs. With few exceptions vacataires feel the director's support as invaluable even though it consists primarily of reassurance and encouragement they are doing a good job. Most teachers think their directors are hard working and take their responsibility to be the "caretaker" of the school very seriously. For the most part school principals have a very limited role in fostering improved teaching and learning; most do not observe in classrooms on any regular basis if at all; most teachers (especially the less experienced and less qualified) stress how valuable the input is when they are observed

School principals provide limited instructional leadership. They do not leverage professional exchanges. If this takes place it's driven by the teachers. There were some schools in which the vacataires coordinated peer-coaching with their colleagues (even in cases where they are not in the same discipline) in order to enhance their teaching repertoire and improve their teaching. In some cases the vacataires share living accommodations and informal, impromptu exchanges occur during their meals and free time. They find this professional exchange albeit ad hoc, extremely useful and would like to see a more systematic and institutionalized form of both intra and extra-school exchange. In almost all cases teachers want school principals to play a more prominent pedagogical role—particularly if it is "entre nous" and not a formal part of the inspection/evaluation system.

C. Improved in-service training (SIR2.3)

- Is there a training mechanism?
- What was the Ministry's role in developing this training?
- How were training needs identified?
- Is there a follow-up mechanism?
- What is the impact of the training?
- Does the Ministry have the capacity to sustain the training program?

Once deployed teachers are on their own, so in-service training and support is essential. Most of the teachers posted to the rural PAEM schools are vacataires or contractuals. They have limited to no teaching experience and lack any formal training. Although a few have gone through some preliminary teaching workshops most vacataires have nothing—training or supplies—to support their teaching. Teachers lack pedagogical knowledge nor do they have resource materials or support staff to assist them in the most basic of teaching skills. Vacataires rely on their own "memories" of teachers which serve as the prototype for their own teaching. In some cases, they are fortunate to have a mentor teacher in their past and can pull from those positive experiences to guide their teaching style and engagement with their own students. Not all are so lucky, however, and in some cases "talk 'n' chalk" teacher-directed instruction is being reproduced in the classrooms. In these cases, PAEM training not only needs to inform but remediate as well. The lack of any kind of needs assessment to determine what teachers know and what their individual and group needs are exacerbated PAEM efforts to effectively target training priorities. Most teachers do not need subject-specific training except as it relates to underscore a specific kind of teaching style or way to reinforce learning. But neither do they need highly theoretical training based on the psychology of learning or curriculum development models.

PAEM based the design of its teacher training module on the development of professional norms, but did not conduct a needs assessment. Key participants including ministry and PAEM staff took part in a participatory process to identify the skills and professional behavior sets for teachers. However, the norms lack sufficient detail and specifications describing what they should "look like" and need an

outlined and structured program to ensure teachers receive skills training as needed if the norms are going to leverage change in teaching and learning. PAEM did not conduct a training needs assessment, so the gap between the desired norms and what actually exist in terms of teacher skills and competencies has never been identified, which means it may not be dealing with priorities. Additionally, selection criteria for PAEM training need to be closely tied to the norms to ensure the neediest teachers are targeted for training first. Currently, vacataires are first in line to receive training. In most cases they would likely be the teachers in most need of training but caution needs to be exercised that the assumption is made that more experienced and more highly qualified teachers ”automatically” present these behaviors and norms.

Most recipients think the content of the modules and training materials are excellent, but there is little evidence they are able to implement all but the most rudimentary components of the module into their daily teaching (discussed above). PAEM has developed and delivered a module and training materials for motivating students. Key players such as PRF, CP and school principals are included in the development of the materials and take part in the training. However, a large percentage of teachers say the material is too dense, too theoretical for effective implementation in the classroom and present too much material in too short a period of time. Teachers consistently suggested developing more practical training modules that more directly address their priority teaching needs. They also felt it needs modifications to make it more accessible to unqualified and inexperienced teachers. Teachers suggested PAEM consider holding the training during a period in which they don’t have any upcoming school obligations. For example, many suggest a 4 or 5 day training session during the December break. In this way, it doesn’t conflict with the academic school year and provides them the time and opportunity to incorporate what they learn into their upcoming lesson planning. These findings are consistent with both the ministry and STTP evaluation conducted earlier.

Training follow-up is non-existent and teachers feel they are left to struggle on their own to use what they learn. Most of the teachers give up in frustration when their attempts to implement the teaching techniques in their classes fail. Teachers appreciate the information about lesson objectives and all but a few use it in their teaching. However, most teachers don’t indicate any deep understanding they also note they are more aware of the need to foster a positive classroom atmosphere and since the training try hard to make it a supportive/encouraging learning environment.

The MOE units charged with teacher support and follow-up are not able to meet their current work obligations and fail to visit schools on any regular schedule. Each regional IA includes a PRF, staffed by pedagogical advisors (CPI) specialized by subject who are supposed to visit schools and help teachers with classroom instructional techniques and related issues. Few have been able to do so for several reasons. The number of CPI is insufficient, and they lack transportation to visit schools. A few have attempted to hold workshops for the teachers, but the teachers also lack the funds for transport. The current support mechanism, based on subject-specific visitations, doesn’t maximize the limited resources and undermines efforts to develop school-based and cross-discipline instructional support systems. Although the introduction of transversal pedagogy rationalizes the limited resources there is resistance to this methodology in some of the implicated offices driven by both political and conceptual reasons. Reorganization and restructuring efforts underway in the ministry appear to be fostering some of this resistance and a bit of a turf war appears to be taking place.

There is no structured mechanism to multiply and share learning; nor are there any incentives to do so. No cascade structure exists to transfer learning. At the school, professional exchange among teachers is served by a subject-based “cellule pedagogique” these groups seldom meet and are not structured into the school schedule. Meetings with other schools and teachers are constrained by distance, time and expense. If this transfer of knowledge is to take place some kind of ministry mandate or policy needs to be put into place that provides time and incentive. Although the effectiveness of cellules varies considerably, in some areas they are providing valuable discipline-based support to teachers and offer a potential mechanism to offer support to teachers.

D. Improved access to ICT (SIR 2.4)

We sit in a dusty staff room. There is no electricity at this school nor is there any water. We listen as the five vacataires being interviewed---all young men fresh out of university-- enthusiastically describe how the computers, internet and photocopier will change their teaching and learning of their students. "We will do so many things when we get our computers. We will be able to get on the internet and download all kinds of material and then make photocopies for our students." We ask them if they've considered how much it will cost for paper and ink. The room is silent. Finally, an English teacher replies, "It won't cost that much—and it doesn't cost anything to use the internet. But we must get the computers soon or we will forget how to use them".

- Are there computers and other ICT equipment?
- Have teachers and students been trained on how to use the ICT equipment?
- How will ICT make a difference in teaching and learning?

ICT demands are high; skills are low; and the means are doubtful. There are no ICT equipment at the schools and expectations about its future use are a cause for concern. Although teachers mentioned they'd received preliminary training on the computers, it's unclear to what degree they have the necessary skills to effectively use the ICT. Some of the software packages and programs they are hoping to use—such as power point—are probably beyond their current skill set and might require some advanced training if they are to be used in their teaching. The teachers' expectations are that they will be able to have almost unlimited access to the computers, the internet and photocopying services.

It is unlikely the number of computers supplied to the schools will be able to meet the demand if both teachers and students will use them and achieve even the most basic level of proficiency. In some of the larger schools, it is unlikely each student would be permitted even the most limited access and doubtful they would be able to develop any level of proficiency or understanding of the computer or the internet. There are no procedures or regulations in place to ensure there is both equal and equitable access to the computers or that measures exist to ensure they are used and maintained properly. It is unclear how well teachers understand how high recurrent costs to maintain the computers and photocopiers will be and where the funds will be found to supply both paper and ink. At one non-PAEM school that had computer equipment it was stashed in a corner cannibalized and covered with dust. Of three computers at the school only one was operating and access was limited to the school principal and surveyent. If this situation is representative the impact of the ICT will be minimal.

Access to ICT doesn't necessarily improve the quality of teaching and learning. Having computers and internet access in schools doesn't mean teaching and learning is student-centered. Nor does it mean teachers will do a better job or students will perform better. Unless teachers use student-centered approaches the internet will just provide more information for teachers to give longer dictees to their students.

E. Access to life skills training (SIR 2.5)

Although the USAID strategy call s for increased access to life skills, PAEM has not supported or been involved in the development of an integrated life skills program by the MOE. There have been no PAEM activities in life skills, but there appears to be ad hoc activities teachers and women in the village undertake to provide entertainment and enrichment activities for the students including some that pertain to life skills. These are generally voluntary and tend to focus on things that are relevant to the lives of adolescent girls and boys—i.e. sex education, sports intramurals, after school activities including clubs, social gatherings, theatrical groups, etc. Women's groups frequently take an active role in sensitization programs and sponsor activities addressing girls' schooling, sex education, and HIV-AIDS.

Chapter 4: Increased Participation of Local Government and Communities in Education Management and Financing (KIR 3)

Strengthened community participation in education and increased capacity of local elected bodies to carry out the responsibilities transferred to them under Decentralization is considered essential to the expansion and sustainability of USAID's middle school program. Community ownership and involvement in the school will not only increase the resource base, but will also increase the accountability of those responsible for schooling—be they school staff, the CGE, the regional and rural council, or the education authorities. Local elected bodies need to develop the understanding and skills in order to respond to education needs and provide the resources and management oversight with which they are tasked.

A. Increased local financing for middle school (SIR 3.1)

- Have local governments allocated more funds to education, particularly for middle schools?
- How have local governments supported middle schools?
- What constrains local government support?
- Has PAEM effectively built capacity for increased local government financial support?
- Have communities contributed resources to the middle school?
- What form did community contribution take and how are they treated?

The local government and community financing component of the USAID strategy (and PAEM project) is ill-defined and under-developed, making it difficult to assess whether financing has increased or even if steps have been taken to support increased local financing. At present, it appears that a targeted set of interventions that deal directly with this SIR, beyond initial orienting and diagnostic activities, have not been developed. Moreover, there is neither an operable definition of what constitutes "local government and community" nor have measurable indicators been specified.[11] In actuality, sources of local finance for the schools are multiple and overlapping: (1) school fees paid by student households, (2) regional and rural council budgets, and (3) community contributions (other than taxes), be it from individuals, community associations/ or ONGs. Further, often community "contributions" are considered to be subsumed by the school fees (or at least the portion established by the APE) and by the Rural Council (the portion derived from the head tax).

A process for data collection/consolidation has not yet been put in place. Local government (i.e. regional and rural councils) financial outlays to the PAEM schools are not necessarily recorded in a way that makes them readily accessible. The in-kind contributions of both local government and community are neither recorded nor monetized. Finally, with the exception of community contributions to school construction, the lack of a definite and standardized program of activities to be undertaken by both the local governments and communities (other than CGE development) precludes using this as a proxy and/or process measure for financial contributions. Until this SIR is better explicated and its indicators fully defined, data will be largely anecdotal and subject to the evalautor's definition and interpretation.

The regional and rural councils were not able to substantiate that their budget allocations to education had increased. Regional and rural councils are charged with the economic and social development—health, environment, education, etc.--of their respective level and locale. Regional Councils are charged with the support and management of middle and secondary education; Rural Councils are responsible for primary education. Virtually all of the Regional Councils' funds are provided by the central government through the "Fonds de Dotation de la Décentralisation" (FDD); they do not raise funds locally. Similarly, Rural Councils receive central government funds, but are also permitted to

[11] The term "community" is loosely and variably applied, often used to denote all actors at the local level who are not part of the Ministry of Education.

levy a head tax (1,000 FCFA) on adults and vote special millages. The Regional Councils in Fatick and Kolda indicated that 40 percent of their budget was allocated to education, although they could not explain why except to say that they reflected central government priorities, which also ostensibly allocates 40 percent of its budget to education. In Tamba, the Council says it allocates 25 percent. Each Regional Council indicates that neither the FDD amounts nor the allocation proportions have varied over the past several years, certainly not since PAEM start-up in the region. The Regional Councils indicated that they had no plans to change the allocation levels. Rural Councils also struggle with limited State-provided resources, but enjoy the flexibility of raising funds locally for education. The challenge they face is collecting the taxes from a reluctant population, either unable or unwilling to pay, and certainly mistrustful of whether the funds will be used to good effect. Consequently, it is probably more accurate to argue that Rural Councils responsible for PAEM schools have increased the contributions they raise for education, rather than to state that their official cash budget allocations have increased.

Both Regional and Rural Councils have directed education-designated funds and other resources to middle schools, but Rural Councils have been more closely involved in PAEM school support. Both Regional and Rural Councils participated in school site selection process and community mobilization, but Rural Councils appear most active in PAEM school support, not surprisingly given their proximity and the direct benefits to their constituency. Only Rural Council responsibilities vis-à-vis PAEM school construction/rehabilitation were stipulated. Rural Councils were successful in providing, clearing and preparing the site; supplying water, sand and other materials for construction; and pursuing utility hook-up, this latter with limited success. In addition, Rural Councils monitored construction and provided both sheltered and secure storage of materials. At rehabilitated schools, they took undertook construction and furnishing of temporary classrooms. To deal with the lack of running water at many schools, the Rural Councils invested funds in building wells and/or cisterns.

In terms of on-going operational considerations, several Rural Councils have financed a security guard, arranged for principal and teacher lodging, and organized facility upkeep and cleaning. Rural Council representative were particularly concerned with assisting student traveling from distant villages. Several were in the process of organizing school cantines. A few were planning on building dormitories, while others were active in brokering boarding arrangements. One Rural Council (Diaoule in Fatick) has already constructed a “centre d’accueil” and cantine with its own funds (850,000 FCFA). Also at the local level, in Fogolembi in Tamba, the “prefet” worked with the community to solve the problem of water supply caused by a school site elevation higher than the local water tower.

In general, Regional Councils report that they have provided funds for middle schools for furniture, equipment, maintenance, utilities and student scholarships. Some have even underwritten school constructions, although not officially part of their mandate. Regional Councils have played a less prominent role in PAEM schools particularly as PAEM has provided for several Regional Council “obligations,” such as school furniture. (Reportedly, in Kolda, resource from both the Regional Council and IA for PAEM schools have been reduced and directed to less “fortunate” schools.) However, appeals are often made to the Regional Council if the Rural Council has been unable to respond satisfactorily. And some enterprising PAEM school principals will often present their requests to both, in the hope that one will come through. For example, in Tamba, the Regional Council has financed the salary and construction of housing for PAEM school security guards and has developed at project with INSERE (France) to finance bore well at schools—including PAEM schools—without running water. In all three regions, the Regional Councils have attempted to resolve some of the problems surrounding utilities, to the extent of drilling wells at certain schools. In Kolda, one chagrinned principal reported that the response to his request for help with utilities was met with a supply of uniforms for girls.[12]

[12]It was later explained that rather than offsetting an indirect cost of girls’ schooling for households in order to encourage girls’ retention, the uniforms were intended to prevent girls from dressing provocatively and tempting boys into inappropriate behaviors.

Local government support is constrained by multiples factors: (1) lack of funds/resources, (2) legal barriers, (3) lack of planning capacity and technical understanding of how to address priority needs. First, neither regional nor rural councils have sufficient resources to meet every school's basic needs. As noted above, most local government funds derive from the Fonds de Dotation de la Décentralisation (FDD). Despite the increase in the number of schools and students, the Regional Councils report that the amount has virtually remained the same. Furthermore, the FDD funds arrive late, often six months after the beginning of the school year. Consequently, the Regional (and Rural) Councils tend to respond to crises instead of formulating and adhering to a routine school support program (which they do not seem to have in any event). While Rural Councils are allowed to raise resources through head tax and special collections, they indicate that they have largely been unsuccessful in collecting the tax moneys. The parents interviewed said that they already paid the APE fees for the school, and that they had no assurance that the taxes would be used for their child's school. They were more at ease with the idea of contributing funds for a specific purpose. [In fact, parents at one school in Kolda expressed astonishment that the funds for PAEM came from ordinary American taxpayers.] Second, Rural Councils also face the additional challenge of their legal mandate that limits their support to primary education. Despite this, as seen above, the Rural Councils have provided support to PAEM schools, either ignoring the mandate or finding ways around it. For instance, building a school cantine to serve a nearby primary school, as well as the PAEM middle school, was given as one example. But they pointed out that there are limits to their creativity and that they are concerned about potential consequences. The increasing demand for primary schooling (reported fueled by the PAEM "écoles de proximité) also constrains their ability to free up resources for middle schooling

Finally, both Regional and Rural Council representative expressed concerns that they were not always getting the best returns on their investments, as they lacked the capacity to plan for how best to support the schools or to obtain the best services or inputs. The Rural Council representatives interviewed indicated that they had neither the skills nor experience to successfully increase payment of taxes or mobilize resources for education (or other sectors.) While some had participated in workshops conducted by PAEM to discuss financing constraints, they have not yet received any practical training in how to overcome them. At this stage, it appears that PAEM has not yet developed a training program to specifically deal the technical needs of the Regional and Rural Councils, as they relate to financing and their obligations to education. To date, emphasis has been placed on mobilizing community resources, but given the crowded field at the school community level (Rural Councils, CGC, CGE, CLEF, CDCS, local associations, etc.) one has to wonder who is mobilizing whom and whether all these organizations are not chasing after the same limited pool of resources to the confusion and consternation of the average community member.

Since the initial community contributions of labor and materials to school construction, the most significant and consistent community support has been channeled through school fee payment. As discussed in Chapter 2, communities (i.e. individuals and community based associations) provided resources--which in principle can be monetized--in the form of labor and materials for construction, maintenance, and cleaning. For the most part, these have been organized and provided through community-level groups, and provided on a sporadic or "as needed" basis. However, a significant proportion (30-50%) of the non-salary school operating budget also comes from community members in the form of user fees paid by students and their families, otherwise known as the APE contribution. These funds—ranging between 3,000 and 5,000 per student-- supplement the 800,000 FCFA provided each term by the ME. Payment of the APE fee is not voluntary, but families unable to pay for their children are allowed to accrue an informal debt that they are expected to pay of as they can (fees are not exonerated).

A lack of transparency and understanding of the school budget, finance and expenditure by community members—including parents—may inhibit future and increased community support of the PAEM schools. That education is the sole responsibility of the State is a prevalent belief in Africa and especially Senegal. By implicating the community in school construction, PAEM has attempted to dispel this belief and instill both a sense of community ownership and accountability for the school.

However, it appears that most community members (including the CGE) have very little understanding of the financial sources, operating budget and expenses of the school and the role they play in it. The parents interviewed felt that payment of the school (APE) fees fulfilled their support obligations to the school and absolved them of further contributions. The CGEs tended to reinforce this perception, as several of their members indicated that the best solution to budgetary shortfalls was to raise APE fees, with little consideration of its effects on demand. In fact, some of the rehabilitated schools had raised their fees in light of the "better quality" schooling provided.

It appears that only the school principal and possibly the "gestionnaire" have a complete view of the school's operating budget. Budget and expenditure information is not widely shared with the school community. At most schools, even the CGE members are not privy to details about the State-provided portion of the school budget, although they do review the APE portion.[13] The lack of transparency works against the school, not just from an accountability standpoint, but by masking the full extent of the routine demands on the school budget and the scarcity of resources to undertake additional improvement activities. If such information were more fully available and explained, both parents and other community member might be more willing to contribute outside the parameters of school fee payment.

A nascent and under-exploited source of community financing is partnerships with local business enterprises or NGOs. Although PAEM has notably forged national-level partnerships (with Microsoft and SONATEL), few schools or communities have attempted to do so and appear largely ignorant of the possibilities, although examples exist: a non-PAEM school in Velingara (Kolda) had developed a close relationship with a Spanish sister-school, exchanging students and staff and receiving computers and equipment. For the most part, the partnerships benefiting PAEM schools identified in the course of this evaluation have been pursued by the Rural Council. For example: in Wassadou (Kolda) the Rural Council developed a school garden initiative with World Vision; in Salameta (Tamba), the Rural Council is working with the NGO Cauri to plan the construction of a dormitory and two classrooms; and in Fatick, the Association des Ressortissants donated 800,000 FCFA to the school. Similarly, a former resident financed the electricity hook-up. PAEM indicates that intends to address the "how-to's" of partnership development in future CGE training.

B. Effective Functioning of School Management Committees (SIR 3.2)

- Have CGEs been established at middle schools as required?
- How do they see their role and responsibilities?
- What have CGEs done so far to support the school, the principal, the teachers, and the students?
- What is the CGE involvement in financial management, planning and fund raising?
- What have the CGE done to liaise with government and education authorities and the community?
- What training and support do CGEs receive?

The CGEs have been in operation only a few months, although most have met several times. Although existing by law for the past 20 years, it has only been recently—this academic year-- that the CGE have been activated (because of PAEM). Elections and appointments were conducted at the PAEM and non-PAEM schools between November 2005 and January 2006. Although theoretically membership could change every year, certain members tend to retain their posts at the organizations they represent (such as the APE). The CGE is supposed to meet two or three times a year at least—at the beginning, middle and end of school, and as needed. Many of the CGE at the PAEM schools have met much more frequently—ranging from once a month to twice a week—in order to development the "projet d'établissement," and some have not met since February. The CGEs have established a set schedule of

[13] Moreover, there was some uncertainty about the handling of APE fees. Some schools indicated that they were collected by the school staff and placed in the school bank account; others were less clear, giving the impression that the fees were collected by the APE and were not always turned over to the school.

meetings, but operate instead on an expectation that they will be called "as needed," which is indicative at this stage of a certain passivity and need to be told how to proceed.

The CGE are not necessarily representative of the school community. Each CGE consists of 9-11 members, representing from various groups in the school community as required by statute. The members who are elected specifically for the CGE (and not just for offices within their organization) are the teacher and student representatives, although it appears that they may be selected by consensus rather than election at some schools. Although 2 APE members is the rule, one CGE had three APE member representatives. Two women members, who represent the local women's association, claim membership by statute, but no other groups on the CGE were represented by women (e.g. teachers, APE members, etc.). Because CGE members are derived from community groups, not locales, not all the villages that are served by the school are represented by CGE members. Most members seemed to live in the village where the school was located or in nearby villages, which may mean that the further villages in the community will remain "polarized" and excluded. Not all CGE members had children currently enrolled at the school.

Full participation of some members may be stymied by status differentials, lack of literacy and French language skills, and gender. The CGE combines principals, teachers, students and community members, who do not enjoy equal status, power, skills or understanding. For example, student representatives are not as likely to take an active voice in planning and school business, although they are expected to voice student concerns and report back to the student body about decisions taken by the CGE. Not all members speak French, but most often meetings are conducted in French. In one school the two female members only spoke Pular. Similarly, women members were less likely to be literate and unable to access materials. Although fellow members claimed that female members regularly attended meetings and were vocal, the female members interviewed indicated that they had not attended all the meetings and spoke only when directly asked a question.

The school principal and teachers appear to be placed to exert the greatest influence on and even dominate the CGE Not all CGE members are equally active. Most schools point to the principal and teachers as the most active. According to the CGE members, the CGE is headed by the school principal, who convokes and presides over the meetings, although this was debated later by DEMSG and IVS officials. The CGE generally works as a group, although there are a few sub-committees, for discipline and "gestion" (mainly financial), but these are staffed solely by school personnel who are CGE members, giving them disproportionate voice in CGE decisions..

After the principal and teachers, the APE representatives appear to be most active in the CGE (). At several schools, they indicated that they visited the school daily. One CGE has established a Comite de Pilotage, staffed by teachers and APE representatives. At one non-PAEM school in Kolda, the principal indicated that he wanted to provide an office to the president of the APE, a CGE member, who was at the school everyday. The PRC is least likely to attend the CGE meetings. One CGE suggested that the inactive members be dropped.

The CGEs have not yet forged a unified "identity." CGE members tended to respond to questions about school priorities and needs from their individual perspective (e.g. APE members saying that students need a cantine, teachers saying they need materials, principal pointing to need for a gardien or housing), rather than as an institution charged with looking at the priority needs of the whole school. The APE is regarded as the major partner of the CGE. The distinction that CGE members make between the CGE and the APE is that the CGE is empowered to make decisions about the schools and the use of resources, while the APE provides a supplementary assistance (although the resources it raises appear to constitute most of the budget over which the CGE exercises control). For example, it may collect additional funds and identify needs and projects, but it is the CGE that ultimately decides how the funds

will be used. No conflicts between the two bodies are expected as two APE representatives are included in the CGE.

The CGEs understand their role in ensuring good school operations, primarily by administering the school budget and responding to the physical needs of the school/students and teachers, but have a limited view of their role in school management. CGE members indicate that their principal function is to "assurer le bon fonctionnement" of the school. This includes maintaining contact/communications and good relations with the larger school community and stakeholders, and ensuring the well-being of the student body, by monitoring student attendance and health and the maintenance/cleanliness of the school. (One CGE had "sanctioned" a student for bad behavior.)

The CGE is not involved in the direct management of the supply-side aspects of the school, such as teacher attendance and performance or use of the state-supplied operating budget. CGE members make it clear the principal is the "captain of the ship." The regional IVS in Kolda says that the CGE are not ready to take on any real management responsibilities, and were they to do so, they would come into conflict with the principal. He does not want the principal to be held "hostage' to the CGE.

The CGEs have not developed (or been provided with) a set of routine tasks that designate areas for activity throughout the academic year. Nor do they have a well-developed sense of the school-level policies that they should take an active part in setting, such as for harassment, pregnancy, regulation of fees for "cours de renforcement," unsupervised tutoring, etc.

Most CGEs are basing their support activities on the development of the "projet d'etablissement," and until then respond primarily on an as-needed basis to requests and activities initiated by the school principal. So far, CGE have done relatively little, as they (1) have only been active since January 2006 and (2) are awaiting further PAEM training on how to develop a school "project d'établissement." Thus far, they have received training and assistance only in how to conduct the needs assessment ("diagnostique"). Most of the school support activities have been undertaken by the principal and by the teachers. However, the CGE have provided moral support and opposed their activities, although not always consulted. CGE activity appear to be mainly re-active (to principal requests and leadership), rather than pro-active at this stage. ("The CGE responds to the principal's requests and ideas." The CGE provides advice in crises.")

Primary support to the principal consists of: attending CGE meetings when convoked, developing the "projet d'établissement" (which so far consists of participating in the PAEM-guided "diagnostique") and approving any proposed budgetary expenditures from the school budget. Next year, they will be involved in overseeing the "projet d'établissement" implementation, setting the school fees and working with the APE to establish the amount of "cotisation" that makes a major portion of the school budget. Some CGE have been active in finding lodging for the principal and teachers.

Some of the activities undertaken by various CGE include: monitoring the construction of classrooms (at rehabilitated schools) arranging for planting trees (coordinating with Eaux et Foret), deciding how the revenues from a school garden will be shared, supervising the building of temporary classrooms (at a rehab'd school), establishing a cantine and student foyer, arranging for clearing school grounds, and generally sussing out needs. CGE members are very concerned about the lack of water and electricity, and have made direct appeals to the Rural Council (the PRC is a statutory member of the CGE.) In some cases this has resulted in attempts from the RC to deal with the problems, but not always successfully. For example, several wells and cisterns have been poorly constructed and will have to be re-done.

CGEs believe that they have no authority over school staff, but have supported the principal in using school budget funds to provide teacher materials. CGE members expressed general satisfaction with school staff, but demonstrated a limited understanding of performance and accountability criteria.

For example, they accept teacher absenteeism as tolerable if the teacher is absent due to traveling to get his salary, illness or dealing with family problems. Even if teacher absenteeism was a problem, they note that they have no authority over teachers and could not legitimately intervene. They are not, of course unaware of teacher and their need, noting that teachers lack materials. In some cases, they have authorized the principal to use part of the school budget to make photocopies of teaching guides and other didactic materials.

The CGEs have not intervened yet in a concerted way to support students, but have acted to support needy students and plan to respond to student needs that may prevent their access and participation in school, rather than their performance. Some CGEs say that they monitor student attendance and consult the student register occasionally. Other CGEs say they will intervene if asked by a teacher or the principal. (Note that only school personnel are members of the CGE sub-committee on discipline).At some schools, the CGE has intervened directly to ensure that students remain in school. At a new school in Kolda, the CGE worked to find lodging for a student. At another, they authorized the purchase of a bicycle for a girl student who had to long commute to school. At another, they got an NGO to support a girl orphan for a month. Most CGEs have identified other attendance-enhancing measures that they hope to find resources to support: school cantines, student lodging, shelters for students between classes, etc. A Fatick school has already established a cantine and foyer with Rural Council funding.

The CGE is not directly involved in student performance. They seldom visit the classroom; at most some may look through the window, but not observe a class. [An APE member who visits the school every day says he asks the surveillant how things are going.) The do not review student performance trends (nor does the school prepare this information), although the get a general sense of how well students are doing by attending the post-composition meetings with parents. They know about the students that have won prizes or are recognized for academic excellence. The CGEs appear to be well-aware of the material inputs to better teaching-learning. Through the "diagnostic" exercise that they have conducted as part of the PAEM training on developing a "projet d'etablissement", they have identified the lack of textbooks and teaching materials as constraints, and say they will make obtaining these materials a priority.

The CGE members were aware of the school's "policy" or practice about re-admitting girls to school after pregnancy, but not all had been consulted by the principal in setting the policy. The CGEs seemed to agree with the prevailing policy at the school, whether it was to allow the married girls to remain in school during pregnancy, or to re-admit them after delivery, or to require that they transfer to another school. None of the CGEs had discussed or developed policies to deal with school-girl pregnancy and harassment by either teachers at the school or boy-students. They did believe they should play a major role with the principal in deciding and negotiating the solution (generally marriage for pregnancy and/or paying for the girls to continue her education). [At one new school in Kolda, a female CGE member was so overcome by the thought of confronting a teacher-induced pregnancy that she could not respond.] Although none have yet acted, some CGE suggest that they could support girls by: finding local lodging, providing an end-of-year gift, buying bicycles, or setting up a cantine for girls.

The CGEs are not yet included in all school planning functions and financial decisions, and are largely unaware of how the state budget allocation to the school is being spent. Involvement of the CGE in the financial management of the school (apart from the teacher gestionnaire who is member of the CGE) is limited. The CGE does not plan or approve the plan for expenditure from the "budget de l'etat" (the 800,000 FCFA credit provided by the ME for basic school operations, which does not appear to vary according to the size of the school). Most CGEs have never seen the budget, and expect that the principal will provide the CGE with an after-the-fact expenditure report at the end-of-the year.

The CGE financial authority is mainly confined to the "budget de l'ecole" which primarily derives from the school fees collected by the school and to a lesser degree some of the other resources raised by the

school or contributed by the community. For example, expenditure of the revenues generated by school, dances or from school gardens must be approved by the CGE. That the CGE now has control of the APE cotisation portion of the school fees is considered a major innovation and improvement because now the CGE can ensure that priorities of the school are being met. The APE is now obliged to work with school and the revenues and their expenditure are known, can be controlled and should be more transparent. CGE members say that they review financial reports prepared by the gestionnaire on the "budget de l'ecole."

The internal controls for accountability could be subject to abuse. The two signatories on the school's bank account are the principal and the "gestionnaire", a teacher proposed by the principal.

The CGEs have not yet been active in fund raising. Most CGE activities in this area are in abeyance until they develop their "projet d'etablissement." Most of their revenues come from school fees, which are now to be approved by the CGE. Some members expressed the belief that parents must "reach more deeply into their pockets." If a family cannot pay, they say there is the 'fonds sociaux" that can defray the expenses or the school will not require that the parents pay immediately. However, they will not exonerate the fees as they don't want parents to expect not to pay. Other fund raising activities mentioned as options by the CGE are "soirees dansantes," wrestling matches, school gardens. They have not considered working with the Rural Council on a campaign to encourage community members to pay taxes in order to increase the funds allocated for education nor have they considered lobbying the Rural Council to designate a certain amount for the school each year.

For the most part, CGEs have not yet actively pursed partnerships with local associations or ONGs. Those that exist developed out of the TOSTAN mobilization or were the work of the PCR (e.g. the school gardens set up at a Kolda school with World Vision). They note that they must finish the PAEM training, before they know how to proceed. Some school partnerships mentioned include: the Association sportif, Comite de salubrite (a women's group), World Vision, Aide et Action. The 10-year old non-PAEM school outside of Verlingara has been active in establishing partnerships: naming a variety of NGOs (ADECK, World Vision), and "sistering" with a school in Spain, which has sent money for bicycles and computers. It and other schools like it could share valuable experiences.

The "projet d'etablissment" as currently conceived and administered may limit the scope of the school improvement activities undertaken by the CGE and could discourage CGE enthusiasm. The activities surrounding and leading to the development of the "projet d'etablissement" (or school improvement plan) form the centerpiece of both the PAEM plan to develop the CGE and the CGE's conception of its role. The development of the SIP is intended to lead the CGEs through the process of community interaction, problem identification, priority setting, solution development, and project implementation. It appears though certain administrative considerations tend to limit CGE understanding of the scope of the "projet d'etablissement" and may constrain CGE activities to support the school and respond to priority needs. Since the "projet d'etablissement" must be reviewed and approved by the IA, many CGE members believe that approval will constitute financing, and are presently looking toward the ME to fund their proposals. Several CGE members indicated that if the IA does not approve of their plan or all its elements, these cannot be pursued through other means (e.g. community or local government financing). Similarly, IA representatives have indicated that the "projet d'etablissement" must conform to the parameters of the African Development Bank grant that it may use for school improvement project. For example, the ADB grant precludes construction. Many CGE and IA representatives, therefore, believe that they cannot pursue construction activities. CGEs may also become discouraged by the time and complexity for "projet d'etablissement" development. One CGE indicated that the process for undertaking the "diagnostic" portion of the "projet" was too complicated and that they did not understand it. Additional delays are also likely to be experienced during the IA approval phase. So far, PAEM has not developed the criteria, guidelines or procedures for IA approval. Finally, it is not evident that the project principals, IA and the CGE have a clear idea of the criteria to be met for approval or even what approval

signifies. Without a shared understanding, the risk is that projects are rejected and school-based initiatives discouraged.

CGEs have participated in the established school meetings and have held consultative meetings on the development of the "projet d'etablissment," but they believe that their need to consult the community is limited as they represent the community. To ensure links with the community, each CGE member is expected to consult with and report back to its constituency. This is done verbally, as minutes of CGE meeting are not made publicly available or posted at the school. The CGE does not generally interact with the community at large, except in the context of three annual meetings held at the school (assemble general and post-composition meetings.) Parents are reached through the APE. [At a new school in Kolda, the APE already convoked two meeting this academic year.] Information sharing is generally done informally ("everyone tells everyone else") and no formal documents (such as the process verbal) presented to the community at large or its constituent groups (not even the PCR). Generally, the CGE believes that its very membership-as they represent and are drawn from the community--obviates its need to consult with the community. All the CGEs indicated that they maintained minutes, although these were not shared with the public.

The CGEs have consulted with the "community" in preparing the diagnostic for the "projet d'etablissment.". This was mainly done by consulting with representatives of the different school community groups, at a large open meeting including the school staff, the students, the PCR, the APE, and various village associations. So far, the CGEs report no negative feedback and believe that the parents and communities are satisfied with their work. Some CGEs noted that parents need to get a better understanding of their role in supporting the school, but did not seem to think that the CGE had a role in doing this.

CGEs tend to rely on the principal to communicate with the local authorities. Most CGEs say that they never have any official interaction with the education authorities (IA or IDEN), although they have interacted with a few in their role as advisors on the "projet d'etablissement." The CGEs do not meet as a body with the Rural or Regional Councils, expecting the school principal to represent the school's needs to these groups. In one school, they said that they encouraged the principal to write a letter to the Regional Council about the electricity and water problems they were experiencing.

PAEM training has jump-started the operationalization of CGEs. Nearly all the CGE members at the PAEM schools have participated in the two two-day training sessions held so far. The first focused on orienting the CGE members to the various roles and responsibilities of the different actors in the education sector (e.g. principal and other school staff, the IA and IDEN, IVS, etc.), and their own role and responsibility at the school, including the importance of partnership with the community. The second module focused on the conception and development of the "projet d'etablissment", including how to conduct a participatory needs assessment, develop an action plan, mobilize the human and financial resources for putting it in place, and monitoring/evaluating its progress and impact.

The CGE members were largely satisfied with the training contents and materials (and per diem), particularly the modules on conflict resolution (although they have not had to deal with many conflicts at the school, they seem to feel the threat of conflict is very real.) They noted that they now understand the ME's plans, how the education system was organized, and the various management procedures. All the CGE members interviewed indicated that they had copies of the relevant government texts/decrets and the modules guides prepared by PAEM. The ME has not provided any materials. [The principal of the non-PAEM school in Kolda referred to the Leadership Training module materials as providing him with the inspiration to jump-start the CGE at his school.] The training sessions were primarily conducted in French and the materials provided are in French, although not all of the CGE members—particularly the women—are conversant in French. Several CGE pointed out that even when concessions were made to

the local language, some members' weak literacy and language skills prevented them from fully "exploiting" the training.

CGEs emphasize their need for additional training in financial management and in planning, particularly in relation to the "projet d'etablissment." They indicate that they need more training on financial management (elaboration, accounting, and monitoring/auditing), as many schools do not have a trained gestionnaire, but have simply assigned the task to an untrained teacher. Other priorities include asset management, maintenance of equipment and infrastructure, and planning. Some expressed the need for statistical analysis and TIC training. They are counting on PAEM to lead them through the cycle of developing the "projet d'etablissement," as they don't know how to develop one yet. They think that the trainings should be expanded from 2 days to four days. PAEM has assigned a set of coordinator/animators to visit the individual schools to help the CGE follow the "projet d'etablissement" development process. This assistance "sur place" is highly valued by the CGEs. However, one CGE in Tambakounda expressed concern about their understanding of and ability to follow the procedures set forth for the "diagnostique" step of the "projet d'établissement" development process.

C. Effective education planning at the regional level.

- Is there a bottom-up decentralized planning system in place?
- What are the constraints to bottom-up planning in the regions?
- Has a bottom-up planning approach been developed by PAEM? Has PAEM effectively supported bottom-up planning?

Social service planning in Senegal is a complex issue, and inextricably linked to questions of governance and finance. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to present a comprehensive analysis of educational planning in the regions. Instead, a summary assessment based on interviews and observation is provided as the foundation for examining USAID efforts.

There is no evidence in the three target regions that effective, participatory and bottom-up planning ("la planification ascendante") for education is taking place. Education is one of the primary areas of responsibility that was transferred to local government (i.e. regional and rural councils) under the national Decentralization Law more than 10 years ago. Starting with the school, planning was expected to progress to increasingly higher levels of government, producing plans for the school ("PE"), the locality ("PLDE"), the commune (PCDE), the department (PDDE), and the region ("PRDE"). In theory, each plan should result from wide consultation, represent a joint effort of the governing bodies and the appropriate education authorities, and inform and be subsumed by plans at higher levels.

In reality, the education planning process is opaque, politicized, and non-participatory resulting in uninformed, skewed and ineffective education plans. Community or constituent consultation is generally done on an ad hoc or informal basis. No valid planning model or routine planning process has been developed to provide a blueprint for joint planning efforts between the rural and regional councils, on one hand, and the IDE's and IA's, on the other. Interviews with both government and education authorities at the various levels reveal that neither group consults or meets with the other to develop plans—there is no system in place for sharing information or regular, scheduled meetings for communication and coordination.[14] Many of the Regional and Rural Council members interviewed claimed that they did not receive any status or statistical reports prepared by the education authorities. Moreover, in some regions, government and education authorities seem highly resistant to working together. Particularly at the IA-level, there seemed to be some resentment that its planning authority had been usurped by

[14] Adding to the planning complexity is the existence of several –largely inactive—groups or committees created under the PDEF: the CLE, CDCS and CRCS, who roles—tellingly did not come up in the planning interviews or discussions..

decentralization, although frequently it was the IA that prepared the PRDE with the Regional Council merely rubber-stamping it. The relations between the Rural Councils and IDE seemed more collaborative, with IDE staff working closely with Rural Council representatives to develop the PDDE. However, a stovepipe approach still prevails: both local government and education authorities have their separate plans, rather than sharing a single plan with separate responsibilities.

Effective planning is also stymied by structural consideration. The division of the roles and responsibilities of local government and the education authorities does not promote effective planning.. For example, the Regional Councils are in charge of the school map, but cannot construct schools. School construction is planned and scheduled by central authorities. IA must act to provide the personnel and the Regional Council the furniture and equipment. Effective planning (and implementation) is possible only with perfect information and coordination, both significantly lacking.

Technical capacity for planning is lacking in both local government and education authorities. Regional and Rural Councils tend to see planning as a series of one-off activities, responding to crises and political pressures. Although each has an education commission, often with former education professionals, none of those interviewed has been trained in planning and expressed the need for training. They often depend on the local education authorities (IA and IDEs) to turn their priorities into an actual plan. However, even the IAs and IDEs have limited planning capacity: they were unable to produce basic statistical information required for planning, some could not interpret the data, and their own planning experience is limited to responding to "formulaires" handed down by the central ME. They themselves are highly dependent on central services of the ME (e.g. DRPE, DEMSG) for support.

Exacerbating all these dysfunctions is the uncertainty about resource availability. Regional Councils say they do not have enough funds to routinize school support, and therefore must rely on a queuing approach to planning (each year a different set of schools moves to the head of the queue to receive support, although they are often "bumped" due to crises and political considerations.) Similarly constraints affect Rural Councils who say they cannot count on tax revenues. Education authorities also suffer budget uncertainties that affect planning. Say one IDE staff member : « L'ID ne sait rien du budget des CEM, les collectivités ne savent rien du budget de l'IDE, même l'IA ne sait pas grand chose du budget de l'IDE et vice et versa !»

The "projet d'etablissement" supported by PAEM does not appear to offer a complete school-based planning model. Efforts to develop the planning and management capacity of education have so far been concentrated on the CGEs, the lowest level of 'governance" in the education system. The development of "projet d'etablissement" is the approach used to organize CGE training for problem diagnosis, community consultation and planning school improvement solutions. However, it is not clear that this approach is sufficient to ensure good planning at the school level. In addition to the shortcomings discussed in the previous section, the PE approach appears at this early stage to focus uniquely on the "extra-ordinary" actions a school can take to the exclusion of the routine planning considerations that every school must deal with on an annual basis as part of its standard operations. For example, a PE may provide for the building of a school cantine, a major and needed improvement, but at this stage it appears that the more mundane and basic planning considerations--such school maintenance and upkeep desks—are not included in the PE planning exercise. It is important that CGEs have the understanding, instruments and tools to plan for basic school functions, not only to support the sound operations of the school but to enhance their ability to participate fully in the management of the school. Otherwise, these basic planning tasks may remain the sole province of the school principal, who also requires assistance and training in planning.

It is not apparent that either USAID or PAEM has developed a comprehensive plan to support effective planning within the target regions. So far, PAEM has held several workshops in the target regions attended by both local government and educational authorities in the target regions discuss the

issues and constraints to education finance (and by extension planning), but it has not yet offered technical training to these groups on the specifics of planning. More importantly, it has not developed a detailed strategy or operational model for effective planning. The "evolutionary" approach of starting with the CGE and then moving on to the higher levels risks ignoring the very actors that have an immediate and notable effect on the PAEM school performance. While the problems surrounding decentralization are clearly too large for PAEM to take on, the development of a blueprint and tools for planning at the commune/departmental level (i.e. the Rural Council and IDE) presents an opportunity to strengthen the technical capacity, communication and coordination among the CGE, the Rural Council, the IDEN and the community.

Chapter 5: Program Management

A. USAID Program Management

USAID and PAEM have developed a collaborative working relationship, but there is no structure to the way they coordinate. They need to institute regular (monthly) meetings with PAEM and use this as a primary planning vehicle and mechanism to monitor project activities and ensure things are moving forward and correspond to their strategy and results framework. USAID should also invite PAEM to participate in donor coordination meetings to ensure project interventions and activities work in coordination with those of partner agencies. This is important on several counts: it further establishes the credibility of PAEM and its staff—particularly the COP; it ensures PAEM activities and interventions interface with other donor-supported activities; and it provides a conduit to expand PAEM's work/approach into other Ministry and donor partner initiatives.

USAID does not seem aware of the gaps or divergences between its Strategy and results framework and the work that PAEM is doing. It has not been diligent in M&E. USAID needs to revise its results framework to ensure all intervention areas of the PAEM/CLASSE are included. For example, school management and principal leadership training is being addressed by PAEM but is not an SIR in the current strategy. In contrast, life skills training is in the strategy but PAEM does not address it in their work plan. On one hand, USAID "is getting what it hasn't paid for" while on the other hand "it's paying for what it isn't getting." Since the strategy is the basis upon which the contract is written, to ensure continuity of project interventions and avoid contractual issues, it is critical the strategy is comprehensive and adequately addresses all components.

USAID risks undermining its program for middle schools by using PAEM as a convenient contract mechanism for off-project activities. USAID should not add tasks to the PAEM contract that are not integral and congruent to the middle school program but find other mechanisms for areas of interest or non-related requests from the Ministry or the US Embassy (e.g. scholarship management, Koranic schools, PPA, centralization/governance).

By continuously adding activities to the education program in a piecemeal fashion, USAID could seriously erode the coherence, quality and conceptualization of its education program. As USAID moves into Koranic schooling, science/math instruction, private/public partnerships, they need to ensure they don't lose their overall thrust and political leverage for education in Senegal nor that their interventions are marginalized or at cross-purposes.

USAID needs to revisit and re-emphasize its understanding with the Ministry that while USAID seeks to expand middle schooling through PAEM, it also aims at supporting the Ministry to develop a viable approach or model for middle school education that will be adopted by the Ministry and used throughout Senegal. There are a number of critical issues that need to be addressed including the policy framework (i.e. vacataires, recruiting women teachers and principals, etc.), Ministry capacity to

meet conditionality (i.e. textbook distribution), and Ministry overall commitment to and political support for USAID education program goals and PAEM interventions.

B. PAEM Project Management

The PAEM Chief of Party, PAEM staff and their cooperating partners are to be commended for all they have accomplished within the short implementation period for this project. They have effectively leveraged a tight timeline for a multi-faceted and complex project which includes construction, multiple training programs, and building capacity through community development and decentralization activities. Key aspects do, however, affect the effective implementation of the project and need to be examined for modification for the next phase of project implementation.

PAEM is logistically challenged. PAEM has offices at the central Ministry of Education building and at the regional ministry offices in the three target regions. Although they are well equipped with up-to-date computers, printers, scanners, etc, the space allotted to PAEM at both the regional offices and central headquarters in Dakar is inadequate for their current and future needs. Regional coordinators operate from a single small office, with barely room for a desk. At the central level, three of the key staff at the central level share one small office. Even carrying on a normal telephone conversation is problematic in such close quarters. There is a severe lack of space to store files, documents, etc. which affects the project's capacity to effectively organize and carry out project activities, efficiently store and access information, materials, etc. PAEM shares meeting rooms with other ME departments, but they are not always available and do not afford a level of privacy that might be desired. Although, there's a private bathroom included in the PAEM office complex frequently there's no water which complicates efforts to keep the offices clean and welcoming particularly the toilet area.

There are definite advantages for the PAEM central office being housed in the ministry building. This has clearly contributed to the strength of the partnership and allows easy access to key decision-makers. It also contributes to the visibility of PAEM within the ministry and the broader educational community and has led to a better understanding of the project and ultimately to the acceptance of the project activities. But it does come at a cost. As the project expands, the need for more space becomes critical.

The scope of work for the COP is over-charged. The COP is the primary driver for both the substantive activities of the project as well as the day-to-day office management activities. On a regular basis she negotiates large contracts, arranges for consultants, signs checks, attends various meetings, etc. This leaves her little time to focus on the key aspects of program design and technical inputs—clearly an extremely important aspect of the scope of the COP. If she is to be able to do this effectively she needs more staff—in particular a deputy project director who could take over responsibility for the logistic and office managerial tasks including accounting, writing contracts, etc.

The COP has done an extraordinary job of fostering collaboration and a sense of ownership for PAEM by ministry officials and other partners. This takes considerable time if it is to be done well—particularly if it's done in a way that supports sustainable implementation of project components when the project is finished. The COP has mapped out ways in which the project needs to connect with other ministry departments and their day-to-day activities but she lacks the time she needs to operationalize the needed collaboration and links to ensure for sustainability.

PAEM is understaffed. In addition to the COP, **t**he project is staffed with a decentralization specialist, a girls and community participation specialist, a quality specialist, three regional directors, drivers a fulltime finance officer, a fulltime administrative specialist and a full time administrative/finance assistant. In addition to the long-term in-country staff, PAEM has a team of international consultants they hire to assist in the implementation of project activities and who they bring out for multiple

consulting activities over the course of a specified period of time (i.e. training module for teacher in-service, etc.)

The scope of the three technical specialists is fairly well-defined and manageable within the current project framework and set of activities. However, as the project gears up it is highly unlikely they will be able to continue meeting project deliverables. In part, this is because the project will be starting a new set of cohorts while at the same time administering the progress and inputs for the 30 schools already constructed and the on-going training activities and community development activities currently underway. The start-up of new PAEM schools requires considerable time out of the office exacerbating their efforts to oversee and supervise the on-going activities for project activities commenced in the first phase.

Additional support is needed for the activities taking place under KIR 2. The project has a heavy input of training. Although this currently falls under the SOW of the quality specialist, that role needs to be redefined to better clarify how PAEM quality activities lead to changes under IR 2. Currently, the quality expert is responsible for a wide array of inputs ranging from improved teacher and school principal in-service to training for community leaders and SMCs. Although there are some similarities among all training activities, there are some significant substantive and conceptual differences between the in-service and teaching/learning classroom-based activities and other training activities. In order to maximize project inputs, there should be a team member who is responsible for overall training activities—particularly those targeting community leaders—and another team member who is responsible for all classroom based teaching/learning based training activities including training for school principals and ministry personnel in the PRF, IGEN, etc. If the project is going to leverage change in the classrooms there must be a PAEM staff member whose task is dedicated to this work with responsibilities targeted to instructional support personnel.

There is also need for a staff member for monitoring and evaluation activities. One of the project's most notable weaknesses is the lack of indicators to capture what the project is doing and an on-going plan and process to collect information about what is taking place to inform decision making and on-going planning. There is powerful and very compelling anecdotal evidence the project has had a positive if not outstanding impact. However, in the absence of hard data documenting change over time—the results are always subject to debate and questions about project impact.

PAEM needs to make more and better use of international technical assistance. Although it has a cadre of international T.A., they do not maintain a frequent or consistent presence. PAEM should contract for the services of a selection of experts who bring a broad spectrum of experience and more importantly, cross-fertilization of ideas and approaches to activities. This is particularly important in activities that address teaching and learning which can benefit from the varying philosophical orientations in reference to instruction that is student-centered and based on teacher-reflection and performance-based instructional practices.

Staffing according to the PAEM project components or the Results Framework does not necessarily make sense, and can limit the types of approaches generated and their effectiveness. For example, **c**oupling increasing girls' access to schooling with the community participation and development component is a mistake. PAEM needs a community development specialist AND a gender specialist. TOSTAN failed to effectively leverage both these aspects of IR 1 in part because they were "squeezed" together. Coupling one with the other contributed to both being underserved and poorly implemented and inadequately framed and understood.

PAEM could make better use of existing materials, many developed under USAID programs elsewhere in the world. Many of the deliverables for PAEM have already been done by other USAID projects and/or other partners. Many countries with a USAID basic education program and USAID global

projects have a reference library of pertinent tools and training packages that could be implemented with little or no modification. Although it is important to design project deliverables/inputs to meet the specific needs of education in Senegal, for the most part, the issues are very similar and the ways in which to address these needs are also very similar. PAEM drew upon a wealth of materials developed by AED and AMIDEAST in other projects and countries. Nonetheless, it would well serve the project and the Senegalese educators to further examine materials that have been successfully developed and utilized elsewhere as a springboard for discussions and modify what already exists to meet their specific needs. A list of various websites and the names of documents and tools PAEM should examine is included in the annex.

PAEM has demonstrated a commitment to participation, but needs to expand its constituency. One of the primary mechanisms fostering exchange has been through the "Circles of Quality," a somewhat modified "brown-bag" approach of discussion around project inputs and overall design. To date these seem to operate as an ad hoc group based on voluntary participation without any specific agenda or program of activities. There is a positive reaction to the "circles" but we detected somewhat of an undercurrent it was composed of "insiders" and not open to all who wanted to participate. The COP could do more to effectively leverage the positive impact of this mechanism if she had the time and staff she needs to plan out a program and strategically involve key partners who have defined roles leading to a certain project result or target.

The second phase of implementation needs to make more of an effort to move beyond the front line of decision-makers and include a broader audience. Strategically, PAEM has included major decision-makers and key players in their discussions and in the quality circles. In the initial phase of implementation this is clearly understandable since identifying gatekeepers and gaining their support and confidence is critical. However, the project risks becoming marginalized and reinforcing the perception it is strictly a pilot project if more people aren't involved in a substantive way. More than one individual should represent the various offices – in part so that when one person is absent efforts to make plans or implement activities do not become stalled or derailed because of lack of representation of key departments, etc. This will not only enhance the support of PAEM activities, it will also serve as a catalyst to transfer the PAEM approach to middle school support to other donors and educational partners.

Chapter 6: Monitoring and Evaluation

- Are there systems in place to measure impact on access, quality and community participation and assess the effectiveness of program interventions?
- Has program progress reporting requirement been complied with?
- Has the program built the skills of education professional to monitor the impact of program activities?

The current Performance Monitoring Plan developed by PAEM is not adequate to meet the myriad data, research and assessment needs of the project, the MOE and USAID. The PAEM PMP is expected to produce the data that shows (1) the impact of the USAID program on middle school participation (generally measured in student terms) and (2) the effectiveness of PAEM various components and interventions—essentially comprising a "model"-- in creating well-managed, performing schools (generally measured in system outputs). Not only is this information required to fulfill USAID reporting obligations, but it is also needed to demonstrate that the PAEM approach is viable for expansion to other regions and for full-scale adoption by the MOE.

Both USAID and PAEM were unable to respond to several of the basic data requests of the evaluation team., in part due to shortcomings in the USAID Strategy[15], which has specified an incomplete and occasionally inappropriate set of performance indicators to measure its SO and KIRs. For example, USAID reports the SO-level impact of its program (delivered virtually exclusively by PAEM) on access by the increase in the total number of middle school students in the three target regions, while in reality the number of students in the schools it funds is much more modest than the regional total. Since the USAID program has neither supported policies nor imposed conditions that would require the regions to increase the number of middle schools, it and PAEM are reporting data on which neither appears to have exerted significant influence, at least at this stage. In addition, while PAEM was able to provide (partial) data on student enrollments in PAEM constructed and rehabilitated schools in 2005/2006, it could not report on the number of "new" (i.e. non-transfer students) in its schools, which would demonstrate the extent to which the program has actually increased middle school enrollments. Similar problems of attribution will undermine both the veracity and credibility of PAEM-reported student indicators—transition, repetition, promotion, drop-out and completion rates—if USAID and PAEM persist in reporting regional, rather that PAEM school-aggregated, statistics.

As a project, the PAEM M&E system is both allowed and expected to amplify the its data needs and reporting systems, beyond the summary indicators used by USAID in its annual report. However, the current PAEM PMP (or M&E plan) does not provide data essential to understanding either program impact or model effectiveness. The PAEM PMP and its M&E system suffer from multiple short-comings:

There is a disconnect and imperfect alignment between the Mission Results Framework and PAEM's PMP that may contribute misunderstandings, complicate implementation and confound evaluation. Although PAEM (including SITT) appears to be almost wholly responsible for implementing and reporting on the Mission's education portfolio for middle school support, it does not share the same Results Framework, whereas projects are typically subsumed by USAID's RF. Instead, while PAEM's RF has retained the USAID SO and Key Intermediate Results (KIRs), it has added and modified the Sub Intermediate Results (SIRs). Often the PAEM SIRs read as indicators or as targets (e.g. "12 schools rehabilitated" or "700 teacher trained…") or are presented as discrete steps or actions, which would be more appropriately delineated as Sub SIRs (e.g. 'a middle school student profile is prepared"). More importantly, the PAEM SIRs frequently deviate from the results that USAID specified in its official RF (as presented in the Strategic Grant Agreement and dated 6/18/2003), the one on which it requested this evaluation be based. Surprisingly, none of the five SIRs comprising USAID's KIR 2 ("improved teaching and learning environments") appear among the SIRs in PAEM's RF. This can lead to serious misunderstandings and critical omissions—as in the case of USAID SIR 2.1 ("Increased access to educational materials…")—that PAEM's RF indicates it is not providing for, but is a key element in USAID's strategy to improve learning quality and part of its contract with the Government of Senegal. PAEM's restatement of some of the SIRs may not be unwarranted, but these variations and their implications must be fully understood by all parties to the USAID program. Discussions with USAID indicated that they were not aware of the self-imposed limitations and modifications made by PAEM, and had not consequently adjusted its expectations of certain inputs and products to be delivered. The statement of the result also influences the research and evaluation questions asked and the indicators used to measure contractor performance and program progress, effectiveness or impact. PAEM's deviation has created a parallel program that makes evaluation difficult: which program strategy—its result, indicators and activities—provides the framework against which progress is assessed?

PAEM does not have a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan, and lacks both the personnel and expertise to manage it. PAEM has not ignored the issue of M&E, but its efforts have

[15] It should be noted the evaluation team was unable to obtain a copy of the Mission's PMP for education, and had to derive information about Mission performance indicators from its Annual report and Strategic Objective Grant Agreement.

been somewhat haphazard and primarily focused on micro-level interventions, such as feed-back on training modules. The current tabular PMP PAEM has developed is not sufficient to guide overall data collection and analysis. It lacks a discussion of the results framework, development hypotheses and critical assumptions; operational indicator definitions, disaggregation specifications, baselines, and targets; instrument specification; and a plan and schedule for data collection (including sampling), tabulation, reporting and quality control. Critical research questions, anticipating those by donors and the ME who are the constituents for replication, have not been articulated nor have special studies relating to the model been named and programmed. (Instead, PAEM invites study proposals on an ad hoc basis, and often receives no response from its partners at the MOE.) The M&E requirements for such a multi-faceted and high stakes project are heavy. Currently, the PAEM Chief-of-Party has assumed responsibility for the M&E component, but the job requires more (full-time) thought, attention and action than the COP understandably has time for. In addition to conceptualizing the M&E plan, the M&E specialist must be able to work with staff, train counterparts, manage data collection and processing, conduct analysis and prepare reports.

PAEM has not established a proper basis for pre-, mid-term, and post-project comparisons, which could undermine its credibility as a viable model for middle schooling. Baselines are notably missing for several areas of project intervention, making it impossible to gauge the extent to which PAEM has improved either educational participation or its interventions have been effective. Multiple examples exist, such as the lack of pre-PAEM intervention data on: transfer students to calculate student enrollment increases; student flow and performance at rehabilitated schools; community awareness and attitudes towards middle and girls' schooling to asses whether they have changed; local government and community contributions (according to some quantifiable metric) to primary and/or middle schools prior to rehabilitation; teacher knowledge, attitudes and practices in the classroom prior to training; etc. Other means of comparison—i.e. control groups-- have not been set up or their viability considered.

Data collection and reporting systems are fragile and problematic. PAEM primarily relies on the MOE for data collection and processing. However, for the purposes of a small pilot project, the MOE's system is not sufficient. First, the ME, on one hand, and USAID/PAEM, on the other, may have different data needs. Some of the data required—such as number of transfer students or learning achievement—may not be routinely collected by the ME. Other data of use to USAID and PAEM, such as student profiles or aggregate semestrial grades, requires development of special instruments and protocols, even if collected by the ME. Second, ME data is frequently not available at the time required by USAID. Third, ME data is often liable to error and inaccurate, and its statistic are not calculated according to the methods specified by USAID or needed by the program. Additionally, it appears that the DEMSG also has some difficulty in disaagregating PAEM schools from regional total, although in theory this should be possible. The PAEM PMP also lists numerous partners in data collection and analysis, but it is not clear which is tasked with actual data collection or how they will do it; clearly an amalgam of multiple partner data is unfeasible. A viable data quality assessment system has not been put in place to verify the data provided. While the project is still small, it is possible to work with the DEMSG on school-based protocols and instruments and train principals and other school personnel in their use and other regional personnel in their audit and analysis.

PAEM has established an internal, quality control system that is poised to provide formative information and useful feedback on specific activities (such as training), but as structured does not provide the valid and reliable data needed for M&E. To assess and revise its training modules PAEM has organized follow-up visits with participants. For example, following the delivery of the teacher "motivation" modules, 4-person national teams (consisting of PAEM and ME staff, involved in module design) visited a small number of schools to interview and observe teachers. PAEM provided training in the methods (focus group, interview, observation) and the development of the related instruments. Reportedly, the emphasis of the work largely turned out to be a "customer satisfaction" survey, with a major focus on logistics; very few classes were observed. This approach is not a substitute for M&E data

collection. In order to observe changes in teacher behavior and the classroom environment, a more robust sample is required and the instruments used must be consistently. The observations must capture a broad range of teaching behaviors, as well as measure how teaching are using the acquired knowledge, rather than solely repeating prescribed actions.

The performance indicators that PAEM has included in its PMP are neither sufficient nor adequately defined. It does not provide for the measure of increased access (i.e. number of new student enrollments in its schools as a proportion of overall enrollments), but reports solely on regional student numbers and number of new places available (without even controlling for seats already existing in rehabilitated schools). Student performance is measured primarily through student flow statistics, which-though valid—are not necessarily indicators of better learning taking place. The sole learning measure is the end-of-cycle completion rate, which has several short-comings: (1) the final exam may not validly measure learning gains, (2) many PAEM schools will not have a terminal grade for several years, curtailing the robustness of the results and inhibiting early diagnosis of problems, and (3) it does not capture learning gains in the critical early middle school grades. The bi-annual grades of students are not aggregated and reported. Given the small number of PAEM schools, student performance tests could be developed and administered (to at least a sample of students).Also related to quality, PAEM's PMP provides for only one indicator that directly measures the extent to which the classroom environment has changed—i.e. uses of new pedagogic methods. Other indicators for school quality focus on inputs, such as the number of teachers trained, etc. Additional indicators that offer insight into the teaching-learning environment—such as student and teacher attendance, student-teacher ratio, student-class ratio, student-book ratio, and % of teachers with materials—are not included.

Most of the indicators in the PAEM PMP are not defined in way that they can be measured. For example, Indicator #11, "level of consensus of stakeholders on role and management of middle school," does not define what consensus means (100%?), what statements or concepts they are to agree about, and even who the stakeholders are. (It is also not apparent why this is a relevant result and indicator, which a narrative and development hypothesis statement might remedy). Similar vagueness affects indicators #9-13 and #16. The measures proposed for increased local government and community participation are particularly confusing. Indicator #19 does not specify the type and quality of services it expects to measure at each level of government. "Community initiatives" to benefit middle schools has not been defined so as to distinguish it from the school projects mentioned in Indicators #9, # 10, and # 21. The multiple definitions provided for each indicator imply that an index will be developed, but this is not explicit, and in most cases a single direct measure would be more intuitive and simpler.

PAEM also faces challenges with the specification of the denominators used for Indicators #1 and #5. If focused (as recommended above) on the actual PAEM schools, then care must be taken to obtain the data for the schools' catchment areas only. For example, only primary schools that feed the PAEM schools should be included in the transition rate and only the appropriately-aged population in the catchment area should be used for the completion rate.

PAEM prepares informative quarterly reports, but they are not a substitute for an annual report. The PAEM quarterly reports are lengthy, prepared in both French and English, and resemble newsletters. Virtually all of the quarterly report consumers read French, so the time-consuming English version adds little value, although it is required by the terms of the Cooperative Agreement. The news and updates are appreciated by members of the PAEM "community" who are already familiar with the project. However, the incremental quarterly discussion of activities—organized by internal project component rather than IRs—is not easily understood by the "outsider", since it offers only a snap-shot of a single quarter without reference to the overall project strategy and work plan. An annual report, although not a Cooperative Agreement requirement, is the appropriate medium to provide an overview of project impact, achievements, problems and future plans. PAEM only presents a tabular indicator summary for the fiscal year appended to the final quarter report, with little discussion or explanation.

So far, PAEM training in M&E has been limited to the internal, quality control mechanism used following the delivery of training modules. PAEM provided training in the methods (focus group, interview, observation) and the development of the related instruments. It does collaborate closely with the DEMSG staff to respond to project and USAID reporting requirements, but no formal M&E training program has been developed. Several of its activities could be structured to support M&E, training the PRF and school principals in using a consistent teacher observation form or training the CGE support teams to use a CGE effectiveness instrument. However, these activities must be predicated on a rational, and fully articulated M&E plan.

Section III

Chapter 7: Summary Analysis and Conclusions

This chapter consolidates and synthesizes the findings and analyses presented in the previous section. It examines the "people-level" impacts, and the overall effectiveness of the approaches used to achieve them, identifying what works, what doesn't and what is missing.

A. Access

Has enrollment increased in middle school been increased? Has girls' educational access increased?

PAEM appears to have increased new enrollments in middle school by 6,040 students, accounting for about 10 percent of the aggregated middle school enrollment.[16] Of the SO-level impacts targeted, those dealing with increased access are most likely to exhibit some change during this first stage of the program, as they are most subject to PAEM control—in that it addresses supply constraints through middle school construction and rehabilitation. In 2005, USAID reported that middle school enrolments increased by 28 percent, directly attributing the total regional increase to its construction and rehabilitation program. As noted earlier, this claim is misleading and calculating the program contributions in terms of increased middle school enrollment is more complex. In fact, PAEM data indicate in Academic Year 2004/2005 its schools enrolled a total of 6,507 students, which accounts for about 12 percent of total middle school enrollments (53,817[17]) in the three regions. However, this does not mean that PAEM has increased enrollments (i.e. new students added to the system) by this number, as (1) rehabilitated schools already existed and (2) even at new schools all but the entry grade (2,986) students are likely to be transfer students.[18] Using entry grade enrollment as proxy[19], PAEM had increased the number of middle school students in the regions by slightly than 6 percent. For Academic Year 2005/2006 (Table 7.1), PAEM schools enrolled a total of 8,471 students out of a regional total of 56,990, this time accounting for 14 percent of enrollments. New entry students (3,054) account for about 5 percent of regional enrollment, <u>but</u> account for 96 percent of the growth in regional enrollments from AY 2004/2005 and AY 2005/2006.

Overall the percentage of girls in PAEM schools less than the regional percentage. In AY 2005/2006, 32 percent of PAEM student were girls compared with 35 percent for the three regions. PAEM schools in

[16] Middle school entry grade students in 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 as a proportion of 2005/2006 total enrollment in the three regions. Also see footnote #4 below.
[17] Figure Cited in USAID 2005 Annual Report.
[18] As noted in Chapter 2, none of those interviewed were aware of a student that had dropped out of middle school or had stopped school after the primary cycle re-enrolling in PAEM schools. Anecdotal information indicate that virtually all students enrolled directly from primary school or had transferred from another middle school. PAEM has not collected on student status as newly enrolled, re-enrolled, or transfers from other schools.
[19] Arguably, only entry grade enrollment used be used only for newly constructed schools and not rehabilitated ones, but this data breakdown was not available, so the new student added numbers are likely to be over-estimated.

Kolda and Tambacounda fall below the girls' share of enrollments for the regions, by 3 and 5 percentage points respectively, while PAEM schools in Fatick surpassed it by 1 percentage point. However, it should be kept in mind that PAEM school serve particularly disadvantaged areas (poor and traditional), where girls' participation is extremely low, so it is to be expected that at this stage the girls' share in PAEM schools would fall below the regional averages (which are biased toward urban schools). Also hinting at a positive trend in PAEM schools is that the percentage of girls in the entry grade has risen from 32 percent in AY 2004/2005 to 35 percent in AY 2005/2006, and has increased in all three regions, suggesting that the demand for girls' education may be growing slightly.[20] Although unsubstantiated, anecdotal evidence derived from field interviews suggests that girls' (and boys') retention has increased.

Table 7.1 : PAEM school enrollment data for AY 2005/2006

Middle School Type	**Fatick**		**Kolda**		**Tamba counda**		Total for Regions	
AY 2004/2005	*Total*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Girls*
Newly constructed	636	285 (45%)	399	78 (20%)	559	162 (29%)	1,594	525 (33%)
Rehabilitated	1,502	593 (39%)	2,128	566 (27%)	1,283	339 (26%)	4,913	1,498 (30%)
Total PAEM	2,138	878 (41%)	2.527	644 (25%)	1,842	501 (27%)	6,507	2,023 (31%)
PAEM Entry Grade	786	299 (38%)	1,146	364 (32%)	1,054	285 (27%)	2,986	948 (32%)
Total regional students							53,817	18,489 (34%)
AY 2005/2006	*Total*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Girls*
Newly constructed	977	433 (44%)	1055	263 (25%)	837	243 (29%)	2,869	939 (33%)
Rehabilitated	1785	719 (40%)	2361	656 (28%)	1456	390 (27%)	5,602	1,765 (32%)
Total PAEM	2762	1152 42%)	3416	919 (27%)	2293	633 (28%)	8,471	2,704 (32%)
PAEM Entry Grade	1037	469 (45%)	1324	409 (31%)	693	183 (26%)	3,054	1,061 (35%)
Total regional students	21079	8671 (41%)	23273	6878 (30%)	12638	4176 (33%)	56,990	19,725 (35%)

Sources: USAID Annual Report 2005, PAEM data (6/2006), field visits

What works, what doesn't and what's missing to increase access?

The PAEM program is advantageously placed to have a major impact on the development of middle schooling, and educational development in general in Senegal. By focusing its program on middle school support, USAID has addressed a serious constraint to educational development in Senegal, long ignored by other donors. Unlike many countries in Africa, intervention in middle schooling offers a unique window of opportunity. The lack of available and accessible middle schools, particularly in rural areas, constitutes an often insurmountable constraint to families who want their children to continue their education. As educational participation increases at the primary level (at 83% GER in 2005), the blockage will increase. Reportedly, the low middle school GER (32%) is largely due to the lack of supply rather than demand at this point. Whereas many children will simply not pursue their schooling, others will have to wait until places open (exacerbating over-aged enrollment) or be forced to live away from home with the associated expense and risks (especially discouraging to girls.) Studies in other countries have shown that the absence of higher grade levels in primary school discourage enrollments in the lower grades. PAEM school communities—school staff, parents and students-- believe that the presence of the PAEM school has had a stimulating effect on not only the demand for middle schooling, but on the demand for primary schooling as well.

The creation of "colleges de proximite" is filling a critical gap by serving disadvantaged communities that normally stand last in the queue for schooling. These are the areas of the highest need (although not necessarily the greatest demand or influence.) The proximity of the PAEM schools is considered by school staff, parents and community members their most important attribute in increasing educational participation. The reduction of travel time and their ability to closely supervise their children

[20] Note that these figures have not been tested for statistical significance, and that AY 2005/2006 schools include both the first and second cohorts of schools.

(and protect their daughters) were universally cited by the parents interviewed as the critical factors in both attracting and keeping children in school, especially girls for whom threats to their safety posed by travel and living from home loom larges in parents' minds. That all but the entry grade during the first school year is made up of transfer student returning home is indicative of the effect of proximity. Moreover, the model that PAEM is developing is best suited to these rural communities, which are representative of the majority of communities in Senegal and where conventional models of schooling are least likely to apply. For example, unlike urban areas, rural communities—whose members are linked by kinship, shared history and culture-- are more amenable to mobilization and participation in schooling.

PAEM has developed a cost-effective and viable process and model for construction, but this appears to work best for new school construction. The need for classrooms and other facilities at rehabilitated schools has not been met, and to a certain extent appears to only increase the size of an existing school that was selected exactly because of its physical dysfunctionality.

PAEM may have been successful in leveraging community participation in initial school construction, but its community mobilization approach and program should be rethought. There is a lack of clarity about the objectives and purpose of its community mobilization program. Are community mobilization activities supposed to raise awareness, and awareness of what--education, middle schooling, girls' participation? Are they supposed to extract additional resources for schooling? Are they supposed to enable to the community to hold the school, educational authorities, and/or local governments accountable for inputs? Similar ambiguity exists about what is meant by community—is it parents, local groups, the CGE? While all the above may obtain, to be effective program activities must be designed to address specific objectives, produce specific results and be tailored for specific groups (or groups of individuals). Moreover, for expansion and sustainability reasons, the approach(es) must be amenable to implementation by the ME through its various field offices (IA, IDE, IVS, etc.) and fit within a reasonable resource envelop. This almost necessarily means that the Tostan approach as currently constituted is not going to be viable for replication.

Some progress has been made in addressing girls' education issues through PAEM activities, but more needs to be done.. PAEM carried out surveys in each region to determine the causes of girls dropping out which were then discussed at community and regional levels. Many communities carried out campaigns to promote girls education and combat early marriage. However, apart the Tostan community mobilization activities and perhaps the "girl-friendly" physical environment, PAEM needs to develop a more targeted strategy, approach or activity plan to deal directly with the issues facing girls in its school communities. Further groundwork is necessary to identify the specific obstacles and priority needs for girls in middle school and of middle school age. Tostan deals with a "canned" set of demand-side barriers that certainly impede girls' education (e.g. early marriage), but has not worked with the communities to empirically identify or deconstruct other demand-side problems so that they can be practically addressed (e.g how many girls need to be escorted to school). School personnel have little appreciation of either the problems facing girls in school and even less on how to remedy them. Although gender sensitization is included in the PAEM training modules there is little evidence that substantive and practical how-to training that can truly leverage change has taken place. This lack of action is also apparent at the policy level. Further action should also be taken on the more obvious and well-known issues surrounding girls' access to and retention in school. Although numerous girls' education policy analyses abound, no action has been planned or taken on some of the more obvious and notorious issues, such as school-girl pregnancy and female teacher recruitment. In fact, discussion with DEMSG members revealed a certain reluctance to pursue these issues. PAEM could be instrumental in developing a step-by-step approach to raising genuine concern and understanding at the MOE, and helping to formulate a girls' education policy framework.

Notably absent from the USAID education strategy is a focus on sound school management and the leadership role of the principal (apart from the pedagogical support he can provide teachers). PAEM has recognized this lacunae and has filled an important niche with the development of a

school operations manual, principal standards and norms, and leadership training. Soundly managed schools and principal development need to be put on the USAID and PAEM Results Framework and strategy map, so that clear objectives, results and approaches can be formulated. Currently, neither USAID not PAEM have developed any measures of good school management, apart from operational CGEs which are one possible means by which to improve management but not a measurable end result. School principals have an overwhelming job and underwhelming resources with which to do them. PAEM needs to develop a better support mechanism and the tools school principals need to act on what they have been taught,. particularly in areas such as monitoring and tracking information and what is happening in key areas (such as student achievement).

PAEM has not yet developed a program to guide the development of the Inspectorate of School Life (IVS). Not only is the IVS newly-created, the demands of the PAEM model are new. The IVS is essentially responsible for overseeing school management and principal support. Both tools and training are needed.

B. Teaching and learning Environment

Has learning improved?

Effectively determining what students have learned and mastered is a complex process and it is premature to expect any evidence of learning gains. Learning is scaffolded so that individual learning tasks are a part of progress of conceptual ideas that build upon one another. Deconstructing the individual learning tasks that contribute to an overall knowledge base and assessing whether or not a student has mastered this skill and "piece" of information, is very difficult. Therefore, it can take years to effectively measure if students have learned and can apply what they are taught. The PAEM project is in a very early stage of implementation in terms of being able to measure the impact on student achievement. Even if one doesn't take into consideration the length of time it takes to demonstrate student-level impact there is also the issue of the availability of reliable and valid instruments and procedures that can effectively measure what students know and can do.

Anecdotal evidence from conversations with teachers indicates students are performing better and understand what they are being taught. In most cases the frame of reference would be based on a very short period of time, however, since a significant percentage of teachers are teaching for the first time and large numbers of the student body are transferring in from the primary level or other schools. Teachers are able to compare student level of engagement and changes in their attitudes and behavior over the course of this current academic school year and many underscore the students are more engaged, appear more interested in their lessons, are making more of an effort to complete their homework assignments, come to school regularly and are on time. Although all these factors are not necessarily indicative of improved student learning, they do have an impact on and contribute to how students learn. Better monitoring of these contributing factors would provide an excellent platform to demonstrate the ways in which student behavior is changing. With proper training and the right tools, teachers and school principals would be able to analyze the information and identify ways in which these factors are influencing the academic performance of their students. This information can then be shared with parents, SMC members, etc. and used to develop plans to further support student level of engagement and academic performance.

Although there are proxies measures that can provide information about student performance and achievement PAEM has not established a basis for their use. Teacher-made tests are limited in the scope of what they can do—particularly with new and inadequately trained teachers—teacher made tests can be a measuring stick of what students have learned in a specific lesson or unit of studies. They can become a more useful tool when teachers are provided with specific training on how to develop a good test and when there is some kind of standard format and process used across the grade levels and by subject area. PAEM needs to consider strengthening teacher capacity to use performance based

continuous assessment procedures to monitor how both students and teachers are doing. This should include training and the development of materials and tools. Schools do not collect information on any consistent basis on what students are doing. There is also a considerable need to strengthen the capacity of teachers and school principals to analyze what the results are "telling them" and on ways to use this information to plan, make accommodations and remediation, etc. In particular, PAEM needs to work with school principals to more effectively collect and use information about grade progression and student attendance/tardiness.

The promotion rate is only valuable in as much as teachers are consistent in their decision-making, are basing promotion decisions on valid criteria and there is some level of comparability between what happens within a school, between schools, between regions, etc. This information will become increasingly more meaningful in the future as more cohorts of students progress through PAEM schools. Most of the newly constructed PAEM schools that completed the first full academic cycle did not have the data needed to provide any substantive information about student attendance, etc. There are no schools-level synthetic records of this (or any kind of performance information). Although teacher take attendance at the beginning of each class period, there was no evidence anything was done with the information—and in most schools it was unclear whether there was any master plan that captured the trends in attendance and tardiness—for students or school personnel. Developing procedures and making and using synthetic records of what is happening is something that PAEM needs to support in the next phase of project implementation.

In the long term, the only reliable measure of student assessment is a criterion-referenced student achievement test which is linked to the curriculum and is designed to measure individual student performance on discrete learning tasks. But the Ministry doesn't use this kind of test. Criterion-referenced tests are very expensive to develop, take a long time to develop—generally a minimum of two or more years---and are feasible only when a curriculum is well-defined and no longer being majorly revised. Instead the Ministry administers the BFEM which is an end of cycle test. It is not designed to provide discrete and disaggregated task-based/indicator specific analysis of student achievement and is limited in its usefulness to assess individual student performance. If USAID and PAEM are serious about gathering student-level impact, at the very least, they need to support the use of performance-based continuous assessment procedures and provide training and tools to ensure its use.

Are teachers teaching better?

Teachers and school principal both point to the critical role PAEM has played in leveraging positive relationships between teachers and their students. Teachers contribute in varied ways both in and out of school as a positive role model to their students, provide both academic and social enrichment and foster a positive relationship between the school and the communities and parents. The teachers have become an extremely powerful force in their small communities and have been able to have an immediate impact in a range of activities that go beyond the daily academic program at the schools.

Although both parents and the students claim their teachers are doing a good job they have a limited understanding of what teachers should be doing. Parents are also restricted in their knowledge of what goes on in the schools and classrooms and students are reticent to share with their parents the daily happenings at school. Ways to strengthening the communication channels with parents is something PAEM could do better so that information about the things they have done well can be used to leverage on-going change. PAEM also needs to help develop programs that teach parents how to support their child's learning in the home and how to work in partnership with the school and their children's' teachers.

What works, what doesn't, and what's missing to improve the teaching-learning environment?

PAEM has made a vital contribution in the overall support to teachers by promoting transversal pedagogy. This not only provides for a more efficient use of limited resources, it also places the primary emphasis on pedagogy rather than subject mastery. Unfortunately, despite the conceptual soundness of this approach, PAEM has been unable to leverage the political will to ensure effective and widespread implementation. PAEM needs to focus on creating a better foundation of support for the transversal pedagogy, provide mediums for exchange to sort out philosophical differences and identify logistical blockages and provide training, materials and tools to ensure key people have what they need to support and implement transversal pedagogy in their work. One of the most critical partners in this process is the PRF. They are under-resourced and under-staffed and are the ones who could most benefit from the widespread implementation of this approach.

Although PAEM has been instrumental in the development of teacher norms and standards they have no "meat" and lack any kind of measurable definition or identifying characteristics. USAID, PAEM and the Ministry need to consider how to pursue this as a tool to leverage improvements in teaching and learning. Research has shown there are three primary challenges when attempting to leverage change through norms and standards. One is that the definitions are based on images of what "good" teaching is which are not always commonly shared. Secondly, the factors that make teachers "good" can not always be identified let alone articulated. And third, there's little empirical evidence that even if one can define what makes a good teacher it is instrumental in improving teacher behavior---particularly of novice teachers. If all parties are committed to their use as a way to improve teaching and foster greater professionalism, the norms and standards need to be better clarified. If they are better articulated so they convey the professional qualifications of teachers and create a shared and public language of practice, they may become an effective vehicle to validate professional activity, hold teachers accountable, provide a framework for evaluation and serve as a tool for remediation or dismissal.

PAEM has not yet put in place a system to support teachers or students. There is no master plan to guide training and material development activities. Multiple factors contribute to the lack of overall cohesiveness and framework for what has been done and what remains to be done: there was no baseline or needs assessment to guide decision-making; the content of the teacher training that was provided was inappropriate to create change in teacher behavior because it was too academic, not grounded in the realities of the daily press of the classroom, and failed to provide sufficient follow-up support to teachers after the initial training. Little has been done to directly support student learning and participation in the classroom. One of the key SIRs, to develop life skills materials for the students, has done been done. Nor have the major studies been carried out to inform planners about the needs of middle school students particularly in reference to the transition from school to the work force. This is an area in which PAEM needs to focus more attention to ensure what is done is addressing high priority needs, can be effectively leveraged in the classroom and will lead to lasting change.

PAEM's plan to provide increased access to teaching and learning materials through ICT has failed to materialize. Teachers are being asked to perform innovative activities in their teaching but lack the materials they need to be able to implement them effectively. The PAEM training program targeted the less experienced teachers who, understandably, have the greatest need for didactic materials to support their teaching. One of the primary goals for introducing ICT into the schools was to provide a means for teachers (and students) to gain access to teaching and learning materials. The expectations of PAEM project designers, PAEM staff and the school personnel on the capacity of ICT to fill this gap are a considerable concern. Further exacerbating the failure of the ICT to meet this need, the Ministry has failed to provide schools with the required number of student or teacher textbooks. Even the existing supplies at rehabilitated or non-PAEM schools is woefully inadequate. The lack of teaching and learning materials is a high priority need and requires immediate attention. Alternative plans need to be explored to ensure schools, teachers and students have a minimum supplies of teaching and learning materials

including both teaching aids and textbooks. USAID needs to consider how to use conditionality to leverage a more timely and effective distribution of textbooks.

Neither PAEM or the Ministry has a structured system in place to assess what approaches and methods are working at the classroom level. Changes are being introduced and teachers are expected to implement them in their lessons yet there's no evidence they will work and no mechanism to gather information about what is happening at the classroom level to guide what needs to be modified or dropped altogether. A primary objective of PAEM was to introduce student-centered practices and create a more positive and supportive learning environment. Ironically, their own modules are neither student centered nor do they provide for a more supportive and positive learning environment. If the PAEM training program is to be successful, this demands a change in the way they implement their training.

C. Local Government and Community Participation in School Financing and Management

Are local governments and communities more involved in school financing and school management?

There is no evidence that local government budget allocations have increased, although both regional and rural councils have directed resources to middle schooling, and specifically PAEM schools in the latter case. These contributions have not yet been routinized. Communities have contributed resources to the schools in the form of construction inputs. Parents point to the payment of school fees as their on-going "contribution."

Only the CGE is placed to "officially" participate in school management, and its role thus far is limited to dealing with demand-side issues, community mobilization, school budget oversight, and general school improvement. Parents and individual community members have input into school management, only in so far as they are represented by the CGE members. Rather than participating in school management, local government and community members see approached for support rather than decisions.

What works, what doesn't, and what's missing in local government and community participation?

PAEM has successfully put in place and activated School Management Committees. Principals and SMC have received some training that has helped them better understand their roles and responsibilities. However, there is no clear evidence they are able to fulfill those roles any better nor are there many tools to provide guidance or detailed steps on how to carry out essential and on-going tasks. In theory, PAEM support should enable the school principals and SMC to do a better job but PAEM needs to improve the way they gather information and monitor what is happening to ensure things are properly structured and having the desired impact.

The approach to the "projet d'etablissment" is only partially developed and not thoroughly thought through, which could compromise its viability and dim community interest. Unrealistic expectations appear to have been raised at schools about the resources that will accompany the "projet." Some schools have complained that the "diagnostic" is too demanding; consideration must be given to the challenges schools face for implementation and reporting.

PAEM has not developed a program to develop the planning/financing capacity of the local governments and educational authorities in the regions. In its nearly exclusive focus on the school, PAEM has by-passed the regional and local levels. The claim that the "projet d'etablissement" is the first step in increasing local financing and management of the school is a dubious one. The "projet" is not a comprehensive planning model, and it is limited solely to the schools. Local governments and educational authorities can not use it for planning. To develop a bottom-up planning mechanism planning templates, protocols and schedules must be formulated, training, offered, and on-going support provided.

D. Overarching Issues

PAEM needs to do its homework. Because of the push for a quick start up and the consuming demands of construction, PAEM has designed several of its interventions and activities without proper baseline data and analysis. This means that they may be basing their activities on some flawed assumptions. For example, a major area of concern is teacher and principal training. Although only one module per group has been developed so far, they were based solely on the norms and standards of desired teacher and principal practice and behaviors without any significant attempt to determine to what extent teachers and principals in PAEM schools had already mastered certain competencies or what they were actually doing in the classroom or at the school. While the assumption that teachers and principals—primarily new ones—do need training in student motivation and leadership is probably sound, the approach of using norms and standards does not guarantee success for future modules. Other examples include community awareness, girls' education needs, ICT and local financing. While soliciting input and advice from ME partners and other knowledgeable persons is important and informative, it is not a substitute for situational and needs assessment studies. Too often, centrally-based personnel based their input on conventional wisdom, which may not always apply to the rural areas where PAEM is working. PAEM also needs to put in place some "reality-checking" mechanism, as it often appears to overestimate the capacity and political will of its partners and the resources needed. For example, in many cases the problems with utilities could have been anticipated. The result is that PAEM often has to engage in remedial activities, such as providing a template for the telephone service application.

Although there is an overall project template driving major activities, there does not appear to be a master plan that details the entire activity over the life of project. Much of PAEM's planning appears to be done on an ad hoc, as needed and rolling basis, in order to take advantage of windows of opportunity, accommodate inputs from its partners and/or respond to external requests. For example, a global teacher training plan should be in place now that specifies the training modules to be developed, their content and delivery schedule. An observed pattern is that PAEM start up activities, planning only for the initial first phase without the design being informed by consideration of the complexities and problems it will face at later stages. A good example is the "projet d'etablissement" for which PAEM has not yet determined—or even considered—how to deal with the inevitable problems of implementation (e.g. approval delays, time span of project, financing, etc.) A fully planned approach should have been developed at the outset.

PAEM needs to do some conceptual mapping that links the desired Results to activities it supports and takes into account all the other activities, inputs and consideration. Often the activities it has planned have only a tenuous link to the result: The development of a school improvement project is hardly sufficient to increase local government and community participation in school finance and management. Similarly, a fully-conceptualized plan should be thought out for girls, rather than on-off activities (including a little training in each module).Even if Tostan had been successful in raising awareness, PAEM has not acted to put in place the provisions to deal with increased presence of girls' in school. Utilization of a backward-mapping approach (or gannet charts) identifying the linkages and overlaps between everything being done to achieve specific tasks would be of considerable value.

Participation is not a substitute for planning. PAEM is notable for the high degree of participation it has engendered. It invites participation from a broad range of stakeholders. The "cercles de qualite" it has established are one of the few opportunity central-level ME staff and other education professionals have to explore and exchange ideas. On occasion, however, participation appears to impinge on planning, Ideas are acted upon or products delivered that may not have a direct or immediate relation to the project, but because they arose from a participatory process and to reject would be perceived as undermining local ownership and the participatory process. A specific example relates is found in the training modules. Planning does not obviate participation but does provide a framework. Vague articulation of project strategy and inputs makes it easy to be pushed off-target and appears to have contributed to the

reinvention of outputs, delay in meeting project target dates, and contributed to the overall mediocre quality of some deliverables.

PAEM has not yet addressed two critical areas that will affect the middle school model's viability and sustainability—policy and institutional development. The AED proposal links policy to quality, but attention must be paid to all the policies that impinge on or have implications for the model's future. Policy blockages are frequently invoked as constraints to PAEM implementation and/or effectiveness, but so far little has been done to address them. PAEM needs to have a better idea of the policies—large and small—that can impede expansion of the model on a larger scale, such as principal selection, vacataires, female teacher recruitment, teacher rationalization and deployment, in-service training, middle school quotas, etc. rather than tilt at multiple windmills, it should pick its priorities and develop a strategy and plan for addressing them. So far, it has invited various study proposals, but without a clear idea of the specific policies it wishes to address. Policy change—and the steps leading to it—take time, so it imperative that these issue be tackled soon.

PAEM attention and support has largely been focused at the school level, and much less at the various ME institutions that support middle schooling. Institutionalization of the model not only depends on the willingness of the various ME units to accept the model, but also their ability to support and implement it on a large scale. PAEM needs to make sure that it is including all the ME players in its activities and that it takes into account what they are doing (for example, the IGEN is developing student standards that should inform PAEM's training). At the central level, there needs to be a clear understanding of different units' roles and responsibilities and a plan developed to build their capacity. A few departments and units stand out, such as the DEMSG and the IVS, but other units should also be addressed.

E. Conclusions

It is too soon to determine whether the development hypotheses underlying the USAID middle school program hold true. But it is apparent that USAID is not only addressing an area of great need, but it is pioneering an approach to middle school education, a level that is assuming greater importance and priority in educational development throughout Africa. Because it is drawing on and applying many of the lessons learned from USAID's successful work in primary education, the middle school model it is developing holds tremendous promise that it will make an important contribution to increasing access, improving quality of teaching and learning, and fostering greater participation and accountability by communities and government.

A great deal of progress has been made within a short time in developing and implementing the middle school model, especially given the modest level of resources and personnel available. PAEM has been able to create an interest and awareness in a broad range of stakeholders, from the central to the school levels. It has introduced new ideas at all levels about governance, transparency and accountability and that schooling requires the involvement of government and community.

Despite its promise, PAEM is still at an early stage of implementation and must take care to address the issues that threaten all projects going to scale. To make the transition PAEM must focus on institutional and policy issues critical to sustainability. Even though three years remain in the development of this model, care must be taken to ensure that the model in predicated on considerations that will support its transition from a pilot project. This demands modifications to assure its broader effectiveness and applicability. Up until now, PAEM has spent considerable time and resources on the construction component of the project somewhat at the expense of the quality inputs. More needs to be done to ensure that PAEM schools are not only desirable in appearance but lead out in terms of the quality of teaching and student performance as well.

Currently, the PAEM project brings together a complex package of project activities that are loosely linked and vaguely defined. Because the scope of the project has been limited, PAEM has been able to effectively implement project outputs. However, as the project becomes larger the lack of definition could be highly problematic and risks doing three things that signal trouble: trying to do too much; being unclear about the direction in which they're going; and attempting to do things in too short a period of time.

Chapter 8: Lessons Learned and Recommendations

A. Lessons Learned

Primary lessons learned from the program are:

1. Proximity is the most significant factor in increasing student enrollment and participation. In some cases it has a direct impact on student performance. That there is a school that is accessible far exceeds whether the school looks good and offers other quality services.
2. Construction pushes all other program activities out of the way. Care must be taken to ensure the non-physical components of the project are not compromised or ignored in the press to build schools quickly.
3. Vacataires are not a liability. Their motivation and enthusiasm more than compensates for their lower education levels and lack of formal teacher training. The vacataires were more receptive to change and eager for new ideas and guidance and actually enjoy their students and teaching.
4. The principal is the prime driver of school development including school management, teacher motivation and support, CGE effectiveness and community participation. The most cost effective, practical and feasible means to improve the quality of teaching is by enhancing the capacity of the school principal to serve this role.
5. Community participation is a loosely defined concept often seen as the panacea for school finance shortfalls. In order to realize the myriad benefits of community participation, the actual players in the community and what they can do should be defined. Care has to be taken to formulate programs so that "ownership" does not exonerate government of its assigned responsibilities.
6. Participation is a double-edged sword. On one hand it promotes a knowledge base and constituency. But on the other hand it can push a project off-track and slows its momentum. Participation must be carefully managed and used judiciously.
7. Despite the years of dialogue around girls' education, do not assume that government policy makers are any more knowledgeable or supportive of girls education than the communities targeted for sensitization.

B. Recommendations

A detailed set of recommendations responding to the mission's request is appended in the annex. Key recommendations are presented below.

1. PAEM should maintain its focus in the three regions--adding/rehabilitating a second cohort of schools, continuing to support the first cohort of schools (through training, etc.), and developing the national and regional educational and governance systems to ensure sustainable support for Middle School expansion and improvement. Concentrating its efforts in the three regions will allow PAEM to build on the foundation and initiative it has already put in place. PAEM is more than a construction model; its approach calls for the collaboration and action of multiple partners (e.g. government, education authorities, collectivities) to ensure the delivery of quality education. Staying in the same regions will allow PAEM to more fully develop the systems required for on-going school support and to support its institutionalization. PAEM should also support/conduct a study on student enrollment in each of the target regions in order to determine school construction/rehabilitation needs and to better

understand the implications (e.g. number of classrooms to build) of enrollment growth patterns at the schools it has assisted.

2. PAEM should continue to focus its school construction and rehabilitation efforts in underserved rural areas in order to reach areas that are least likely to be served by the ME construction program. The community participation approach utilized by PAEM is best suited to cohesive smaller communities, rather than urban or peri-urban areas. The "écoles de proximité" is a model that is going to be able to serve the most number of communities and will have the greatest application throughout Senegal.

3. USAID should assist the Ministry to conduct a study and analysis of the number of disciplines that can be supported in the middle school curriculum, assessing the demand for teachers, specialized skill sets and other inputs in light of the resources available for Middle School.

4. The DEMCG should create a unit that is dedicated uniquely to middle school education, and is in charge of coordinating the policies and programs related to its development and delivery. PAEM should support the formulation of a plan for its development and respond to specific training needs. The Ministry should also undertake to expand the IVS at the central, regional and departmental levels and authorize the IDEN to support and work with middle schools.

5. PAEM's approach for school rehabilitation should be reformulated to reflect the reality that most school candidates for rehabilitation will, in fact, require extensive new construction. School rehabilitation should provide for sufficient classrooms to accommodate the student body and eliminate temporary shelters and include the construction of an administrative block, library, boundary wall, etc. (all the elements included in the new school construction model). This will reduce concerns about "écoles a deux vitesse" as well as place all schools on equal footing in developing according to the PAEM approach.

6. Selection criteria for school construction and rehabilitation should NOT be based on the availability or proximity of an electrical grid, access to water, or telephone coverage. These criteria would eliminate the communities that most need the "écoles de proximité." However, specific site selection with the community should maximize utility accessibility (e.g. the school sites should not be at the top of a hill). PAEM should explore and provide alternatives if a school's access to utilities is not possible in the short-term. These include solar power, generators, bore-hole wells, etc. temporary low-tech solution should also be suggested to the school (buckets for drinking and cleaning water placed in each classroom, etc.)

7. PAEM's community sensitization component (delivered by TOSTAN) should be redesigned to focus directly on education and the schools, rather than diffused across the sectors. Communities should be provided with concrete examples of how to plan for and support the school after the initial construction is completed. The model needs to train them in on-going needs assessment and planning. The model and associated materials and manuals should be developed so that it can be replicated by the education authorities (most likely by the IDEN), local government and associations (e.g. rural councils, GPF, ASC). IVS and IDEN need training so they can actively facilitate community support and participation. A checklist of measurable indicators to evaluate community participation and determine if they are meeting basic requirements and standards should be developed.

8. PAEM should develop a comprehensive approach to girls' education addressing policy and institutional issues as well as creating accessible and girls' friendly schools. This should include an orientation to senior-level Ministry officials on strategic planning to address gender issues and support girls' education, and to ensure that Ministry officials fully understand both the constraints and options for increasing girls' educational participation. PAEM should also work with the Ministry and

communities to promulgate a program to make schools more accessible for all students including students with special needs.

9. The Ministry with PAEM support should develop a "vacataire" policy and development program that address career path issues, incentive packages, deployment strategies, training approaches, etc. PAEM should support the Ministry to project resource needs (i.e. budget, planning and management) and the potential consequence of dealing with an increased number of "functionaries" (should "vacataires" intend to pursue a teaching career.) PAEM should help the government anticipate future "vacataire" union's demands and the government's response. PAEM should also support the Ministry to conduct a baseline study on middle school "vacataires"" in order to determine recruitment strategies, training needs, human resource development investment strategies, their long-term career goals and choices, their expected longevity at remote schools, etc.

10. PAEM should undertake with appropriate partners (e.g. IVS) a training needs assessment all teachers and school principals to support the development and delivery of the training program. Principals should be included in all the teacher training modules on pedagogy. In order to underscore and reinforce transversal pedagogy, a whole-school approach to training should be undertaken for select modules. All school personnel should be trained at the same time so that professional exchange, mentoring, peer coaching and a "circle of quality" approach is strengthened.

11. The IVS should develop, with PAEM support, an overall program (i.e. institutional scope of work) that defines the various components and elements of "la vie scolaire." This program should correspond to the norms and standards for school principals and also reflect applicable "texts" and regulations. A multi-year action plan for the elaboration of the various elements should be prepared. An iterative school management checklist and visit protocol should be developed for use by IVS (and its agents) to ensure the IVS are using the same standards and that schools are meeting all current management requirements.

12. The SOAG should include a condition that PAEM schools are supplied with a sufficient number of "manual scolaire" in each subject area which includes teacher manuals, program guides and student textbooks. The number of student textbooks should allow for effective sharing among the students and be no less favorable than the standard ratio as defined in the Ministry textbook policy (i.e. two students per textbook--2:1).
13. USAID should provide a standard package of teaching and learning aids to all PAEM schools. The quantity allocated to each school should be calibrated on the number of teachers and students enrolled in the school. The package should include generic teaching/learning materials as well as subject-specific materials. (A more detailed list of illustrative instructional materials is appended in the annex.)

14. USAID should assist the Ministry to identify blockages and to develop procedures and practices that enable the PRF to make regular and scheduled school visits. USAID support could provide a vehicle to each region. In order to guarantee that vehicles are used exclusively for official Ministry business, we strongly recommend the provision of pick-up trucks and/or motorcycles where appropriate. Provision of vehicles should be contingent on agreed upon reporting requirements and the development of specified products..

15. USAID should support the Ministry to explore how other donors can use PAEM training modules and materials to expand the training approach and pedagogy "transversal" to other regions.

16. PAEM should collaborate with Fastef to develop a complementary fast-track training program for "vacataires". The training should include a collection of step-by-step how-to guides on setting up a class at the beginning of the academic school year.

17. PAEM should develop a more detailed approach, set of activities, and process and output indicators for local financing and management. It—or some other designated USAID partner—should develop a program that addresses improved "local" government support of middle schooling, including planning, resource allocation, transparency, participation/consultation, and monitoring and evaluation. It should also support the development of an analytic concept paper that addresses middle school financing issues, constraints, and needs assessment at each level within the region, so that the resource landscape is known, planning and allocation processes identified, and even actual funding levels specified to serve as the basis of a component design. PAEM's program should be specifically aimed at improving planning (and financing) within the regions. It should include all three (known levels) of planning: (1) the school community, (2) the collectivity, and (3) the region. The program should work both vertically and horizontally, so that (1) each level's plan for middle school support informs and is reflected at the higher level and (2) the plan at each level is prepared based on collaboration between local government and the relevant educational authority.

18. The IVS, with PAEM support, should develop a checklist of measurable indicators (i.e. norms and standards) for determining the effectiveness of CGEs, based on discussion and feedback with the DEMCG, regional IVS, CGEs, and others relevant groups. They should be officially adopted and then be used to inform the CGE training program and materials provided to the CGE, as well as assessment and diagnostic criteria used by IVS or their agents during school visits. The norms should be shared with CGEs, principals, teachers and communities at large.

19. A detailed program for the "projet d'établissement" cycle—its development, activities, financing, management and assessment—should be fully developed. Agreement and procedures need to be developed with the IAs to establish "projet d'établissement" assessment criteria, approval timelines, and communication protocols with the CGEs. In addition, PAEM should re-examine CGE understanding of "projet d'établissement" to ensure that it is not limiting the scope of activities that could be undertaken for school improvement or lead to reliance on outside financing.

20. USAID should revisit and re-emphasize its understanding with the Ministry that while it (USAID) seeks to expand middle schooling through PAEM, it also aims at supporting the Ministry to develop a viable approach or model for middle school education that will be adopted by the Ministry and used throughout Senegal.

21. As it enters the second phase of the project, PAEM should cultivate a "big picture" perspective that includes working with the Ministry and other partners on policy and institutionalization issues, in order to ensure model adoption and sustainability. PAEM may wish to convene a meeting of all its partners to develop a policy matrix and action plan to ensure that these issues are being addressed at all levels. It may also wish to engage international technical assistance to support this exercise.

22. PAEM needs more staff. In particular they should consider adding a deputy director (local or international) to deal with the administrative, financial and logistical aspects of the program.

23. PAEM should develop a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan. The tabular PMP is not sufficient. PAEM should establish baselines for all the areas of project intervention: students, teachers, principals, CGE, CPE, etc. PAEM should develop a list of research or analytic studies that are required.

ANNEXES

MID-TERM ASSESSMENT OF THE MIDDLE BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

Annex 1: Scope of Work

ATTACHMENT 1: WORK STATEMENT FOR MID-TERM ASSESSMENT OF THE MIDDLE BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

Purpose of the proposed assessment:

The purpose of this mid-term assessment is to review program progress to date and identify areas for improvements that will facilitate the attainment of planned results as well as guide the Ministry of Education and USAID in developing a program for supplemental basic education funds. Representatives from USAID and the Ministry of Education will participate in the assessment to ensure that the findings and recommendations are based on an accurate understanding of the program.

Background

As part of the current strategic plan for Senegal, USAID supports the efforts of the GOS in the education sector to ensure that all children receive at least 10 years of basic education in order to build the human resource base that the country needs to reduce poverty, create jobs, and enable the meaningful participation of more Senegalese women in the global economy.

Begun in FY 2003 and originally scheduled to span six years, the USAID program specifically targets increasing access to middle school education in Senegal. It seeks to improve the quality of middle school education and make it more accessible, especially for girls. To achieve this objective, USAID constructs new schools in remote rural areas in three underserved regions of Senegal: Fatick, Kolda and Tambacounda; renovates and/or expands existing schools; supports improved training programs for teachers, principals, and directors in middle schools; encourages the participation of local communities and governments in managing and financing their middle schools; and provides school textbooks and learning materials. A new Mission Strategic Statement is expected to be approved by the Bureau in early 2006. The Mission intends to phase out the existing Strategic Objective and launch the new education program beginning in May 2006. The Education Program to be approved under the Strategic Statement will run from May 2006 through 2011. It is expected that the current cooperative agreements will continue implementation under the current strategy. The Mission may also want to consider amending one of these agreements to extend beyond the current PACD of January 2008. The current education program was developed based on an assumption that the Mission would receive approximately $4.3 million per year in basic education funds. In FY 06, the Mission is likely to receive a total of $13 million.

The Strategic Objective is: *Increased Access to, and Improved Quality of, Middle Basic Education, Especially For Girls*. It is assumed that the achievement of the three following intermediate results will lead to the attainment of the objective.

1. Increased physical capacity of middle schools: Efforts to build and equip new middle schools and renovate existing ones will significantly contribute to increasing the availability of classrooms for more students. Mentoring and scholarship programs for girls, in addition to awareness raising activities and social mobilization will complement these efforts to expand access to middle school education.

2. Improved teaching and learning environment in middle schools: To create a favorable learning environment while increasing the relevance of the curriculum, the program will:
    a. provide more books, teaching tools, visual aids, and other teaching materials;
    b. foster new skills and teaching practices like the use of simple home-made instructional materials and techniques for teaching science in poor rural settings;

c. provide computers and training in the use of new information and communication technology (ICT);
d. develop agreed-upon standards for school directors and put in place a training program to meet these standards;
e. provide refresher type courses in conjunction with the teacher training centers within regional schools and academic inspection offices;
f. introduce life skills modules (HIV/AIDS, hygiene, civic responsibility) into the curriculum;
g. provide in-service training for Directors of both public and private middle schools;
h. assist the Directorate for Middle School and General Secondary Education, in consultation with the private sector representatives, in the creation of performance evaluation tools, and the definition of new curricula and basic sets of skills expected of teachers and graduates.

3. Increased participation of local governments and communities in education management and financing: Local communities and governments are involved in school affairs through the establishment of school management and Education committees. The school management committee members and school staff are trained in preparing, executing, and monitoring the performance of a viable school model. The community, in turn, is trained in raising funds, initiating voluntary activities, and mobilizing resources in support of education. The school business plan is utilized to introduce and implement a decentralized planning system. There is hope that transparency of the budget process will encourage local businesses, civil society and the local community to join in partnership alliances in support of their schools.

In August 2003, USAID awarded a cooperative agreement to the Academy for Educational Development (AED) as the prime technical assistance partner of the program. AED's key partners include the Directorate of General Middle School and Secondary Education (DEMSG) in the Ministry of Education, the Research Triangle Institute (RTI), the Mississippi Consortium for International Development (MCID), Tostan, and the Fondation Paul Guerin Lajoie.

The program (referred to as PAEM) encompasses Children's Learning Access Sustained in Senegal (CLASS) and Senegal's Improved Teacher Training (SITT) Cooperative Agreements. PAEM is organized under the following four components: Access and Participation, Policy and Educational Quality, Decentralization and Community management, and Monitoring and Evaluation. Each of these components is then comprised of several sub-components as shown by Table below.

COMPONENTS	KEY SUB-COMPONENTS	KEY PARTNERS	Coop. Ag.
Access and Participation	School construction and renovation	DEMSG and DCES/regional CTRs	CLASS
	Community Mobilization/participation	TOSTAN	
	Keeping girls in school	DEMSG	CLASS/SITT
Policy and Educational quality	Formulation and better organizational capacity (conferences, quality circle , pedagogic innovations, capacity building)	DEMSG	CLASS
	Improvement of teaching and	Paul Gerin Lajoie	SITT

	learning environment		
Decentralization and Community management	Awareness raising on decentralization, middle school reform, etc		CLASS
	Capacity building of support units and school management councils		CLASS/SITT
	Development and implementation of school improvement plans	TOSTAN	CLASS
Monitoring and Evaluation	Development of a Performance Monitoring Plan		CLASS/SITT
	Data collection and reporting	TOSTAN,	

To date, the USAID program has contributed to increasing the number of middle schools in the three regions by building, renovating and equipping 26 middle schools in rural areas in partnership with local communities. Each of these new schools is fenced in and includes four classrooms, a library, a science laboratory and a computer room with Internet connectivity, a principal's office and a room for teachers, in addition to separate bathrooms for boys and girls. Conveniently located within walking distance (two kilometers) from the homes of students, the newly-built schools provide an opportunity for students to stay in their home environment while benefiting from improved, modern learning conditions. As a result, there has been an increase of over 28% in enrollment in the regions assisted by USAID, especially among school girls.

By supporting GOS training programs for teachers and principals in public and private middle schools, and by providing school textbooks and learning materials, USAID seeks to improve the quality of the teaching and learning environment in the targeted regions. Equally important is the commitment and sense of ownership demonstrated by the local communities that have established and started operating management committees to help local governments assume their responsibilities for supporting the local schools.

Recognizing the importance of leveraging additional resources through alliances with the public and private sectors, USAID has also developed two partnership agreements. Under a Global Development Alliance (GDA) with SONATEL, Senegal's major telecommunications company, 100 scholarships were awarded in 2005 to high school girls from socio-economically disadvantaged families in the three targeted regions. The second GDA agreement with Microsoft

It should also be noted that an in-house assessment of the teacher training component will be undertaken in March – April, 2006 by AED, the implementing partner. USAID and the GOS are expected to participate in the in-house assessment whose results should feed into the overall education program assessment.

Information sources:

The Assessment Team shall familiarize itself with USAID and GOS program documentation. USAID/Senegal will ensure that all relevant documents are available to the Team prior to the field work. The documents will include, but not be limited to:

- Education Sector Study undertaken by LTA
- Education concept papers drafted in 2005

- Education Strategic Objective Grant Agreement (SOAG)
- "Plan Décennal de l'Education et de la Formation" (PDEF)
- Cooperative Agreement Program Descriptions
- USAID and TA performance monitoring plans
- TA annual work plans;
- Quarterly and semi-annual progress reports
- Terms of Reference for the March/February Assessment of the Teacher Training Component.
- Final Report of the above assessment.
- Quality Improvements in Primary Schools, Community School Alliances Community Participation Baseline Assessment.
- Best Practices Document – Community School Alliance - Ghana
- Other documents, as required.

Objectives:

The two primary objectives of this assessment are to:

(1) Conduct an assessment of USAID-funded Middle School Basic Education Program over the past 3 years to assess:

(a) Whether the program is achieving expected results;
(b) The results framework and whether revisions are required to better capture improvements in quality, community participation, and access to education;
(c) The effectiveness of current implementation approaches and how they might be improved upon;
(d) The extent to which the participation, management, and oversight provided by local governments, school management committees and PTAs are effective;
(e) The extent to which the implementation of activities has fostered equity and improved education quality in the targeted geographic areas.
(f) The extent to which the program has been effectively coordinated with other donors when appropriate.

(2) Generate information and recommendations to guide the GOS and USAID in programming supplemental resources. USAID and the GOS have had several discussions on the subject of the future education strategy which is captured in the Mission's Strategic Statement. In order to assist both governments in further fleshing out the new five year program the assessment should address the followings questions:

(a) What results should be pursued with the additional resources?
(b) Should the Mission expand into additional regions or work in selected urban areas?
(c) How can the program best address transparency and accountability issues in the education sector? To what extent might these issues be addressed through a more genuinely decentralized education system?
(d) Are there any other program components such as policy reform, curriculum reform,etc, that should be included?
(e) Should the Mission expand its Islamic education program? If so, and to what extent?

Findings, recommendations and lessons learned from the proposed assessment will inform decision making by USAID/Senegal, the Government of Senegal Ministry of Education (GOS/MOE), implementing partners, and customers in further implementing the Middle Basic Education Program.

Scope of Work:

Required tasks and illustrative work plan
Over the course of the assessment the evaluation team shall work on the following tasks:

Tasks	Dates/Timeframe
Assessment Team Meeting to discus methodology, action plan, roles & resp	May 8, 2006
Literature Review	May 9-10, 2006
1- 2 day workshop with GOS, USAID, and implementing partner representatives to discuss methodology for assessment, questionnaires and field work approach.	May 11-12
Final work plan submitted	May 15
Field travel; Field work performed.	May 17-27
Stakeholders' workshop (presentation of preliminary findings/recommendations)	May 29-30
First full draft assessment report submitted – US team depart Senegal	June 8
USAID/Senegal and GOS provide feedback on draft report	June 15
US team leader incorporates feedback/comments, submits final report to USAID/Senegal	NLT June 23, 2006

Methodology of the assignment
The assessment team shall review all relevant documents including those listed in the background section. Since this is a participatory evaluation the consultants will lead a team of representatives from USAID, the MOE, and the grantee to undertake the field work in each of the three regions. For this purpose the consultants will prepare, based on the issues to be investigated below, a set of questions to be asked by each team in a given region. It is anticipated that observation of classrooms sessions may be conducted. This team will also be involved in working with the consultants to identify relevant recommendations. The consultants have the overall responsibility for facilitating the meetings and drafting the final report.

For each region, assessment teams led by the consultants, will visit a sample of schools Each team will also meet with education officials at the regional and departmental level, as well as with local government entities. Some of the stakeholders to be interviewed include local administrative officials in targeted localities; regional and departmental school inspection officials; partner school principals and teachers; members of school management committees; education committee members; students in assisted schools; and members of local communities, including Koranic schools businesses, and civil society. A list of relevant stakeholders per region, including the names of organizations, contact persons and the schedule of field visits and interviews will be provided. If deemed necessary, a sample of stakeholders will be selected depending on the type of organizations (e.g. business, civil society,etc.). Once data are gathered and analysis completed, the team will proceed to prepare its findings, conclusions, and recommendations for an action plan.

Issues to be investigated
The assessment team will be required to address specific program issues including, but not limited to:

Increased Access and Participation:

- Are the methods for increasing access currently employed by the program effective? Have these increased in increased enrollment rates and retention rates for girls? Are there other key constraints to access which the program is not addressing?
- What should be done to further increase access and participation?
- Which type of activity has been more cost effective in terms of increasing access: construction of new structures or rehabilitation of existing classrooms?
- How does the program measure the extent of community participation? Are there other indicators that should be utilized?
- Has the GOS provided an adequate number and the right mix of teachers to staff newly built schools? Is there a problem with shortages of teachers in other areas of the three regions in which USAID operates?

Policy and Educational Quality

- What policy issues has the program addressed? What has been the effect?
- Are there other policy issues that should be addressed? If so, what are they?
- Is the program supporting revisions to the curriculum? Is this an appropriate focus?
- To what extent has the MOE's capacity to design, manage, and monitor similar activities been developed?
- Should part of the future policy reform program include measures to increase the percentage of female teachers (currently only 16% nationwide)? What measures might be taken to address this in the future.
- Are any policy reforms needed to increase transparency and accountability in the education system?
- Have adequate measures been taken by the GOS or the program to: (1) make the curriculum more relevant; (2) reduce the number of subjects; (3) increase the number of subjects taught by individual teachers?

Increased Participation of Local Governments and communities in Education Management and Financing

- What kind of training has been provided to locally elected officials?
- Is the program approach for increasing community participation in education effective?
- Are schools being managed in a transparent manner? What mechanisms are in place to encourage transparency?
- Have communities attempted to raise education issues with local authorities (either district education offices or CR)? Have their issues been addressed?
- Have community organizations such as PTAs, School Management Committeers, etc, initiated activities in support of their schools?
- Is the current approach for fostering community participation and management effective?
- What are the key factors that contribute to successful community involvement?
- How can project activities be improved to better support community participation?
- To what extent has the program supported genuine decentralization and how?

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Are there systems in place to measure the impact of teacher training?
- In case such systems exist, do they capture improved teaching in the classroom?
- Are there adequate monitoring systems in place to capture changes in community participation?
- What have been the key challenges in this area
- Is there a system for accurately assessing increases in access in the three regions?

- Has the program been effective in building the skills of education professionals to monitor the impact of program activities?
- Has program progress reporting been complied with?
- How is community participation in their schools measured?

Program Management

- Does the implementing partner have sufficient staff resources to effectively manage the program?
- Has the MOE provided sufficient staff resources to effectively support implementation of the program?
- Has the technical assistance worked effectively with the MOE at all levels?
- Have the roles and responsibilities of the MOE and technical assistance been adequately addressed and specified?
- Has USAID provided effective management and oversight?

Cross-cutting issues

The original assumptions (hypothesis) are that : (a) collaboration is effective between education sector partners and donors; (b) community involvement leads to ownership; (c) community involvement stimulates demand for girls' education; (d) trained/skilled local elected officials perform better than non-trained officials in carrying out the education responsibilities transferred to them under the decentralization law; (e) more middle schools near students' homes encourage girls' retention in schools; (f) D/G and Education Strategic Objectives mutually reinforce their activities; (g) an SO steering committee is established and is operational; (h) the network of relationships from the school level up to MOE is effective; (i) enhanced regional capacities result in quality education development plans; and firm budgetary and administrative commitments between the region, its schools, and the central government.

- Has the program been equally effective in all of the three regions in terms of increasing community participation? If there are differences, what accounts for the differences?
- Are the above hypothesis still valid?
- Should some of the original assumptions be modified? Are all key hypothesis included in the above list? If not, which ones need to be added?
- Do the selected components include the right mix of interventions?
- To what extent has the program effectively complemented other donor initiatives/other development partner activities?
- Have there been any significant differences among the three regions in terms of the implementation of various program components?
- What are the lessons learned for other USAID programs or development partners?

Deliverables

The Assessment Team shall provide the USAID Education Team Leader with:

1. a work plan including a proposal for data collection;
2. a draft assessment report; and
3. a final assessment report.

Prior to drafting the assessment report, the Assessment Team Leader shall submit his/her suggested outline for USAID/Senegal's approval. It is expected that the main body (sections INTRODUCTION through LESSONS LEARNED) of the final assessment report will not exceed 40 pages. The report shall include the following sections:

1. Acknowledgement

2. Acronyms list
3. Executive Summary
4. Table of contents
5. Introduction
6. Background
7. Purpose and Methodology of the Assessment
8. Findings (about management/implementation, achievements, etc.)
9. Analysis
10. Conclusions
11. Recommendations
12. Lessons learned
13. Bibliography
14. Annexes (terms of reference/scope of work; organizations contacted; a discussion of the methodology and data collection tools, etc.)

The Assessment Team Leader shall submit all draft documents to the Education Team Leader at USAID/Senegal. The documents shall be in English in electronic format (E-mail or disk in Microsoft Word). If delivered by e-mail, the documents should be sent to Education Team Leader (psow@usaid.gov) for review and feedback. The Education Team Leader will work closely with the steering committee and provide comments to the Assessment Team Leader as specified in the finally approved work plan. The Assessment Team Leader shall incorporate USAID's comments and submit final electronic documents, as well as printed and bound copies (including five copies in English and 5 copies in French) within the specified timeframe. The Evaluation Team Leader shall also submit one electronic or hard copy of the final assessment report to the Development Experience Clearinghouse at HTTP://WWW.DEC.ORG/SUBMIT.CFM or 8403 Colesville Road, Suite 210, Silver Spring, MD 20910, USA.

Debriefing meetings will be held at periodic intervals during the time of the assessment work. In these meetings, the Assessment Team Leader will present preliminary findings and recommendations to Mission staff and the Education Steering Committee. At a debriefing meeting following the initial assessment, USAID/Senegal will provide initial feedback.

Required Personnel

Assessment Team
It is proposed that the Assessment Team be comprised of two international consultants, two local consultants, USAID and GOS representatives, and implementing partner representatives.

Team Leader

Responsibilities:
He/she will be responsible for coordinating the participation of GOS, USAID and implementing partner representatives on the assessment teams. In this capacity, he/she will manage, coordinate, write assignments and prepare fieldwork and briefings. He/she will ensure that the study work is completed on schedule and will ensure the quality of English translation of final report. Working in conjunction with other team members, he/she will be responsible for analysis of the data and lessons learned and recommendation aspect of the data collection system.

The team leader will be responsible for facilitating the two workshops with GOS, USAID, and Implementing Partner representatives before and after the field work is conducted.

Working with other team members, he/she will be also responsible for assessing the appropriateness of buildings from a gender and other relevant perspectives (availability of running water, electricity, etc), the quality of education, including pedagogical aspects, enrollment and retention of girls and identifying possible activities for new programming

Incumbent should be an expatriate.

Qualifications:
* Proven Team Leader experience.
* Minimum of 10 years experience working in basic education sector in Africa, including designing, assessing and evaluating basic education programs
* Excellent spoken French .
* English language capabilities.
* Master degree in Education or relevant field.
* Typing and word processing skills.

2. Institutional development/Transparency and Accountability Specialist

Responsibilities:
Working with the other members of the contract team, he/she will be responsible for assessing governance issues in education, including transparency and accountability in financing and managing education; institutional arrangements within the Ministry of education, including working relations between the implementing partners agency and the Ministry of education staff. He/She will be also responsible for assessing education decentralization, looking at such aspects as leadership of local governments in education management and planning, institutional arrangements and effectiveness of collaboration with local governments, GOS relevant technical services and other partners for program implementation at field level. He/She will lead one of the field survey teams comprised of USAID, GOS and implementing partner representatives.

Qualifications:
* Minimum of 10 years experience working on institutional, and transparency and accountability in social sectors
* Basic education programs assessment and evaluation experience.
* Excellent spoken French skills.
* Master's degree in political economy, organizational development, or a relevant field.
* Typing and word processing skills.
* Typing and word processing skills.

Incumbent should be an expatriate.

3. Community participation/Girls education specialist

Responsibilities:
Working in conjunction with other team members, he/she will be responsible for assessing and analyzing community participation to education financing and management, including local governments, community-based organizations. The incumbent will be responsible for assessing all aspects related to girl education, including the effectiveness of activities and initiatives within and outside the schools to increase girl's enrollment and retention. To the extent that there is time and opportunity, he/she will be responsible for learning what kinds of koranic schools are active in project regions and the extent to which government education institutions are providing

support to these institutions. This information could contribution to the GOS's ongoing policy dialogue on the reform of Koranic schools as well as help programming new funding under the education program. The consultant will lead one of the field survey teams comprised of USAID, GOS and implementing partner representatives

Qualifications:
*A minimum of 7 years of experience working on community participation in education and girls' education, including designing, assessing and evaluating basic education programs with girls education component. Proven experience in non formal education program evaluation, including Koranic school is highly desirable.
* At least a Master's degree in education field.

Education Policy Specialist

Responsibilities. This consultant will be responsible for reviewing the policy reform component of the education program to determine to what extent the program has effectively addressed key policy issues. The consultant will also review relevant education policy in Senegal when pertinent to key implementation issues. The consultant will be responsible for reviewing the manner in which USAID and the implementation partner have collaborated with the MOE and the extent to which there has been effective collaboration with other donors.

Qualifications:
*A minimum of 7 years of experience working on education policy and organization issues. Experience conducting policy analysis and evaluations is a plus.
* At least a Master's degree in a field related to education.

Each consultant will lead a field research team comprised of USAID, the GOS and implementing partner's representatives.

PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The period of performance is scheduled to begin o/around May 8, 2006 for approximately one month. The final report shall be submitted no later than June 23, 2006.

Logistical support

The assignment is based in Dakar, Senegal, with travel expected for field visits to projects. USAID will provide office space and access to office equipment (printer, copier, fax, telephone) for the consultant's use. Local transportation for field visits will be provided by USAID. Mission staff will assist with scheduling meetings and appointments with implementing partners and other key informants.

The contractor team leader will be required cover the per diem of up to 4 GOS representatives over a period of up to ten days to enable them to participate in the field visits.

Annex 2: References

DOCUMENTS

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Addae-Boahene, A. & Arkorful, K. (January 2003). *Improving Quality Education Through Community Participation: SMC/PTA Resource Handbook.* EDC: Accra, Ghana.

Addae-Boahene, A. & Arkorful, Kingsley. (January 2001). *Improving Quality Education Through Community Participation: Resource Handbook.* EDC: Accra, Ghana.

Boahene, A., Arkorful, K. (October 1999). *Community School Alliances: Improving Quality Education Through Community Participation Best Practices Baseline Assessment*. EDC: Accra, Ghana.

DEMOGRACY AND GOVERNANCE

Chapman, D. (November 2002). *Sectoral Perspectives on Corruption and the Education Sector*. MSI: Washington, DC.

EVALUATION

Schuman, S., Cecilienne, L., Sow, P. (4 mai 2006). *Rapport préliminaire : Evaluation Interne Projet SITT Composante qualité*. USAID : Dakar, Senegal.

Ndiaye, B., Sakho, B., Diaham, M., Sarr, J. (2006). *Projet de Rapport Sur le Suivi Evaluation des Formations des Enseignants Dispenses Dans Les Régions de Tambacounda, Fatick et de Kolda.* USAID : Dakar, Senegal.

GOVERNMENT OF SENEGAL

Diagne, A. (18 avril 2006). *Programme Décennal de l'Education et de la Formation (PDEF). Rapport économique et financier 2005.* Ministère de l'Education: Dakar, Sénégal.

Ministère de l'Education. (25 juin 2005). *Décennal de l'Education et de la Formation (PDEF). Plan d'Action de la Deuxième Phase2005-2007.* Ministère de l'Education : Dakar, Sénégal.

Ministère de l'Education. (Provisoire juin 2005). *Gestion de la Qualité de l'Education et de la Formation dans la Deuxième Phase Du PDEF*. Ministère de l'Education : Dakar, Sénégal.

Ministère de l'Education. (juin 2003). *Suivi Pas à Pas des Dépenses d'Education*. Ministère de l'Education : Dakar, Sénégal.

Ndour, I. (avril 2006). *Rapport d'Etape Sur la Formation des Membres de CGE Par le PAEM*. Ministère de l'Education : Dakar, Sénégal.

Ndour, I. (décembre 2005). *La Mobilisation Communautaire Autour Des Collèges de Proximité : L'Expérience du PAEM*. Ministère de l'Education : Dakar, Sénégal.

République du Sénégal. (juillet 2004). *Lettre de Politique Générale Pour le Secteur de l'Education et de la Formation.* République du Sénégal: Dakar, Sénégal.

République du Sénégal. (février 2000*). Lettre de Politique Générale Pour le Secteur de l'Education et de la Formation*. République du Sénégal: Dakar, Sénégal.

PAEM/CLASSE
PAEM/CLASSE, Ministry of Education. (2006). *Décentralisation de L'Enseignement Moyen Au Sénégal.* AED : Dakar, Sénégal.

PAEM/CLASSE, Ministry of Education. (novembre 2005). *Pré-Rapport des Ateliers Régionaux de Consolidation des Diagnostics de la Structure de Mise En Oeuvre du PDEF*. AED: Dakar, Sénégal.

PAEM/CLASSE SITT QUARTERLY REPORTS
AED. (October 31, 2005). *Quarterly Report. July 1 to September 31, 2005*. AED: Dakar, Senegal

AED. (April 30, 2005.) *Quarterly Report January 11 to March 31, 2005.* AED: Dakar, Senegal

AED. (January 31, 2005.) *Quarterly Report October 1 to December 31, 2004.* AED: Dakar, Senegal.

AED. (October, 31, 2004). *Projet d'Appui a l'Enseignement Moyen (PAEM) Children's Learning Access Sustained in Senegal (CLASS) and Senegal's Improved Teacher Training (SITT).* AED. Dakar, Senegal.

PAEM/CLASSE SITT WORK PLAN
AED. (August 5, 2005). *Work Plan Year 3 October 1, 2005 to Septermber 30, 2006*. AED: Dakar, Senegal.

AED. (August 31, 2004). *Projet d'Appui a l'Enseignement Moyen (PAEM) Children's Learning Access Sustained in Senegal (CLASS) and Senegal's Improved Teacher Training (SITT) Work Plan—Year 2 October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005.* AED: Dakar, Senegal.

AED. (January 26, 2004). *Senegal's Improved Teacher Training SITT: Work Plan--Year 1.* AED: Dakar, Senegal.

AED. (September 29, 2003).*Projet d'Appui a l'Enseignement Moyen: Children's Learning Access Sustained in Senegal Work Plan—Year 1 October 2003 to September 2004*. AED: Dakar, Senegal.

PAEM/CLASSE TRAINING MATERIALS
PAEM/CLASSE. (janvier, 2006). *Cahier du Membre de CGE: Module 1. Version Provisoire.* AED: Dakar, Sénégal.

PAEM/CLASSE. (janvier, 2006). *Guide du Facilitateur de CGE: Module 1. Version Provisoire.* AED: Dakar, Sénégal.

PAEM/CLASSE. (janvier, 2006). *Documents Support Pour le GCE: Module 2. Version Provisoire*. AED: Dakar, Sénégal.

PAEM/CLASSE. (janvier, 2006). *Guide du Facilitateur de CGE: Module 2. Version Provisoire.* AED: Dakar, Sénégal.

PAEM/CLASSE. (janvier, 2006). *Documents Support Pour le CEM: Module 2*. AED: Dakar, Sénégal.

PAEM/CLASSE. (janvier, 2006). *Fiches d'Evaluation: Module 2. Version Provisoire.* AED: Dakar, Sénégal.

PAEM/CLASSE. (décembre, 2005). *Motivation Des Elevés Formation Des Professeurs De Collège: Cahier du stagiaire*. AED: Dakar, Sénégal.

PAEM /CLASSE. (décembre, 2005). *Le Leadership: Guide de Formation Chefs d'Etablissements.* AED: Dakar, Sénégal.

Sénégal Ministère de l' Education & PAEM /CLASSE. (décembre, 2004). *Le Guide Du Chef D'Etablissement*. AED: Dakar, Sénégal.

PROPOSAL

AED, RTI, Mississippi Consortium for International Development & DEMSG. (July 9, 2003). *Children's Learning Access Sustained in Senegal: Projet d'Appui a L'Enseignement Moyen CLASSE/PAEM.* AED: Washington, DC.

AED, RTI, Mississippi Consortium for International Development & DEMSG. (May 21, 2003). *Children's Learning Access Sustained in Senegal: Projet d'Appui a L'Enseignement Moyen CLASSE/PAEM.* AED: Washington, DC.

Truong, L., Gilbert, L., Sow, M., Sy, B., Ngom, A. (June 2002). *Proposal for a USAID Program to Support Basic Education in Senegal*. L.T. Associates, Inc.: Washington, DC.

USAID

USAID/Senegal. (Draft 2006). *Strategy Statement: USAID/Senegal.* USAID: Dakar, Senegal.

USAID/Senegal. (Draft 2006). *Education Results Framework.* USAID: Dakar, Senegal.

USAID/Senegal. (January 05, 2006). *Annual Report FY 2006.* USAID: Dakar, Senegal.

USAID/Senegal. (2003). *Education Results Framework.* USAID: Dakar, Senegal.

USAID/Senegal.. *Country Strategic Plan 1998-2006*. USAID: Dakar, Senegal.

Sellar, S. (August 1997). *The Political Climate and Will in Senegal for Political and Economic Reform: Final Report.* USAID: Dakar, Senegal.

USAID/Senegal. (30 juin 2003). *SOAG: The Children's Learning Access Sustained In Senegal (CLASS) Program.* USAID: Dakar, Senegal.

DVDs

PAEM/CLASSE. (2005). *La Pertinence des Collèges du Proximité* : DVD. AED: Dakar, Sénégal.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATIONS

Hart, L. (2006). *Overview: Governance, Accountability and Corruption.* USAID Office of Democracy and Governance, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA)

Hart, L. (2006). *Governance in Senegal.* USAID Office of Democracy and Governance, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA)

Hart, L (2006). *Sectoral Vulnerabilities.* USAID Office of Democracy and Governance, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA)

Hart, L (2006). *Strategies and Tools.* USAID Office of Democracy and Governance, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA)

Hart, L (2006). Indicators. USAID Office of Democracy and Governance, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA)

Hart, L. (2006). *Managing Mainstreaming.* USAID Office of Democracy and Governance, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA)

WEBSITES

http://www.education.gouv.sn/ Senegal Ministry of Education

http://www.ieq.org IEQ I & II

http://www.usaid.gov/educ_training/abel.htm ABEL I & II

http://www.USAID.gov USAID. Africa Bureau Office of Sustainable Development Publications

Annex 3: Methodology and Work Plan

Questions de Recherche	Sources des Données	Méthodes pour la Collecte des Données	Instruments
O.S. Améliorer l'accès et la qualité de l'éducation, particulièrement chez les filles			
1. Comparativement à la moyenne nationale et régionale, dans quelle mesure les possibilités d'accès, la participation active des élèves et leurs performances scolaires se sont-elles améliorées ?	ci-dessous		
2. Dans quelle mesure l'écart entre filles et garçons a-t-il été réduit, comparativement à la moyenne nationale et régionale ?	ci-dessous		
D'une manière plus spécifique:			
A. Dans quelle mesure, davantage d'élèves ont –ils la possibilité de poursuivre leurs études dans les collèges d'enseignement moyen? Quelle proportion le nombre d'élèves inscrits à la suite d'un transfert représente-t-il parmi l'effectif global ?	AED ME	A demander	Tableau de synthèse des statistiques
• Effectif d'élèves des CEM du projet			
• Effectif d'élèves des CEM créés par le projet,			
• Effectif additionnel des CEM réhabilités par le projet			
• Progression du taux d'admission en 3ème dans la région (avant et à la suite du projet) comparativement à la moyenne nationale.			
• Progression du taux de transition enseignement élémentaire -enseignement moyen dans la région, comparativement à la moyenne nationale			
B. La participation active des élèves s'est-elle accrue ?	AED ME	A demander	Tableau de synthèse des statistiques
• Comparaison du taux d'absentéisme dans les établissements du projet avec la moyenne régionale et la moyenne nationale			Tableau synthétique d'établissement
• Comparaison du taux de promotion d'un niveau à un autre dans les établissements du projet avec les moyennes régionale et nationale	CE		
• Comparaison des taux de redoublement avec les moyennes régionale et nationale,			
• Comparaison des taux de déperdition avec les moyennes régionale et nationale,			
• Comparaison des taux de survie (cohort completion of 10th grade) avec les moyennes régionales et nationales.	AED ME	A demander	Tableau de synthèse des statistiques

Questions de Recherche	Sources des Données	Méthodes pour la Collecte des Données	Instruments
C. Dans quelle mesure, les performances des élèves se sont-elles améliorées? • Comparaison des moyennes obtenues aux évaluations annuelles de passage en classe supérieurs avec les moyennes régionale et nationale • comparaison du taux de réussite à l'examen de fin de cycle avec les moyennes régionale et nationale • comparaison du taux de transition vers le secondaire aux moyennes régionale et nationale [A désagréger par région et par sexe, et par rapport à l'évolution des données nationales depuis l'implantation du projet]			
3. Les parties prenantes (autorités scolaires, directeurs d'écoles, professeurs, communauté parents d'élèves, ont-elles le sentiment que le projet a créé des conditions d'élargir l'accès et d'améliorer les performances scolaires ? Dans quelle mesure ces conditions sont-elles favorables aux filles ?	Partie prenants multiples	Entretien des groupes, Interview	Guide d'entretien : ME, Commission d'éducation, IA/IDEN, CE, CG, Enseignants, élèves, parents/communautés
RIC: accroissement de l'accès à l'enseignement moyen (données physiques)			
• nbre de places supplémentaires créées			
SRI 1: Davantage de CEM construits **SRI 2: Amélioration des infrastructures des établissements cibles**			
1. Est-ce que les écoles moyennes ont été etablies? • Nbre de nouveaux établissements construits • Nbre de nouvelles classes • Nbre de CEM et de classe équipées • Nbre de CEM spécifiquement équipés (latrines, sport equipment, etc.) • Nbre d'établissements réhabilités (par rapport à certains ou tous les standards du ME)	AED	A demander	Tableau de synthèse des statistiques
• Les normes de coût et autres standards du ministère ont-ils été respectés dans la construction ? • Les constructions ont-elles été procedees d'apres le calendrier planifie et comme prevu? • Qui supervise et gère les constructions? Quelle est l'implication du ministère ? • Comment le ME est-il impliqué? Y avait-il un calendrier d'exécution?	AED IA CE	Entretien	Guide d'entretien
2. Le processus et les critères de sélection des sites d'implantation ont-ils obéi à une démarche rationnelle? • la sélection a-t-elle tenu compte de la carte scolaire?	AED Tostan	Entretien	Guide d'entretien

Questions de Recherche	Sources des Données	Méthodes pour la Collecte des Données	Instruments
• Est-elle fondée sur des critères (disparités, etc.) • Correspond-elle à une réponse à une demande? • Quel a été le processus? • Le processus initialement choisi a-t-il été respecté? Quels ont été les problèmes et les contraintes ?	CE		
3. Les niveaux cibles pour les contributions et la participation communautaires ont-il ete acheves? • Pourcentage d'établissements qui satisfont aux normes de construction? • Quels types de contributions de la communauté dans la construction des écoles?	AED IA, C.Ed. CE, CG	A demander Entretien	Tableau de synthèse des statistiques Guides d'entretien
4. Les CEM fonctionnent-ils correctement ? • Fonctionnent-ils régulièrement ? Depuis quand fonctionnent-ils ? • Les CEM sont-ils entièrement équipés ? • Ont-ils démarré avec un personnel adéquat pour l'ensemble des disciplines enseignées? -ratio élève-professeur(compare aux standards) -Checklist for teachers: par discipline /grade et genre • Quel est le niveau de qualification comparative des professeurs? • Sont-ils régulièrement rémunérés et à temps? • Ya-t-il suffisamment de commodités pour répondre aux besoins des élèves ? -effectif par classe (compared with standards) -y a-t-il les latrines pour les filles, un point d'eau potable? • Y a t- il un budget pour la maintenance? • Le ministère a-t-il fourni un budget correct et autres besoins en ressources promis ? (e.g. electricity)? • Les établissements sont-ils soumis à l'administration des IA et IDE et les appuis courants? • les communautés ont-elles contribué à la maintenance ou à d'autres initiatives en vue d'apporter des améliorations à l'école ? Comment?	AED IA, C.Ed. CE, CG	A demander Entretien Entretien, Observation	Tableau de synthèse des statistiques Guides d'entretien Guides d'entretien Tableau synthétique d'établissement
SRI 3: accroître la sensibilisation des communautés à l'importance de l'enseignement moyen et notamment pour les filles			
1. De quelle manière a-t-on ameliorée la sensibilisation des communautés? • A-t-on mené des campagnes de mobilisation? Selon quelle ampleur et sur quel thème ? Coverage and content? • Le programme de formation de la communauté a-t-elle été bien conduit? • Le dispositif de mobilisation communautaire est-elle en place (e.g.community mediators)? • Quel rôle le personnel de l'établissement a-t-il joué dans la sensibilisation? • Autres groupes ou organisations ont-il joues un role dans la sensibilisation?	AED, CE		Guides d'entretien
2. Quelles sont les manifestations observables des changements d'attitude et de comportements favorables à l'enseignement moyen et pour les filles? • Montrent-elles qu'on a inscrite des élèves qui n'aurrient pas pu le faire autrement ? Qu'est-ce qui	CG, CE, Enseignants, Elèves,	Entretien	Guides d'entretien

Questions de Recherche	Sources des Données	Méthodes pour la Collecte des Données	Instruments
l'explique ? • La communauté a-t-elle mis en place un programme ou initié des activités tendant à accroître la sensibilisation ou l'accès et le maintien (bourses d'encouragement pour les filles, prise en charge des frais de scolarité, tutorat, etc. Lesquelles ? Comment les ont-ils mis en place? Qui participe? • La communauté appuie-t-elle l'établissement dans le domaine de la maintenance ou dans d'autres domaines d'amélioration?	Parents et communauté, C. Ed.		
RIC 2: L'environnement d'apprentissage et d'enseignement améliore			
RQ: Quelles sont les manifestations observables que l'environnement d'apprentissage et d'enseignement sont plus propices a l'amélioration de la rendement scolaire des élèves? • Ratio élèves:enseignant • Ratio élèves: sale de classe • Ratio élève: manuels scolaire • Taux d'absenteeisme des enseignants • Taux d'être a l'heure des enseignants % des enseignants qui préparent des plans de leçons	AED, CE, Enseignants, Eleves	Entretien	Guides d'entretien Tableau synthétique d'établissement
SIR 2.1: Accès accru aux matériels didactiques			
• % des écoles, des enseignants et des élèves ayant les matériels spécifies	« «	« «	« «
1. Les écoles ont-il été fourni avec les manuels scolaires, les guides d'enseignant, et les matériels didactiques? Est-ce qu'ils étaient disponible a la rentrée? Est-ce qu'ils étaient fournis par le ME?	AED, CE, Enseignants, Elèves	Entretien	Guides d'entretien
2. Est-ce que les enseignant ont et utilisent les matériels didactiques? Peut-il accéder les ressources de référence?	CE, Enseignants, Elèves	Entretien	Guides d'entretien
3. Est-ce que des élèves ont et utilisent les matériels? Est-ce que les livre osont disponible aux élèves? Y-a-t-il une bibliotheque a l'ecole?	CE, Enseignants, Elèves, C/P	Entretien	Guides d'entretien
4. La communauté appuie-t-elle l'établissement dans le domaine de des matériels didactiques ou des fournitures?	CE, CG, C/P	Entretien	Guides d'entretien
5. Est-ce que les enseignants fabriquent les matériels et les utilisent en classe?	CE, Enseignants	Entretien, Observation	Guides d'entretien, Grille d'observation
SIR 2.2: Salle de classe améliorée et environnement d'enseignement			
1. Qu'est ce qui a été fait pour améliorer la salle de classe et l'environnement d'enseignement ? • L'environnement physique favorise-t-il les études ? Est-ce que les classes correctement illuminées et ventilées, assez spacieuses et dotées de mobilier de rangement et matériel d'affichage etc.. ? La salle de classe et le mobilier permettent-il les groupes de coopération pour améliorer les apprentissages des élèves ?	CE, Enseignants, Elèves	Entretien, Observation	Guides d'entretien, Grille d'observation

Questions de Recherche	Sources des Données	Méthodes pour la Collecte des Données	Instruments
Qu'est-ce qu'on a fait pour aider les enseignants et les soutenir a remplir leurs devoirs?			
2. . Qu'est ce qui indique l'amélioration de l'enseignement apprentissage ? • Comment cette amélioration se traduit chez l'élève ? La salle de classe est-elle accueillante ? • Les comportements des enseignants sont-ils favorables à l'apprentissage ? L'enseignant utilise t-il des méthodes centrées sur les élèves. (technique de transfert des acquis de leur formation? L'enseignant est-il sensible au genre ? L'enseignant utilise t-il des supports d'apprentissage ? Effectue t-il des préparation pour planifier ses leçons ? Le professeur pose-t-il des questions pertinentes ? L'enseignant fait-il montre de maîtrise des connaissances académiques ? Combien de temps est réservé aux activités et aux apprentissages ? L'enseignant utilise t-il stratégies d'enseignement variées dans la classe ? • Les élèves montrent-ils un plus grand engagement vis-à-vis des études ? Les élèves posent-ils des questions ? Sont-ils plus actifs dans l'apprentissage ? Sont-ils motivés ?	CE, Enseignants, Elèves, CG, P/C	Entretien, Observation	Guides d'entretien, Grille d'observation
3. Dans quelle mesure le chef d'établissement a contribué à l'amélioration des apprentissages ? Est-ce qu;il a mis les systèmes de gestion en oeuvre pour régler les actions des eleves et les enseignants? Peut-on voir dans quelle mesure, il supervise les tâches des enseignants et apporte des conseils ? Le chef d'établissement a-t-il suggéré des échange et enrichissement professionnel ? Existe-t-il un programme de cours particuliers ou remédiation pour les élèves et pour les filles en particulier ? Quelle mesures ont été prises pour contrôler l'absentéisme des eleves et des enseignants, la santé et la sécurité des élèves, etc.?	CE, Enseignants, Elèves, CG, P/C	Entretien, Observation	Guides d'entretien, Grille d'observation
4. Qu'est qui est fait pour soutenir les filles, particulièrement en science et maths ?	« «	« «	« «
5. Qu'est-ce que la communauté fait pour soutenir l'enseignement-apprentissage? • La communauté est-elle impliquée dans le processus d'enseignement-apprentissage)	« «	« «	« «
SIR 2.3: Amélioration de la formation continuée			
• #/% d'enseignants bénéficiaires de la formation continuée • #/% d'enseignants recevant un certificat après la formation • #/% de chef d'établissement bénéficiaires de la formation continuée • #/% de directeurs recevant un certificat après la formation	AED	A demander	Tableau de synthèse de formation
1. Existe-t-il un programme de formation continuée ? Y a-t-il eu une analyse des besoins ? Modules et matériaux de cours ont-ils été élaborés? Ces formation cibles t-elles les résultats et les qualités énumérés dans le SOAG ? a avoir le programme et l'organisation développé ? Est-ce que des critères de sélection sont définis pour la formation des enseignants ?	AED, IA/IDEN, CE	Entretien	Guides d'entretien
2. Le programme de formation a-t-il été déroulé à temps ? Y a-t-il eu un nombre suffisant de formateurs compétents ? Le ME a-t-il constitué des équipes dans les collèges ? où a-t-on choisi les enseignants et les chefs d'établissement pour participer ? Est-ce que des directeurs ont été impliqués inclus dans le programme de formation de professeur ? Est-ce que le matériel utilisé était suffisant ? Qu'est ce qui indique la satisfaction de la participation à ces formations ? Que faut-il changer au besoin ? Peut-on répliquer la formation ? Existe-t-il des ressources affectées par les collectivités locales ou ME pour ces formations dans les collèges.	AED, IA/IDEN, CE, Enseignants	Entretien	Guides d'entretien
3. Les chefs d'établissement, personnels des IDEN et des IA ont-ils été impliqués la formation continuée ?	« «	« «	« «

Questions de Recherche	Sources des Données	Méthodes pour la Collecte des Données	Instruments
Qu'est ce qui indique l'acceptation des nouvelles approches et méthodologies et dans quelle mesure sont-elles intégrées aux critères d'inspection ? Y-a-t-il un budget pour la formation?			
4. Qu'est qui prouve que les enseignants et les chefs d'établissement appliquent ce qu'ils apprennent dans la formation sur place ? (voir ci-dessus)	CE, Enseignants, Elèves, CG, P/C	Entretien, Observation	Guides d'entretien, Grille d'observation, Checklist de CE
5. Existe-t-il un mécanisme de démultiplication de la formation reçue par les enseignants ? La méthode cascade a été t-elle été développé pour le transfert des compétences ? Est-ce que ceci est suffisant pour assurer l'augmentation globale de la qualité d'enseignement à l'école ? Existe-t-il des mesures incitatives pour encourager les enseignants à partager leur expérience?	CE, Enseignants, CG, P/C	Entretien, Observation	Guides d'entretien, Grille d'observation, Checklist de CE
6. Existe-t-il un mécanisme pour évaluer l'impact de la formation et modifier la formation et les programmes existant fondé sur le besoin de changement ? Est-il prévu le feed back avec les enseignants.	« «	« «	« «
SRI 2.4: Accès accru à TIC			
• % d'écoles avec travailler l'équipement des TIC (ordinateurs) • % d'écoles avec le personnel qualifié dans les TIC • % de professeurs qualifiés dans l'utilisation des TIC • % d'écoles rendant équipées en équipement des TIC pour les élèves	AED, CE	Entretien	Tableau de synthese, Guides d'entretien
1. Quel type d'équipement des TIC est disponible dans les écoles/classes ? Qui l'a fourni ? Dans quelle mesure, ces écoles ont-elles bénéficié de ces équipements ? Y a-t-il des ressources pour l'entretien, pour réparer et l'équipement ?	AED, CE	Entretien, Observation	Guides d'entretien
2. Le personnel d'écoles sait-il utiliser et faire fonctionner les appareils ? Un programme de formation à l'utilisation et à l'entretien est-il développé (pour les enseignants, l'administration, les élèves ?	CE, Enseignants, Eleves, CG	Entretien, Observation	Guides d'entretien
3. Quel type d'utilisation est prévu ? Comment les ordinateurs sont-ils utilisés ? Les enseignants les utilisent-ils pour la préparation de leçon ? Les élèves les utilisent-ils pour des projets d'apprentissage ?	AED, CE, Enseignants, Eleves, CG	Entretien, Observation	Guides d'entretien
4. Comment TICs sont-elles intégrées dans l'enseignement-apprentissage ? Y a-t-il des salles multimédia ? Dans quelle mesure l'équipement en TIC est disponible pour les enseignants et pour les élèves ?	CE, Enseignants, Eleves, CG	Entretien, Observation	Guides d'entretien
5. La communauté a-t-elle doté les écoles en équipement des TIC?	CE, CG, P/C	Entretien, Observation	Guides d'entretien
SRI 2.5: Accès accru à la formation aux compétences à la vie active			
1. La formation, des cours/modules de compétence de la vie et du matériel ont-ils été développés et évalués ? Par qui ? Pour qui, seulement pour les filles ? Quels sujets (santé, contraception, HIV-SIDA ?	AED, ME, IA		
2. Sont-ils incorporés au curriculum ou supplémentaire?	« «	« «	« «
3. Les IA, IDEN, chefs d'établissement, enseignants ont-ils reçu une formation dans l'enseignement des compétences à la vie active ?	AED, ME, IA, CE, CG,		

Questions de Recherche	Sources des Données	Méthodes pour la Collecte des Données	Instruments
	Enseignants		
4. Programmes de formation aux compétences de vie active sont-ils dispensés aux élèves des collèges ? S'agit-il d'un programme additionnel ou est-il intégré dans le programme existant ?	Enseignants, Elèves	Entretien	Guides d'entretien
5. Dans quelle mesure peut-on observer des changements dans les attitudes et comportements des élèves ? Comment ont réagi les parents et la communauté devant l'enseignement des compétences à la vie active. Have life skills programs been delivered to students at schools?	CE, CG, Enseignants, Elèves, C/P	Entretien	Guides d'entretien
RIC 3: Accroissement de la participation du pouvoir local et des communautés à la gestion et au financement de l'éducation			
QR: Quelles sont les manifestations observables qui témoignent que les communautés et les pouvoirs locaux sont davantage impliqués dans les appuis aux écoles support, à l'administration et au financement de l'éducation? Montant en $ des fonds (y inclus les contributions en nature) levées par les communautés pour les établissement d'enseignement moyen (moyenne/école) • Nbre d'écoles ayant bénéficié de la contribution de communauté en ressources, • Nbre d'entités de pouvoir local ayant alloué des fonds pour l'éducation • Pourcentage d'augmentation du montant alloue aux ecoles moyennes	C. de Ed, IA/IDEN, CG, AED	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien, Tableau de synthèse de financement
SRI 3.1: accroissement du financement local de l'enseignement moyen			
1. Les collectivités locales ont-elles alloué plus de fonds à l'éducation, plus particulièrement à l'enseignement moyen?	C. de Ed, IA/IDEN, CE, CG, AED	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien,
2. Les pouvoirs locaux ont –ils réussi à développer une coopération avec le secteur privé ou avec d'autre organismes en vue d'accroître les ressources? Pour quoi faire? Comment a-t-on piloté et géré le processus?	« «	« «	« «
3. y a-t-il des contributions communautaires en ressources (monétaire ou autre genre) pour les écoles? Si oui, peut-on avoir une estimation quantitative, quel type de ressources et selon quelle fréquence ? Avant ce projet, quelle était l'importance relative de la contribution des communautés dans les ressources de l'établissement?	CE, CG, P/C, AED	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien, Tableau de synthèse d'établissement
4. S'agit-t-il de contributions de l'ensemble de la communauté ou uniquement des parents d'élèves ? S'agit-il de contributions volontaires ou imposées à tout le monde?	« «	« «	« «
5. Quelle proportion représentent les contribution de ces communautés dans le budget de fonctionnement de l'établissement?	« «	« «	« «
6. Y a-t-il un programme de levée de fonds? Y a-t-il un calendrier régulier pour ces contributions ?	CE, CG, P/C	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien,
7. La communauté a -t-elle développé un partenariat avec les milieux locaux du secteur privé ou avec d'autres organismes pour appuyer les écoles?	« «	« «	« «
8. Les écoles ont-elles la compétence pour accepter les contributions externes et communautaires? Qui gère et	CE, CG, P/C,	Entretien des	Guides d'entretien,

Questions de Recherche	Sources des Données	Méthodes pour la Collecte des Données	Instruments
administre les contributions des communautés ? y a-t-il un dispositif de prévention de détournements?	IA	groupe	
9. y a –t-il un lien entre l'importance des contributions communautaires et l'importance des ressources provenant des autorités centrales ou du ME?	« «	« «	« «
SRI 3.2: Fonctionnement effective des Comités de Gestion des Ecoles			
1. Les CEM du projet ont-il un CGE ? les rôles, responsabilités et conditions d'adhésion et mode de fonctionnement sont-ils définis et codifiés? Y a-t-il un statut ou règlement intérieur?	CG, CE	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien,
2. Qui peut prétendre à la qualité de membre? Nombre de femmes parmi les membres ? Combien de parents d'élèves? Les élèves y sont-ils représentés ? Ont-ils quelque chose à payer ?	« «	« «	« «
3. Dans quelles limites s'exerce leur autorité dans les prises de décision et la gestion ? Ont-ils une autorité quelconque sur le personnel enseignant (régulation de l'absentéisme, discipline? Ont –ils pour principal rôle de lever des fonds? Leur rôle comporte-t-il des tâches de pilotage de ce qui est entrepris part l'école et l'évaluation des résultats scolaires ?	« «	« «	« «
4. Comment sont organisés les comités de gestion d'établissement? Peuvent-ils avoir directement accès aux instances des pouvoirs locaux et aux autorités du ministère de l'éducation? Les communications passent-elles toutes nécessairement par le chef d'établissement? Qui joue le rôle d'arbitre en cas de conflit entre le comité de gestion et l'établissement ?	« «	« «	« «
5. Le CGE se réunit-il régulièrement, selon quelle fréquence ? Y a-t-il des procès verbaux disponibles ? Y a-t-il une comptabilité ?	« «	« «	« «
6. Les membres des CGE ont-ils bénéficié d'une formation? Sur quoi? Pour combine de membres? Selon quelle fréquence? Par qui? Les pouvoirs locaux et les représentants du ME ont-ils contribué à la formation (ou ont-ils bénéficié eux-mêmes) sur la gestion des CGE?	AED, CG, CE	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien, Tableau de synthèse de formation
7. Quelles sont les initiatives prises par les CGE pour appuyer les établissements et ou les élèves? A quel moment? • Ont ils développé un plan d'amélioration de l'école? Quel est le processus qui a été mis en oeuvre? En quoi cela a-t-il consisté? • Ont-ils implanté ou réalisé des projets ou des activités pour l'amélioration de l'école ou pour appuyer les élèves? • Ont –ils entrepris une action spécifiquement destinée à l'accroissement de l'accès du maintien et de la performance et le bien être des filles à l'école? • Qui parmi le CGE et les communautés est actif dans l'appui aux écoles et aux élèves ? qui a mis en place le projet d'amélioration de l'établissement ? • Les membres des CGE visitent-t-ils les écoles. Ont-ils une permanence à l'école ? • Le CEG procède-t-il à la levée de fonds auprès d'autres programmes (gouvernement ou autres) ? Comment?	CG, CE, C/P, enseignants, élèves	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien,
8. Comment les CGE interagissent-ils avec les parents, la communauté et les élèves? • Comment mobilisent-ils la communauté, communiquent et partagent l'information? Organisent-ils des	« «	« «	« «

Questions de Recherche	Sources des Données	Méthodes pour la Collecte des Données	Instruments
rencontres, de fora, publient-ils de résultats, etc.? • Comment collectent-ils l'information auprès de la communauté? Comment ont-ils organisé la communication école-communauté et communauté-école ?			
Existe-t-il d'autres parents, groupes/organisations dans la communauté travaillant avec l'école ? Qui sont-ils ? Que font-ils ? Ont-ils besoin de la permission du comité de gestion de gestion d'école ?	« «	« «	« «
SRI 3.3: Efficacité de la planification au niveau régional			
1 .Que signifie la planification en éducation ? En quoi consiste la planification de l'éducation ? Quelles sont les composantes de la planification de l'éducation? La planification intègre t-elle les investissements en infrastructure, personnelles et matérielles ? Y a-t-il un aspect portant sur les connaissances académiques et sur le programme ?			
2. La Commission d'éducation du Conseil régional est-elle été établie ? Comment est-ce que des membres sont choisis ? Combien des personnes du milieu local sont représentées (et comment les écoles sont-elles représentées ?	C. de Ed, CG	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien
3. Qu'est est leur rôle/pouvoir dans la planification et/ou l'allocation de ressource éducative ? Comment fonctionnent avec les autorités régionales d'éducation (IA, IDEN) ? Que sont à leurs responsabilités (en particulier par rapport à la loi 1996 sur la décentralisation) ? Font-ils une planification de l'éducation propre pour leur localité?	C. de Ed, IA/IDEN	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien
4. La Commission d'éducation a-t-elle reçu une formation spéciale pour exercer leurs tâches et responsabilités relativement à la planification et la préparation de leur de leur budget. Quelles sont les compétences transférées? Ces compétences comprennent-elles la planification, de plus d'équipement, personnel et matériels?	C. de Ed, AED	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien, Tableau de synthèse de la formation
5. Qu'est ce que les Commissions d'éducation ont fait pour soutenir l'éducation, particulièrement les collèges et de filles, dans leurs régions ? Les collèges reçoivent-elles des fonds municipaux qui leur sont normalement destinés ou reçoivent-elles des dotations spéciales ? Comment se prennent les décisions pour l'allocation de ressources.	C. de Ed,	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien
6. Quels sont les rôles et la responsabilité de l'IA (et/ou de l'IDEN) dans la planification éducative et/ou l'allocation des ressources ?	IA/IDEN	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien
7. Existe-t-il un système de planification décentralisée ascendant en place ? Dans quelles mesures, les plans d'école ont-il besoin d'être évalués et intégrés dans le plan régional d'éducation ? Qui contrôle ce processus ?	C. de Ed, IA/IDEN, CG, AED	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien
8. Ils ont reçu une formation en planification, allocation de ressources, élaboration de budget etc. ?	C. de Ed, IA/IDEN, CG, AED	Entretien des groupe	Guides d'entretien, Tableau de synthèse de la formation

Le Plan de Travail pour l'Evaluation

Date	Tâches/Activités
4-9 mai	• Revue des documents
	• Formulation des questions de recherche
	• Elaboration de l'approche et de la méthodologie
	• Préparation pour la séance de travail
10 mai	• Séance de travail
11-13 mai	• Développement des instruments
	• Développement des protocoles pour les visites sur le terrain
	• Identification des équipes d'enquête
14 mai	• Voyage aux régions
15-19 mai	• Collecte des données et de l'information
20 mai	• Rentrée á Dakar
22-30 mai	• Aggrégation et analyse des données
	• Identification des résultats préliminaires
	• Préparation pour la séance de travail
31 mai-1juin	• Séance de travail
3-8 juin	• Rédaction du rapport (1er draft)
9 juin	• Présentation a l'USAID
23 juin	• Rapport final

Annex 4: Contacts (Dakar)

PRENOMS	NOMS	STRUCTURE
Ministere de l'Education		
LEOPOLD	FAYE	DEMSG (DIRECTOR)
ALEXANDRE MBAYE	DIOP	DEMSG
YOLANDE	FABER	DEMSG
IBRAHIMA	NDOUR	DEMSG (IVS)
CHEKHOU	DIAHABY	DRH
SOKHNA DIOUF	THIAM	DPRE
CHEIKH MBACKE	CISSE	IA DAKAR
YORO	FALL	IDEN VELINGARA
AÏMEROU	NDIAYE	IDEN TAMBA
BABACAR	GUEYE	FASTEF
JOSEPH	SARR	CNFC
CHEIKH TIDIANE	DIOP	CNFC
NDIOGOU	FAYE	IGEN
BABACAR	SENGHOR	PRINCIPAL FATICK
U.S. Agency for International Development		
OLIVIER	CARDUNER	MISSION DIRECTOR
ERIN		DEPUTY DIRECTOR
LISA	FRANCHETT	USAID PROGRAM OFFICER
PAPE MOMAR	SOW	USAID EDUCATION OFFICER
MAMADOU	DIARRA	USAID TRAINING SPECIALIST
SOUNKA	NDIAYE	USAID M&E SPECIALIST
KATHRYN	LANE	USAID DG OFFICER
ELIZABETH	HART	DCHA/DG (WASHINGTON)
PAEM/CLASS		
LARRAINE	DENAKPO	COP PAEM
OUMAR	DIONGUE	CR DECENTRALISATION
DJIBRIL	DIOUF	CR ACCES
IDRISSA	DIENG	CR QUALITE
AMINATA	DJIGO	CR TAMBA
SADDICK	SALL	CR KOLDA
PAPE LATYR	DIOUF	CR FATICK
REPRESENTATIVE		TOSTAN (THIES)
Civil Society		
MAMADOU	KANDE	PCR DIOULACOULON
DEMBA	SALL	PDT COM EDU C REGIONAL DE TAMBA
ROKHAYA	DIOUF	SYNDICAT UDEN
SEYDOU	SY	SYNDICAT SUDES
BOUNA	DIOUF	APE FATICK
DEMBA	SALL	PDT COM EDU C REGIONAL DE TAMBA

Annex 5: Detailed Recommendations

IR 1: Increased Access to Middle Schools

1. PAEM should maintain its focus in the three regions--adding/rehabilitating a second cohort of schools, continuing to support the first cohort of schools (through training, etc.), and developing the national and regional educational and governance systems to ensure sustainable support for Middle School expansion and improvement. Concentrating its efforts in the three regions will allow PAEM to build on the foundation and initiative it has already put in place. PAEM is more than a construction model; its approach calls for the collaboration and action of multiple partners (e.g. government, education authorities, collectivities) to ensure the delivery of quality education. Staying in the same regions will allow PAEM to more fully develop the systems required for on-going school support and to support its institutionalization.
2. PAEM should continue to focus its school construction and rehabilitation efforts in underserved rural areas in order to reach areas that are least likely to be served by the ME construction program. The community participation approach utilized by PAEM is best suited to cohesive smaller communities, rather than urban or peri-urban areas. The "écoles de proximité" is a model that is going to be able to serve the most number of communities and will have the greatest application throughout Senegal.
3. Expansion of middle schooling in Senegal may be stymied by resources demanded by the ME's current configuration of middle schooling. USAID should assist the Ministry to conduct a study and analysis of the number of disciplines that can be supported in the middle school curriculum, assessing the demand for teachers, specialized skill sets and other inputs in light of the resources available for Middle School.

(Possible SOAG Conditionalities)

4. The GOS should be required to match (in some proportion) the total donor support provided to the construction of middle schools. For example, if USAID, the World Bank and JICA build ten schools then the government needs to build a certain number of schools within a specified timeframe and region. A study may have to be conducted in order to determine the appropriate financing formulas in terms of Ministry contributions and government support (at the local, regional and central levels).
5. A Memorandum of Agreement should also be developed with the educational and government authorities (i.e. Regional Council) in the regions targeted for USAID support, to ensure that they cooperate and provide the necessary support for PAEM. For example, all new school construction and provision of associated resources (e.g. teachers, furniture) should follow the school map and a rational process of support and allocation.
6. The Ministry of Education should agree that other partners building "écoles de proximité" should follow PAEM's construction and rehabilitation models. PAEM will make available the construction plans and other materials, and provide guidance and explanation as needed to the other partners.
7. The DEMCG should create a unit that is dedicated uniquely to middle school education, and is in charge of coordinating the policies and programs related to its development and delivery. PAEM should support the formulation of a plan for its development and respond to specific training needs.
8. The Ministry should undertake to expand the IVS at the central, regional and departmental levels.
9. The Ministry should authorize the IDEN to support and work with middle schools.

SIR 1.1 and 1.2: More Middles Schools Constructed and Rehabilitated

1. PAEM should support/conduct a study on student enrollment in each of the target regions in order to determine school construction/rehabilitation needs and to better understand the implications (e.g. number of classrooms to build) of enrollment growth patterns at the schools it has assisted.
2. PAEM's approach for school rehabilitation should be reformulated to reflect the reality that most school candidates for rehabilitation will, in fact, require extensive new construction. School rehabilitation should provide for sufficient classrooms to accommodate the student body and

eliminate temporary shelters and include the construction of an administrative block, library, boundary wall, etc. (all the elements included in the new school construction model). This will reduce concerns about "écoles a deux vitesse" as well as place all schools on equal footing in developing according to the PAEM approach.

3. PAEM should develop and provide to the new and rehabilitated schools master plans for future use of the school property that address placement of additional (community-built) structures and specify safety considerations and regulations. PAEM should develop plans and material lists for other structures the community might build (e.g. school canteen, lodging for students, guard house, health room).
4. PAEM needs to review and modify the new school construction design, including material specification, in order to address problems found in the first cohort of schools. Problems observed include: windows that can't be secured, warped wooden doors that can't be closed, broken front gate hinges, and cracked walls and floors
5. In addition to the one-year inspection, the construction inspection protocol should provide for an inspection after a three-month period of school use to effect repairs that impede school operations, will worsen with time, or require school budgetary outlays that should be borne by the contractor.

(Community Contribution to Construction)

6. Communities should continue to be required to provide materials and labor which includes clearing the land, providing water and sand.
7. The community contract for selection of a site should include building a student shelter out of local materials. PAEM should provide guidelines for its placement and construction.
8. Communities should agree to provide and finance a guardian. PAEM can provide the plans and specification for the guardian's lodge should the community decide to provide housing.
9. Access to all the school facilities should be made handicap accessible. Plans can be developed by PAEM and provided to communities on how to make the facilities handicap accessible (ramps, door sizes, etc.).

(Maintenance and Cleaning)

10. The community should agree to maintain the school in return for its construction/rehabilitation; this should be made part of the community contract. PAEM should develop a maintenance plan including a manual, routine maintenance schedule and checklist, replacement material specifications, etc. and provide for training to the principal and CGE members (and others) in its use.
11. Schools are not being kept clean. Sanitary blocks, in particular, are extremely dirty and pose a health risk. Community sensitization should include a unit on the relationship between school cleanliness and student health. The community should agree to provide for regular cleaning. PAEM should develop practical guidance on cleaning including a manual, schedule, checklist and options for a cleaning rotation and provide on-site training to principals and CGE members (and others) on how to properly clean the facilities especially the staff bathrooms and sanitary blocks. Some basic cleaning supplies could be provided such as a hose long enough to reach from the water spigots to the sanitary blocks.
12. The CGE should be required to establish a sub-committee that oversees cleaning and maintenance of the school.
13. Training and guidance provided for cleaning should stress the equitable distribution of these tasks. Specifically, cleaning should not automatically be assigned to girls and women. Girl students should not be expected to assume full responsibility for sweeping classrooms and cleaning sanitary blocks; work assignments should be shared by boy and girl students.

(Utilities)

14. Selection criteria for school construction and rehabilitation should NOT be based on the availability or proximity of an electrical grid, access to water, or telephone coverage. These criteria would

eliminate the communities that most need the "écoles de proximité." However, specific site selection with the community should maximize utility accessibility (e.g. the school sites should not be at the top of a hill).

15. PAEM should calibrate the community contribution to utility provision and hook-up to their ability and the degree of difficulty in accessing these services, and provide assistance as required to fill the gap.
16. PAEM should explore and provide alternatives if a school's access to utilities is not possible in the short-term. These include solar power, generators, bore-hole wells, etc. temporary low-tech solution should also be suggested to the school (buckets for drinking and cleaning water placed in each classroom, etc.)
17. The application process for a telephone should be simplified, if possible. PAEM should develop a routine procedure with templates for application letters, etc. for the communities to facilitate the process.
18. The Ministry should develop a plan of action for ways to expedite the process for getting schools hooked up with the necessary utilities.

SIR 1.3 Increased Community Awareness of the Importance of Middle School, especially for Girls.
(Increasing Community Awareness and Participation)

1. PAEM's community sensitization component (delivered by TOSTAN) should be redesigned to focus directly on education and the schools, rather than diffused across the sectors. Communities should be provided with concrete examples of how to plan for and support the school after the initial construction is completed. The model needs to train them in on-going needs assessment and planning. The model and associated materials and manuals should be developed so that it can be replicated by the education authorities (most likely by the IDEN), local government and associations (e.g. rural councils, GPF, ASC). IVS and IDEN need training so they can actively facilitate community support and participation. A checklist of measurable indicators to evaluate community participation and determine if they are meeting basic requirements and standards should be developed.
2. The CGE and other community representatives should be trained in community mobilization so that they are not dependent on TOSTAN or the government to initiate mobilization activities.
3. A plan and guidance should be developed for the periodic re-mobilization of communities to ensure community support and sensitization activities continue after the initial mobilization. The follow-on awareness component could be expanded to include enrollment to primary school as well.
4. In the communities where CGC have been established the relationship between the CGC and the school needs to be more clearly articulated. Their roles and responsibilities should be defined in such a way that the CGC corresponds and supports CGE and school activities/initiates/priority needs.
5. PAEM should determine TOSTAN's willingness and capacity to modify the mobilization approach and materials to focus more closely on the schools, use the CGE (rather than CGC), and train government or community leaders with the necessary skills to carry on mobilization activities. Other arrangements for development of the community mobilization component should be made if continued work with TOSTAN is not viable.
6. A special effort needs to be undertaken to encourage participation of fathers' in the school and education of their children. This might include father-specific activities such as coaching sports teams.
7. Parents should be given explicit guidance on how to support their children's learning i.e. a child who has eaten breakfast and has a snack or lunch performs better than those who don't, a child needs time, space and light to study, a child needs sufficient sleep, etc. Project should consult Uganda SUPER project parental and student support materials.
8. In planning community participation activities the daily schedules of women and the time they are available should be taken into consideration as well as their language ability and literacy level to ensure their full participation. As part of the PAEM community participation program facilitators

should encourage the increased participation of women as official representatives on community organizations

(Increasing Girls' Access and Participation)

9. PAEM should provide an orientation to senior-level Ministry officials on strategic planning to address gender issues and support girls' education, and to ensure that Ministry officials fully understand both the constraints and options for increasing girls' educational participation.
10. The Ministry should examine principal selection criteria to ensure qualified female teachers are not precluded from ever being principals given the use of gender-biased ascriptive or social characteristics as (secondary) selection criteria. It should consider developing a fast-track affirmative action program for female principal recruitment (e.g. quotas, incentives, housing, etc.).
11. The Ministry should develop actionable policies and associated programs to increase the number of women teachers and effect their deployment to "écoles de proximité" and other remote locations. PAEM should assist the Ministry in developing its analysis of the problem and formulate a plan of action.
12. The Ministry should plan and implement a female "vacataire" recruitment campaign that includes an incentive package. This pool of young women is more likely to be more mobile and willing to accept posts in remote locations than experienced female teachers, because they probably have not yet married or started families.
13. In far as possible, each "école de proximité" should be staffed with (at least) one female teacher. PAEM should support the development and delivery of specialized training modules to allow them to serve as mentors to girl students.
14. PAEM should develop and disseminate materials to women's organizations on mentoring girls. In addition, a part of the community sensitization program should include an option for on-going community support for a girls' mentoring program.
15. PAEM should support the development of units or modules on practical strategies to address issues that constrain girls' access, retention and learning. These modules should be made part of the training delivered to Ministry officials, IAs and IDENs (including IVS, IS and CPIs); regional and rural council members, CGE members, principals, teachers, students and other community groups.
16. All training modules, regardless of subject, should dedicate a portion that addresses gender dimensions for both boys and girls. For example, student motivation should address the different learning styles and needs of boys and girls.
17. The Ministry should revise its policy requiring that girls who are pregnant must leave school during the pregnancy and must transfer to a new school following the birth of the baby. [These policies are not considered productive or followed at the school level.] Education authorities and school personnel (including CGE members) should receive guidance on process, procedures and options to deal with teachers and students who impregnate girls.
18. The Ministry should develop practical guidance on harassment at schools (teacher-student, student-student, girls-boys) that schools can adopt and implement. PAEM should support the development of a sensitization program aimed at the entire school community (principal, teachers, CGE, students, community) that defines harassment in practical terms and provides guidance to each group on how to deal with it. The student code of conduct should include harassment of girls by the boy students.
19. PAEM should work with the Ministry (possibly the IVS) to develop special, non-curricular modules to deal with adolescent physiology and behavior, including a basic needs assessment. Specifically, the modules should respond to immediate students needs for sex, health and hygiene information that will allow students to understand and manage the physical and psychological changes they are experiencing. Module development should include a plan for delivery at the school (including training) and provide guidance to the school principal and CGE on how to support its delivery on an on-going basis. (For example, the local nurse or mid-wife might be an appropriate candidate to deliver the training to students.)

20. USAID and the Ministry should consider the development of a merit-based scholarship program (in addition to the current bursaries) for the top girl in each class to motivate all the girls (not only the neediest ones). A limited merit scholarship program for the two top boys in the school could also be developed.
21. As a condition of community selection for school construction or rehabilitation, communities should agree to put in place measures to ease the after-school domestic obligations on the girls so that girls can participate in after-school activities (including reinforcement courses). The community mobilization campaign should include PRA-type methods to help the community map out its strategy.
22. School authorities (the principal and CGE) should monitor the extra-curricular student/teacher interactions and meetings to ensure that appropriate behavior, relations and a risk-free environment for girls are maintained. PAEM should support the education authorities (e.g. IVS, IDEN) in helping the school adopt measures to guide the young and mostly male teachers in appropriate behavior and reduce the potential for unintentional inappropriate situations.

(Making Schools More Accessible to Students)

23. PAEM should support a situation analysis on accessibility issues that includes quantitative data so that the magnitude of needs is understood. For example, how students (and girls) actually require lodging and canteen services? The study could be conducted by the CGE and community members, as either part of the "projet d'établissement" diagnostic or initial community awareness activities.
24. The principal or CGE should develop individual student files with relevant social information (e.g. distance the student lives from school, family status, lodges with family in the village, etc.) in order to plan appropriate interventions, monitor at-risk students, and provide statistical data to the education authorities and PAEM (for internal M&E).
25. Schools principals and CGE should be encouraged to make the school timetable (i.e. hours of operation) more convenient and accommodating to student needs, by taking into consideration the distances students have to walk. This could be included in either initial discussions with the community at large or later included in CGE schedule of activities and community consultation.
26. PAEM should support the development of best practices for increasing student accessibility that can be shared with the schools. It could consider organizing a departmental or regional level forum for principals, CGE members and community representatives to share ideas, discuss problems, etc. on increasing access and retention, especially for girls, into school (providing bicycles, lodging, school canteens,). PAEM should also include training for principals, CGEs and communities on planning to make the school more accessible.
27. PAEM should work with principals to develop guidelines that address students who transfer into the school whose family lives outside the catchments area. This can compensate for the loss of the family head tax as well as the contributions the community makes to the construction of the school and other on-going support and contributions (e.g. higher inscription fee, community fee, etc.).
28. In the absence of Ministry funding for the education of special needs children, communities should be urged to support the education of special needs and handicapped students.

(Staffing the Schools: Teacher Recruitment and "vacataires")

29. PAEM should support the Ministry to conduct a baseline study on middle school "vacataires"" in order to determine recruitment strategies, training needs, human resource development investment strategies, their long-term career goals and choices, their expected longevity at remote schools, etc. This profile should include the following information:
    - number and sex of "vacataires"
    - education level
    - subject area
    - competencies and skills
    - social factors including their marital status and how far from their home is the school

- assessment of behavior in and outside of the classroom
- identification their perceived needs and priorities
- examination of their motivations for becoming a "vacataire"

30. The Ministry with PAEM support should develop a "vacataire" policy and development program that address career path issues, incentive packages, deployment strategies, training approaches, etc. PAEM should support the Ministry to project resource needs (i.e. budget, planning and management) and the potential consequence of dealing with an increased number of "functionaries" (should "vacataires" intend to pursue a teaching career.) PAEM should help the government anticipate future "vacataire" union's demands and the government's response.
31. PAEM should help the Ministry on developing ways to maintain the current "esprit des corps" that exists among the "vacatiares" and recognize and validate their contribution. For example, a monthly radio program for "vacataires" could serve to recognize their contributions, provide information useful to new teachers, and allow for on-air discussions among the "vacataires".
32. "Vacataires" should be recruited no later than June, so that they can participate in PAEM-supported emergency training before the beginning of the school year.
33. Selection criteria for "vacataires" should be based on meeting minimum levels of subject area knowledge mastery, calibrated for teaching in middle schools, and basic French language mastery. Assessment instruments should be developed and each candidate rated per performance. Hiring decisions would be strictly based on these criteria.

Improved School Management (as ensured primarily by the principal):

(USAID)

1. Effective school management should be explicitly recognized in the USAID Results Framework, possibly included as an SIR under access (e.g. "More effective operation and management of schools").

(School Operations)

2. To reduce teacher and principal absenteeism, the Ministry should develop a more efficient means to process the payment of salaries that either eliminates the need for or reduces the time spent in school personnel travel to collect their salaries and deal with other administrative needs. Various options include creating collection points at the departmental or school level, authoring principals to collect salaries, arranging with local banks to take the money to the schools, etc.
3. Policies for and guidance in more effective use of all school staff should be developed. For example, the surveillant's role (if available) could be expanded to better support the roles and responsibilities of the principal and teachers, such as collecting and preparing school reports. Each teacher should also be responsible for an additional role such as developing school-community out reach programs, extra-mural activities or clubs, preparing informational materials, etc.
4. School principals and CGEs need to have a better understanding of the policy and procedures they can establish (in consultation with key stakeholders) at the school level, such as school hours of operation, addressing school pregnancy issues, managing student and teacher punctuality and absenteeism, regularizing getting school personnel salaries, etc. They also need to take a more proactive role in establishing rules and procedures for after school remediation and reinforcement courses, including a standardized fee structure and schedule that accommodates the most students.
5. PAEM should support the development of guidance, procedures, and exemplary for principals on how to organize and conduct formal, regular staff meetings for information exchange and for in-school teacher professional exchanges, rather than relying on casual exchanges and word-of-mouth.
6. PAEM should support the development of guidance, procedures and exemplary schedule for schools (i.e. their principals and CGEs) to expand the number and regularize meetings with the community
7. Principals should be encouraged to share all financial information about the school (including the Budget de l'Etat) with the CGE (and other partners, as appropriate), in order to effect more rational planning and in the interests of transparency.

8. Principals should be encouraged to make public and share certain reports such as end-of-year reports with the community, as well as the CGEs.

(Principal Training in Management)

9. The principal performance norms and standards developed by PAEM and the ministry should be defined in actionable and measurable ways. The Ministry should translate the norms into a checklist of observable and measurable behavior that forms the basis of principal assessment criteria. Redundancy should be eliminated and they should be congruent with any norms, standards and competencies developed for teachers and students. The Ministry needs to vet the norms on a wider basis throughout the DEMCG, with the principals (throughout Senegal) and with the relevant unions and associations. They should be officially adopted and then serve as the foundation for principal training, assessment and support. The norms should be shared with principals, teachers and CGEs, and communities at large.
10. PAEM should develop (with appropriate partners, i.e. the IVS) a comprehensive training plan for school management aimed at principals which provides an outline, schedule and annotation of the entire training program. This plan should take into consideration the established principal norms and standards as well as their observable and explicit needs. The plan should also determine the availability of school personnel and their optimal availability to participate in the training activities.
11. PAEM should support the development and delivery of an intensive program of principal training by the IVS and others (e.g. Principals' Association) to address basic school operations, management and personnel issues. This could be implemented for two weeks in the summer. All middle school principals should be trained (although some modules may not apply to non-PAEM schools.)
12. The school principal's guide needs to be updated, expanded and distributed to all principals. It should be highly practical with step-by-step instructions, examples, and procedures. PAEM needs to determine the viability of and alternatives to the CD format used previously for materials, as it may not be easily accessible for use by all principals.
13. PAEM should undertake with appropriate partners (e.g. IVS) a training needs assessment. Training modules and materials in school management for school principals identified by the Evaluation Team include:
    - Financial management and accounting
    - Fund-raising, revenue generation and partnership development
    - Personnel management (especially how to deal with the personal and professional needs of a mainly young and untrained teaching corps.)
    - The student- (and girl-) friendly school and "la vie scolaire"
    - Community communication, consultation and mobilization
    - CGE development and management
    - Reporting, monitoring and evaluation
14. Principals should be provided with the training and tools to produce synthetic/analytic reports that allow overall analysis and presentation of school trends: teacher and student attendance, student grades and performance, etc. They can use "canned templates" that permits easy ways to analyze and present the information. These reports should be shared with the CGE, parents and other community members and/or posted publicly.
15. Principals should receive additional and more advanced training on the computers. All computer training provided to the teachers should also include the principal.

(Principal Training in Pedagogical Leadership)

16. Principals need to develop their capacity to provide instructional and pedagogical leadership. Training modules and detailed "how-to" materials should be developed and delivered to reinforce the principal's role as a pedagogical leader, including how to organize in-school and between school professional exchanges for teachers. Principals should be included in all the teacher training modules

on pedagogy. In order to underscore and reinforce transversal pedagogy, a whole-school approach to training should be undertaken for select modules. All school personnel should be trained at the same time so that professional exchange, mentoring, peer coaching and a "circle of quality" approach is strengthened.

17. Principals should be trained in classroom observations and how to provide guidance and constructive feedback to teachers to improve their classroom management and teaching so that observations become a routine and regular part of a principal's management responsibilities. Principals should be provided with observational tools, protocols and scheduling exemplars as part of the training to help them plan and implement classroom observations. In order to maximize their usefulness and acceptance, the observations should not be used in the formal teacher evaluation process. It should be made very clear that these observations are for formative purposes only so that teachers and their unions do not challenge them.
18. Principals should be encouraged to participate in all cellule exchanges, not just those in his/her subject area.

(School Management Support--Development of the IVS)

19. The IVS should develop, with PAEM support, an overall program (i.e. institutional scope of work) that defines the various components and elements of "la vie scolaire." This program should correspond to the norms and standards for school principals and also reflect applicable "texts" and regulations. A multi-year action plan for the elaboration of the various elements should be prepared. An iterative school management checklist and visit protocol should be developed for use by IVS (and its agents) to ensure the IVS are using the same standards and that schools are meeting all current management requirements.
20. PAEM should consider a month-long internship or study tour for select IVS personnel at US or Canadian middle schools, in which they spend time at schools with principals in order to expand their understanding of the role and various dimensions of a principal's role (i.e. instructional leadership, private-public initiatives, student support, community interaction and outreach, etc.). These individuals should then be required to prepare a training program, training modules, materials and/or guidelines for principals based on their experience.
21. The Ministry should consider increasing the number of IVSs in the regions and possibly adding IVSs at the IDEN level or assigning IDEN inspectors IVS-type duties.
22. All IVS in the target regions (and probably all of Senegal, given their relatively small numbers) should be trained in the various modules and courses developed for IVS, school principals, CGE and other related issues.
23. In order to deal with the logistical constraints, PAEM should consider providing each target region with a small truck ("camionette') to be shared between the IVS and CPI to meet a predetermined program of school visits. Continued use should be predicated on meeting obligations for specified actions and products. The program may also include non-PAEM schools in order to spread the transversal pedagogy and other school management and teaching and learning concepts.
24. The IVS and other inspectors at the IA and IDEN should be included in (and probably conduct) all principal-related training.

IR 2: Improved teaching and learning environment

(*Possible SOAG conditionaliies)*

1. The SOAG should include a condition that PAEM schools are supplied with a sufficient number of "manual scolaire" in each subject area which includes teacher manuals, program guides and student textbooks. The number of student textbooks should allow for effective sharing among the students and be no less favorable than the standard ratio as defined in the Ministry textbook policy (i.e. two students per textbook--2:1).

2. A binding constraint on teaching and learning (particularly in math and science) is both the scope and sequence of the curriculum. Subject area standards and indicators of learning are very demanding and may not correspond to students' cognitive development and capacity to learn. Although this represents a major sector reform and institutional issue, USAID should encourage the Ministry to revisit their overall curriculum. In particular, the Ministry needs to re-examine the standards of learning and student performance indicators in each subject area by grade level. This examination needs to assess what has been learned in previous years so that the introduction of new content is "scaffolded" and provides for both the required content knowledge and student skill sets. A SOAG condition might be that the Ministry develops a plan and process to undertake this review.

SIR 2.1: Increased Access to Instructional Materials

(Teacher manuals, guides and student textbooks)

3. If the Ministry is unable to provide them, PAEM should ensure all schools have teacher manuals and program guides. Although the lack of student textbooks is a major impediment to learning, USAID should be very cautious about providing student textbooks which then releases the government from the obligation to provide them to all PAEM schools and would undermine the SOAG conditionality.
4. PAEM should assist schools to develop a textbook management policy and set of procedures that maximizes textbook use. The procedures should include instructions on how to handle a book and protect it to ensure the textbooks last for the amount of time (textbook life) stipulated in the policy. The school-based textbook management policy and set of procedures should be a part of the principal and CGE training.

(Teaching and learning materials)

5. USAID should assist the Ministry in pursuing public-private partnerships to obtain supplemental teaching/learning materials. For example, USAID could facilitate Ministry negotiations with DHL to provide all Senegalese schools maps of Africa similar to the one in the business center at the Meriden Hotel. (See the Sudan basic education program for information about a US-based NGO that supplies reference materials and student textbooks as part of the cost-share requirement for the USAID Sudan co-operative agreement.)
6. USAID should provide a standard package of teaching and learning aids to all PAEM schools. The quantity allocated to each school should be calibrated on the number of teachers and students enrolled in the school. The package should include generic teaching/learning materials as well as subject-specific materials such as maps for history and geography, a microscope and slides for science, weights and a balance scale for science and math, etc. (A more detailed list of illustrative instructional materials is included in the annex.)
7. PAEM should provide a basic package of reading materials including reference books, recreational reading materials (poetry, fiction, non-fiction, biography, etc.) and magazine subscriptions in both English and French.
8. The project should consider alternatives for the provision of teaching/learning and reference materials that are not computer and internet based.

(Making teaching and learning materials)

9. PAEM should include a training module on creating and using instructional materials. The training should be implemented as a whole-school approach in which all school personnel, including the principal, participate in the training at the same time. Upon completion of the training, the school should be provided with a package of supplies to create teaching and learning aids (e.g.. magnets, tempura paint, contact paper, basic construction supplies, blank flash cards, poster board, etc.). This training should also include suggestions on the effective use of classroom walls for instructional purposes.

10. The community sensitization program should include information on ways the community can support improved teaching and learning by supplying local materials and in-kind labor to make learning and teaching aids for the school.
11. PAEM should consider hiring a short-term consultant to carry out a search on the internet to identify websites that provide information and instructions on making teaching and learning materials. The consultant should prepare a manual with the instructions for teaching and learning aids organized by subject area. The manual should also include an annotated bibliography of websites about student-centered and performance-based teaching and learning activities. The consultant should be experienced in teaching strategies and be familiar with the classroom environment in Senegalese schools.

SIR 2.2: Improved classroom teaching/learning environment

(Pedagogy transversal)

1. USAID should assist the Ministry to identify blockages and to develop procedures and practices that enable the PRF to make regular and scheduled school visits. USAID support could provide a vehicle to each region. In order to guarantee that vehicles are used exclusively for official Ministry business, we strongly recommend the provision of pick-up trucks and/or motorcycles where appropriate. Provision of vehicles should be contingent on agreed upon reporting requirements and the development of specified products.
2. The CP support to schools should be revised to be more efficiently. During each visit to a school the CPI should provide instructional support to all the teachers regardless of the CPI's subject area and area of expertise. Not only will this approach provide for a more efficient use of resources it also reinforces the acceptance and implementation of the pedagogy "transversal".
3. PAEM should support the Ministry in developing an in-service and professional development program for the CPIs. This should include the creation of a mechanism for professional exchange. In addition, all CPIs in a region should be trained in the pedagogy "transversal".
4. PAEM should assist the DEMCG in developing a program to expand and reinforce the understanding and appreciation of the pedagogy "transversal" with ministerial partners (i.e.IS, CP, IGEN and formation continu).
5. PAEM should assist the IA, PRF, IS and "formation continu" to develop a plan to provide PAEM training and materials to all teachers in a region. It is not realistic that project resources (time, money and personnel) should underwrite and deliver this training to the non-PAEM schools.

(Teacher performance norms and standards)

1. The teacher performance norms and standards developed by the Ministry should be defined in actionable and measurable ways and eliminate all redundancies. PAEM should assist the Ministry to translate the norms into a checklist of observable and measurable behaviors that forms the basis of teacher assessment criteria. The norms should also take into consideration the subject area student competencies which are being developed by the IGEN.
2. The Ministry should vet the teacher performance norms on a wider basis throughout the DMCG and approve, institutionalize and officially adopt the norms as the foundation for teacher training, teacher evaluation and teacher support activities and programs. The norms should also be shared with principals, teachers and CGEs.

(Instructional support)

3. PAEM should work with the necessary partners to develop a routine and coordinated plan of teacher support to improve classroom instruction. The plan should address support provided by principals, the cellule, PRF, and CPI.
4. The Ministry needs to strengthen the regional capacity to provide on-going instructional support to teachers. This should address Ministry provision of both human and financial resources.

5. The Ministry should consider deploying a CPI specialized in pedagogy "transversal" at the department level in each region.
6. PAEM should assist the principals to create mechanisms at the school level to provide teacher professional exchange. This assistance should include how to identify issues and topics to discuss, how to find time for the exchanges and how to foster active participation of all school personnel. Principals should also receive training to strengthen their role as an instructional leader. (See school management under IR 1.)

(Classroom observations)

7. PAEM should work with the Ministry to develop a classroom observation guide and checklist of skills that can be used to identify master teachers and "animateurs cellule". Individuals identified as a master teacher or animator should receive specialized training in mentoring and peer coaching and allotted the time to provide instructional support to teachers at their schools. (For example, one day a week can be ear-marked for peer coaching and mentoring or cellule activities.)
8. The Ministry should use classrooms observations as part of the teacher evaluation process. These observations should be considered when decisions are made for teacher promotions.
9. PAEM should assist the Ministry to develop materials (including tools) to train CPI, IS and other relevant inspectors on how to conduct classroom observations that focus on pedagogy "transversal".

(Science and math)

10. PAEM should assist the Ministry in identifying ways the project can support the initiative to improve science and math teaching and learning. This might include helping the Ministry implement a small pilot program in which different models are tested.
11. PAEM might consider hiring a math and science consultant who can help them and the Ministry to identify model programs, to modify the programs to correspond with Ministry middle school science and math curriculum and to provide guidance on adaptations required for an experimental pilot program. One source of information that might be consulted is the "*What Works Clearinghouse*". This is a US Department of Education project that evaluates educational innovations and their results. Each innovation is rated on a specific set of research-based criteria to determine how effective they are.

(Teaching and Learning)

12. PAEM should assist the principals to create mechanisms at the school level to provide teacher professional exchange. This assistance should include how to identify issues and topics to discuss, how to find time for the exchanges and how to foster active participation of all school personnel.
13. PAEM should develop teacher resource manuals including sample student-centered lesson plans in each of the subject areas. The manuals can be 3-ring binders that provides for the inclusion of additional pages. PAEM should consider identifying, and translating as needed, examples of exemplary lessons teachers have posted on the internet.
14. PAEM should develop a highly practical "how-to" for teachers on basic planning, teaching methods, continuous assessment strategies and classroom management strategies.
15. PAEM should develop a best practices guide prepared by the PAEM teachers that includes teacher anecdotes and suggestions on how to motivate students, teaching practices they find useful, extra-curricular activities used to enhance student learning, etc. This could be a periodical or radio program for "vacataires".
16. PAEM should work with schools to identify how to use the multi-purpose room for group learning activities to ensure space and resource constraints do not deter the implementation of PAEM innovative teaching/learning techniques.
17. PAEM should re-examine some of the teaching strategies introduced in the training modules (i.e. use of small group learning) to ensure they are realistic and able to be implemented in the classroom.

18. PAEM should review the internet sites for the USAID-funded ABEL, IEQ, and EQUIP projects which have a wealth of excellent materials (in both English and French) directed at improving teaching and learning. There are also subject-specific materials in science and math, HIV/AIDS and other STDs, environmental education, etc. PAEM should also review other USAID education programs in Africa that have an SIR to improve teaching and learning.

SIR 2.3: Improved in-service teacher training

(Training plan, modules and materials and follow-up)

6. USAID should support the Ministry to explore how other donors can use PAEM training modules and materials to expand the training approach and pedagogy "transversal" to other regions.
7. PAEM should develop a comprehensive training plan which provides an outline, schedule and annotation of each module for the entire training program. This plan should take into consideration the established teacher norms and standards as well as the observable and explicit needs of teachers. The plan should also consider the availability of school personnel and determine the optimal times they are able to participate in training activities.
8. PAEM should develop distance education teacher-follow-up support activities (print, computer, and/or radio) to complement and supplement the on-site training modules.
9. PAEM should develop training materials that provide teachers with a more profound understanding of what student-centered teaching is and what kinds of learning activities support student-directed and performance-based learning. This should include the use of videotapes, classroom observations and simulations to reinforce what student-centered teaching "looks" like. PAEM might consider establishing laboratory schools in each of the three regions to facilitate this learning.
10. PAEM should develop training which provides for a deeper understanding of what student participation consists of (participation goes beyond asking and answering questions or going to the black board) and what it means to "support" student learning in large group, small group and individual instruction.
11. PAEM should develop training on the different levels of cognitive functioning (higher order thinking). The training should include concrete examples of higher order thinking in planning and presenting lessons, in questioning patterns and in learning activities that require application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. The training also needs to address effective use of written exercises and board work that goes beyond the typical copying of the "dictée" in student "cahiers" and rote learning that occurs in most classrooms. PAEM also needs to ensure Ministry partners have a shared understanding of higher order thinking which is used in instructional support to teachers and evaluation of their performance.
12. PAEM should develop training on ways to evaluate student comprehension and subject area mastery. It should also include a section on providing individual support to weaker students as well as how teachers can be more responsive to the gender implications of both the boys and girls.
13. PAEM training modules should be very practical, user-friendly and user-ready. In addition to content information in the modules, they should include guides, templates, tools, checklists, etc. that enables teachers to walk out of the training sessions and immediately apply what they learned in their teaching. The training and support should focus on overall instructional and classroom management skills in lieu of strengthening competencies in specific subject areas. This does not, however, prescribe not using subject area-specific examples in the modules.
14. All PAEM training programs should include a how-to section for the participants on sharing what they have learned with colleagues and how to conduct peer coaching to support the implementation of PAEM teaching strategies and innovations in their schools.

(Initial "vacataire" training)

15. PAEM should conduct a classroom observation baseline survey in a representative sample of schools to determine and establish "vacataire" competencies and needs. The data should be used to inform on-going training plans including the content of the modules. The survey will also provide the project

with the information needed to better monitor and report changes taking place in teaching and learning.

16. PAEM should collaborate with Fastef to develop a complementary fast-track training program for "vacataires". The training should include a collection of step-by-step how-to guides on setting up a class at the beginning of the academic school year. For example, the guide could include a template for writing a student-centered lesson plan, instructions and tools to assess student subject area mastery from the previous year, suggestions on student seating arrangements that take into consideration special learning needs such as vision or hearing impairments and best practice suggestions such as assigning seats in the front of the classroom to shorter students and seats in the back to taller students.

SIR 2.4: Increased access to CIT

1. PAEM should work with principals to develop a CIT utilization plan including a manual and guidance for equitable use of the computers and internet that takes into account gender (of both teachers and students), wear on the equipment, and the priority needs of the school. This plan should address teacher expectations on the use of CIT in their lesson preparation and presentations and ensure that the equipment is used in the most efficient and effective way.
2. Rather than providing each school with a laptop to use for power point presentations, PAEM should install a desk top computer in the multi-purpose room where classes can go for power point presentations. Since the use of power point is limited to one teacher at a time, a desk top model provides for both the most efficient use of the equipment and the greatest level of control.
3. PAEM should conduct a study at the end of the first year of implementation on the use of the CIT, problems that were encountered, the wear and upkeep of the equipment and the impact of CIT on teaching, learning and school management. The findings should be used to modify the distribution, training and utilization of CIT in both new and existing PAEM schools.
4. Low tech options to improve teaching and learning and increasing access to learning and teaching materials should be considered in lieu of the CIT.
5. Schools should consider ways in which the computers and internet might be used to leverage funds for teaching and learning materials and other school needs.

SIR 2.5: Increased access to life skills training

1. PAEM should develop a "Kids Can Do It" handbook for FOSCO that addresses student and school life issues. The handbook should include a section on ways students can enhance their own learning, use of study skills like SQ3R and meta-cognition strategies.
2. PAEM should work with the Ministry to develop a fast-track sex education module that addresses the physical and hormonal changes and behaviors of adolescent students. The module should include information on ways students can talk to adults and their peers about sex and who they should seek for advice and support on sexual issues including sexual harassment and abuse and inappropriate behaviors by teachers, other students and individuals in the community.
3. PAEM should encourage schools to create clubs and after school activities that address life skills. For example, these could include a club on income-generation activities and personal finances; presentations on career options and goal setting and planning; effective time management; how students can foster positive relations between the school and the community; how to host presentations and campaigns on HIV/AIDS and other STDs; and how to foster self-assertiveness and agency (particularly for girls)
4. PAEM (with Ministry assistance and guidance) should consider developing a handbook for FOSCO that provides guidance and how-to information for the students on effective leadership, the roles and responsibilities of informed citizens, democratic representation and participation, and positive strategies to effect change and resolve issues. This guidance should target ways to strengthen school leadership and foster positive relations between the students and school managers and personnel.

IR 3: Increased participation of local government and communities in education management and financing

1. USAID should be more specific in explicating IR 3, and SIRs 3.1 and 3.2. As PAEM has not really developed a program in these areas (except for IR 3.2), there are few specifics that the evaluation can address in terms of effectiveness and/or impact. USAID needs to both detail its expectations and outline a strategy. Specific definitions of "local government," "local financing," and "community" are required. Specific government- and community-level partners should be identified.
2. USAID may wish to consider merging into one SIR planning (3.1) and financing (3.2), as generally the latter is the result of the former, particularly if PAEM is to develop a coherent approach to local level support of education. Moreover, this would provide for the formulation of a more coherent set of activities an
3. PAEM should develop a more detailed approach, set of activities, and process and output indicators for this IR. At present, it appears that PAEM is solely focusing on the school through the CGE. It—or some other designated USAID partner—should develop a program that addresses improved "local" government support of middle schooling, including planning, resource allocation, transparency, participation/consultation, and monitoring and evaluation.

SIR 3.1: Increased Local Financing for Middle Schools

1. USAID should support the Ministry in making a case to Ministry of Finance (or other appropriate Ministry) to increase the budget allocations for education to local government (and specifically for middle schooling.)
2. The Ministry should consider revising the "textes" and/or policies that proscribe the Rural Councils from providing support to the Middle Schools. PAEM could help the Ministry develop the "plaidoyer" based on a review of what Rural Councils are actually doing (or not doing) to support the "écoles de proximité."
3. PAEM should support the development of an analytic concept paper that addresses middle school financing issues, constraints, and needs assessment at each level within the region, so that the resource landscape is known, planning and allocation processes identified, and even actual funding levels specified to serve as the basis of a component design (see #3 above)
4. PAEM should support ways to strengthen the capacity of community groups to develop transparent accounting procedures. They should be given training and instruments to report on their activities and justify funds, expenses and accomplishments which can be shared with the community (public meeting, posted, etc.). In addition, community groups should be encouraged to elect their representatives rather than appoint them which will increase representatives' participation and level of engagement.
5. PAEM should work with the Rural Councils on ways to increase community willingness to pay taxes. These could include publicity about how public funds were spent on middle school support (e.g. visits to the school to see improvement), as well as making public the budget and expenses.

SIR 3.2: Effective Functioning of School Management Committees

(CGE Support and IVS)

1. The IVS, with PAEM support, should develop a checklist of measurable indicators (i.e. norms and standards) for determining the effectiveness of CGEs, based on discussion and feedback with the DEMCG, regional IVS, CGEs, and others relevant groups. They should be officially adopted and then be used to inform the CGE training program and materials provided to the CGE, as well as assessment and diagnostic criteria used by IVS or their agents during school visits. The norms should be shared with CGEs, principals, teachers and communities at large.
2. PAEM should assist the IVS to review the existing texts on CGE and make recommendations for any necessary modifications that could improve CGE operations and effectiveness. It should also help the

IVS put in place an M&E system that would help diagnose and inform any proposed changes, as well as to determine whether the CGE have been effective tools for school improvement.

3. An operations handbook for CGE should be developed. It should include practical guidance on basic operations, how-to guidance on establishing them, and checklist and calendar of routine tasks. CGEs should be provided with a suggested meeting schedule and program guide that corresponds to the changing needs and operation of the school throughout the school year. It should elaborate in actionable terms CGE roles and responsibilities, over and above their implementation of the "projet d'établissement". It should also include guidance on community mobilization, communications and how to create partnerships.

(CGE Training)

4. PAEM should undertake with appropriate partners (e.g. IVS) a training needs assessment for CGE and support the development of a comprehensive CGE training program that deals with all aspects of "la vie scolaire" that require CGE involvement and support. Training modules and materials in school support and management identified by the Evaluation Team include:
   - Financial management and accounting (including review of both the Budget de l'Ecole and the Budget de l'Etat).
   - Planning
   - Fund-raising, revenue generation and partnership development
   - The student- (and girl-) friendly school and "la vie scolaire"
   - Community communication, consultation and mobilization
   - CGE organization and operations
   - School operations (including what to expect from teachers and the principal in terms of teaching and management).
   - Monitoring the school
5. Included in the conflict resolution module (for principals and CGE members) should be training on how the principal can deal with and resist pressure from powerful and influential groups who want to undertake inappropriate actions at the school (i.e. building a mosque on school property).
6. CGE training should include a section on how to encourage the full participation of all CGE members. CGE meetings and CGE training should take into account the literary and language limitations of members and make changes as necessary. Guidance should be given to CGEs on how to leverage, incorporate and best use student representatives.

(CGE Organization)

7. Some thought should be given to task allocation for CGE sub-committees. These could include sub-committees for community mobilization, maintenance/cleaning, etc. Non-school CGE members should be included on the discipline and financial management sub-committees.

(CGE and Community Participation)

8. Principals and the CGE should host a coordinated planning session in which all community groups come together to determine how different activities can be allocated/chosen by different groups to support the school. Community organizations should also be encouraged to present what they have done to support the school at an end-of-year ceremony and recognition day (see below).
9. The principal and CGE should be encouraged to expand and regularize more meetings with the community, not just parents of students. In addition to "la Rentree" meeting, the school should plan an event/meeting near the end of the school year to inform the community of its accomplishments and needs. To encourage wider community participation some kind of social event or entertainment organized by school personnel and students could be presented.

10. CGEs should provide community awareness training to parents of students on ways they can support their children's education and what they should expect from the school i.e. accountability of teachers, accountability of principal, accountability of the CGE.

(Projet d'Etablissement and School Improvement Activities)

11. A detailed program for the "projet d'établissement" cycle—its development, activities, financing, management and assessment—should be fully developed. Agreement and procedures need to be developed with the IAs to establish "projet d'établissement" assessment criteria, approval timelines, and communication protocols with the CGEs. In addition, PAEM should re-examine CGE understanding of "projet d'établissement" to ensure that it is not limiting the scope of activities that could be undertaken for school improvement or lead to reliance on outside financing.
12. PAEM should support the participatory development of best practices and how-to guide for the CGE and community groups on activities to improve the school, once a full cycle of "projet d'établissement" has been completed. Each year, the inventory of ideas and best practices should be expanded and updated.
13. The CGE should make public the school budget and expenditures with the community in order to demonstrate to the community that their funds are being used appropriately and to encourage continued support.
14. Efforts should be made to provide the training, direction and ideas to the CGE and principal on how to bring the school closer to the community. At least one activity should be included in the "projet d'établissement" that "gives back" to the community. The plan of action should include certain things the school will do that year for the community i.e. organize football matches; school fair; school play; health seminars; community clean up undertaken by the school (community environment clean-up campaign).

SIR 3.3: Effective Education Planning at the Regional Level

1. The Ministry should consider revising the "textes" and/or policies that proscribe the Regional Councils from any construction at the school. PAEM could help the Ministry develop a revised policy that optimizes school support.
2. PAEM should develop a program specifically aimed at improving planning (and financing) within the regions. It should include all three (known levels) of planning: (1) the school community, (2) the collectivity, and (3) the region. The program should work both vertically and horizontally, so that (1) each level's plan for middle school support informs and is reflected at the higher level and (2) the plan at each level is prepared based on collaboration between local government and the relevant educational authority. For example, the school should jointly plan with the community, the IDEN with the Rural Council, and the IA with the Regional Council.
3. PAEM should work with the Ministry (and or other relevant central government institutions) to develop an approach, training modules and materials suited for each level.
4. At each level, the training program should be conducted jointly with local government and education authority representatives. It should address their specific roles and responsibilities and show how their activities are (or should be) linked. Training delivery could be timed to correspond with the government and Ministry planning cycles, and be used to actually produce the official plans. An end-of-the year, training could include an assessment of progress.
5. Planning handbooks should be developed that detail the step-by-step procedures for joint planning and for establishing regular coordination and progress reporting meetings between government and educational authorities at each level, and among levels.
6. Regional (and rural) councils should be encouraged to provide some kind of awards ceremony or recognition (radio announcement) to acknowledge CGEs and communities that have done an outstanding job in support of their school.
7. The regional (and rural) councils should be encouraged to support exchanges among each other on what they've done to support middle schooling.

USAID Program Management

1. USAID should institute regular (monthly) meetings with PAEM.
2. USAID should invite PAEM participation in donor coordination meetings.
3. USAID should not add tasks to the PAEM contract that are not integral to the middle school program, but find other mechanisms for areas of interest or non-related requests from the Ministry (e.g. scholarship management, Koranic schools, PPAs, centralization/governance).
4. USAID should revise its results framework to ensure all intervention areas of the PAEM/CLASSE are included. For example, school management including principal knowledge, attitude and behavior should be addressed.
5. USAID should revisit and re-emphasize its understanding with the Ministry that while it (USAID) seeks to expand middle schooling through PAEM, it also aims at supporting the Ministry to develop a viable approach or model for middle school education that will be adopted by the Ministry and used throughout Senegal.

PAEM Project Management

(General)

1. As it enters the second phase of the project, PAEM should cultivate a "big picture" perspective that includes working with the Ministry and other partners on policy and institutionalization issues, in order to ensure model adoption and sustainability. PAEM may wish to convene a meeting of all its partners to develop a policy matrix and action plan to ensure that these issues are being addressed at all levels. It may also wish to engage international technical assistance to support this exercise.
2. PAEM should ensure that its highly appreciated participatory approach includes key decision-makers and gate-keepers, as well as multiple representatives, from the various units of the Ministry in order to ensure buy-in and acceptance of the model.
3. PAEM should work with the Ministry to ensure that the IA and IDEN are fully involved in the project and are allowed to assume their responsibilities vis-a-vis the project as provided for under decentralization.
4. PAEM should conduct rapid, but empirically-based needs assessments for all the actors in the various components of the project (e.g. principals, teachers, CGEs, IVS, DEMCG, etc) in order to develop training and support programs. In theory, the need should be defined as the difference between what their actual knowledge, behaviors and attitudes are and the norms, standards and/or goals set for them by the ME and/or project.
5. PAEM should continue to involve local teams in the development of the modules and materials, but it should exert a stronger role in identifying the content and approach (possibly by including international short-term T.A. on the teams) to ensure that the modules and materials are tailored to needs and are not simply recycling existing ideas and less suitable materials.
6. PAEM should make greater use of existing materials for its manual, handbook and module development. It should search out existing materials that correspond to various PAEM program interventions which provide very practical guidance and tools developed by USAID and other multi- and bi-level projects (e.g. In My Classroom, IEQ materials, Girls Can Do It, GirlsPLACE, Seeing for Yourself, Equity In the Classroom materials). It may wish to assign a US-based research assistant to identify and gather these materials.

(Logistics)

7. PAEM should be provided more office and work space, but should remain at the Ministry of Education. PAEM should develop a plan that addresses space requirements and, with USAID, discuss with the Ministry. If its needs cannot be accommodated, PAEM should consider relocating to a space nearby.
8. Office space needs at the regional level should be similarly addressed, but MOUs with the regional IAs could include this as a conditionality of additional support.

9. Logistical support provided to various departments or units in the Ministry, IAs or IDENs (e.g. vehicles provided to regional PFR and IVS), should be predicated on a performance contract with specified schedule and deliverables. For example, the IVS and the CPI must develop a schedule of school visits and a SOW for the visits, and provide proof that the visits have taken place.

(Staffing)

10. PAEM should consider adding a deputy director (local or international) to deal with the administrative, financial and logistical aspects of the program.
11. PAEM should plan and provide for more international expert involvement in planning and developing its approaches to the various project intervention areas (e.g. community participation, school management, CGE, etc.), including the training plan, modules and materials. The international consultants are expected to bring hands-on, highly practical expertise and experience with a wide range of approaches and materials that have been effectively used elsewhere to produce desired results. PAEM should establish on-going support arrangements with key international consultants that will spend time each quarter to work with the various partners on the different components (e.g. IVS and school management, etc.)
12. PAEM should consider adding a full-time international in-country staff member specialized in teaching-learning to work with the local PAEM quality specialist, given the demands of this component. This person could also deal with over all training program and material development.
13. PAEM should consider re-organizing internally, so that construction/rehabilitation and on-going community participation are handled separately (particularly if PAEM takes these latter activities on "in-house").
14. PAEM should consider adding a monitoring and evaluation specialist to take charge of supervising data collection, reporting, and assisting in the development/management of special studies or inquiries that may be planned (e.g. analysis of student enrollment and accessibility).
15. PAEM should consider adding financial/logistics assistants in the regions to work under the supervision of regional coordinators. This two-person regional team should be replicated in other regions if/when they are added to the project.
16. PAEM should consider adding a local part-time Public-Private Partnership expert, who can actively pursue and manage alliances, as well as work with the Ministry in developing its capacity to build partnerships. International expertise should be engaged to periodically provide support.
17. PAEM should broaden the dissemination plan of publicity materials (brochures, CDs, videos, etc.) about the project within the Ministry at both the national and regional levels.

(USAID and Donor Coordination)

18. PAEM should regularly brief USAID on issues that it should be raising both internally at USAID (in other sectors) and in the donor community.
19. PAEM representatives should be invited to accompany USAID to donor meetings as resources persons, with first-hand familiarity with policy, institutional, and resource constraints.

Monitoring and Evaluation:

(General)

1. PAEM should develop a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan. The tabular PMP is not sufficient. It should include:
   - Discussion of its results framework, development hypothesis/rationale, critical Assumptions and risks
   - Indicator definition, disaggregation, baselines and targets, and special issues
   - M&E strategy and plan for data collection (including sampling), tabulation, reporting and quality control
   - Data collection instrument design

- Plan and approach for baseline data collection
- Special studies, analyses and inquiries

2. PAEM should establish baselines for all the areas of project intervention: students, teachers, principals, CGE, CPE, etc. While baselines are not always the same as needs assessments (see above), they often overlap. For example, baseline on teacher performance in the classroom should comprise part of the teacher training needs assessment. These baselines should be carried out for all schools and institutions targeted for intervention. PAEM can disaggregate the data for the different cohorts.
3. For certain areas of intervention, PAEM should consider establishing control groups (e.g. teachers outside of PAEM schools, schools with no PAEM interventions, etc.)
4. PAEM should develop a list of research or analytic studies that are required. For example, it is strongly recommended that PAEM conduct a study/analysis of enrollment, retention and performance patterns at its schools in order to determine the extent to which it has improved access, quality, and gender equity. Current data is incomplete and precludes analysis (even for access).

(Data Collection and Reporting)

5. PAEM should work with the schools (specifically the principal) to ensure all student, teacher and other data is collected for its schools, according to ME definitions, in order to ensure the timely access to the data, which will be of most use to the Mission if available by the end of the USG fiscal year.
6. PAEM should work with its various partners charged with data collection to develop appropriate instruments, recording protocols, and reporting formats.
7. When PAEM uses Ministry-collected data about its interventions, it should establish and implement a sample-based data audit to ensure data veracity and quality.
8. PAEM should consider preparing an Annual report that not only present statistical data according to indicators, but provides an overview of accomplishments, activities and future plans. This would be more user-friendly to those not immediately involved in the activities. It may wish to negotiate with USAID that this replaces the last quarterly report of the year.
9. Quarterly reports need only be prepared in French. The consumers of the information they provide are Francophone, whether in the ME, the Mission or the donor community.
10. PAEM should ensure that required USAID indicators that fall within the work ambit of PAEM are reflected in its PMP". PAEM should review with the Mission the indicators on which it will have to report over-and-above the Mission's RF requirements, and plan accordingly for data collection, etc.

(PAEM Results Framework)

11. PAEM should revise its results framework (as used in the quarterly reports and M&E plan) so that it corresponds to USAID's RF (and the activities that fall within PAEM's purview) It should then elaborate under each SIR, sub-SIRs that correspond to activity areas (not single outputs, such as a student profile) in its work plan and develop appropriate indicators.

(Indicators)

12. Analysis of the PAEM school data should not only include comparison with regional and national statistics, but also with the previous academic year's indicators in the PAEM schools. For example, the promotion rate in PAEM schools may be expected to increase on an annual basis, which could indicate the impact of continued PAEM support of the school. The rate of change in PAEM schools (as well as absolute statistics) can be compared to the rate of change for the regional and national indicators as a control measure to show that similar change rates have not occurred throughout the country.
13. PAEM should employ an indicator that better captures its impact in terms of student enrollments. (Indicator #6 counts the physical places added only, and Annual report claims of regional increases cannot wholly be attributed to PAEM.) For newly constructed schools, the number of new students added to the system can be calculated by subtracting the number of transfer students from the total

enrollment for the academic year. If a student had attended another middle school, but not during the previous year, he/she should be counted as a "new" student added to the system. For rehabilitated schools, new students added should be calculated by subtracting the previous year's enrollment as well as transfer students. PAEM should require each school to report on student enrollment accordingly (students never before enrolled in middle school, students having attended a middle school within the past academic year, students having attended a middle school but not within the past academic school year.)

14. PAEM should work with the schools to collect and synthesize an average of annual (or even second semester) "notes de composition" in order to see whether student performance (not just student flow or even final BFEM pass rates increase). These should be disaggregated by grade level, subject area and sex. Since these are internal teacher-reported grades, a regional or national comparison is not feasible. PAEM should consider using control schools.
15. PAEM needs to better define the "completion rate" indicator, and specify the denominator that will be used. UNESCO completion rate definition uses a population denominator, which may be difficult to ascertain for PAEM school catchments areas and not be as meaningful as calculating a survival rate (which calculates the percentage of students having started 6eme four years earlier that have successfully completed 3eme.) Alternatively, PAEM could simply show the success rate, which use the number of students enrolled in 3eme that have met defined performance standards.
16. PAEM should add some school quality measures over which it may exert control or which may indicate problems. For example, it should report on the student-classroom ratio, the student-teacher ratio, the student-textbook ratio, the percentage of women teachers, etc.
17. PAEM should better define many of its indicators so that they are measurable and "objectively verifiable." For example, clear criteria for Indicators #9, 10, 11, and 13 should be specified. Indicators 15, 16, 17 19, 20 and 21 require checklists with measurable criteria.

Annex 6: Data Table completed by PAEM

Regional Statistics (can include PAEM schools)

	2004/2005								2005/2006[1]								Total LOP	
	Fatick		Kolda		Tamba		Total		Fatick		Kolda		Tamba		Total			
1. Total # of Middle Schools	35 + 5[2]		38+1		27+2						59+3		32+2					
3. Student-Classroom ratio	49:1		76:1		71:1						140:1		61:1					
4. Student-Teacher ratio	61:1		33:1		37:1								27:1					
	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F
5.. # of teachers in Middle Schools	257	48	601	48	301	25							459	52				
6. % teachers who are women	#48		#48		#25								#52					
7. % teachers who are vacataires	#52		#290		#153								#242					
	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F
8.. # of students in Middle School (non PAEM)	14133	5737	17378	5375	9255	3058					23273	6878	12638	4176[3]				
9. % increase in enrollments in non-PAEM schools																		
10. % students in Grade 6	#5997	#2521	#7905	#2474	#4207	#1338					#9844	#3170	#2943	#959				
5. Average grade-to-grade promotion rate																		
6. Average repetition rate																		
7. Drop-out rate																		
8. Survival Rate (through Grade 3)																		
9. Pass rate on end-of-year exam																		

[1] The DEMSG is currently compiling these statistics, and only partial tables were available.
[2] CEM + Lycee/CEM
[3] Includes PAEM schools

Statistics for PAEM Schools

	2004/2005[4]								2005/2006								Total LOP	
	Fatick		Kolda		Tamba		Total		Fatick		Kolda		Tamba		Total			
1. # of PAEM Schools																		
• constructed	3		3		4		10		3		3		2		8		18	
• rehabilitated	3		3		2		8		1		1		2		4		12	
• total (constructed + rehab'd)	6		6		6		18		3		3		3		12		30	
2. # of PAEM Schools with:																		
• electricity									7		4		6		17		30	
• water									6		2		4		12		30	
• telephone									0		0		1		1		30	
• all three									0		0		1		1		30	
3. Student-Classroom ratio																		
4. Student-Teacher ratio																		
	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F
5.. # of teachers in PAEM schools	57	6	70	2	41	3							78	9				
6. % teachers who are women	#6		#2		#3								#9					
7. % teachers who are vacataires	#39		#38		#34								#51					
8.. # of students in PAEM schools	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F
• constructed	636	285	399	78	559	162					1055	263	837	243				
• rehabilitated	1502	593	2128	566	1283	339					2361	656	1456	390				
• # of students enrolled in rehab'd school prior to PAEM rehabilitation																		
• total "new" students added (constructed + rehab'd less previous rehab'd school students)																		
9. % increase in enrollments in PAEM schools (for school in operation in 2004/2005)																		
• constructed																		
• rehabilitated																		
• total (constructed + rehab'd)																		
10. % students in Grade 6	#786	#299	#1146	#364	#1054	#285					#1324	#409	#693	#183				
5. Average grade-to-grade promotion rate																		
6. Average repetition rate																		
7. Drop-out rate																		
8. Survival Rate (through Grade 3)																		
9. Pass rate on end-of-year exam																		

[4] these schools (or new buildings) were not in use until the 2005/6 school year

Annex 7: Instruments

The following instruments are included in a separate file folder entitled Annex 7: Final French Instruments.

They include:

1. Interview Protocols:

- School Principal
- CGE
- Teachers
- Students
- Parents
- CGC
- Regional and Rural Councils (Education Commissions)
- IA (including the Regional Ministry Data Table)
- IDEN
- PRF
- CBO

2. Classroom Observation Guide

3. School Profile

School _____ Region F K T
Interviewer_____ CBO Focus Group

Introduction

1. Quelles sont les organisations qui interviennent à l'école ? (mettre une croix et notez s'Il s'agit d'un homme ou femme)
Associations (citez) □ ♀ ♂ ONG □ ♀ ♂ GPF □ ♀ ♂ SCOFI □ ♀ ♂

2. Combien des temps votre organisation soutient t-elle l'école?

4. Quel est le pourcentage de femmes qui appartiennent à l'organisation ?

5. Connaissez-vous le PAEM ? O N
6. Quels sont les objectifs généraux du PAEM ? Expliquez

O.S. Impact : Amélioration de l'accès et la qualité de l'éducation, particulièrement chez les filles

1. A votre avis, le PAEM a-t-il amélioré l'accès, le maintien et la performance des élèves de votre école ?

2. Comment pouvez-vous apprécier cette amélioration ?
   - Les élèves sont-ils plus assidus ?
   - Sont-ils plus ponctuels?
   - Sont-ils plus disposés à faire leurs devoirs à la maison ?
   - Réussissent-ils mieux dans les études et examens ?
   - Les parents sont-ils plus impliqués pour soutenir les élèves ?
   - Les élèves sont-ils plus intéressés par les leçons ?
   - Quoi d'autre?

RIC 1 : Accroissement de l'accès à l'enseignement moyen (données physiques)

SRI 1 et 2 : Davantage de CEM construits et amélioration des infrastructure des établissement ciblés

1. Votre organisation s'était-elle engagée à soutenir la construction/réhabilitation des collèges ?

2. Votre organisation a-t-elle contribué à organisation à l'amélioration de l'environnement physique du collège ? En quoi?

3. Sous quelle forme votre organisation a-t-elle contribué à la construction/réhabilitation ?

4. Quelle a été la contribution de votre organisation à l'amélioration de l'environnement physique du collège ?

School _____ Region F K T
Interviewer_____ CBO Focus Group

5. Comment votre contribution a la construction ou a la réhabilitation va-t-elle améliorer l'enseignement apprentissage dans votre collège ?
6. Avez-vous été contacté pour contribuer a la construction/réhabilitation du collège ?
Si oui, par qui ?

7. travaillez vous de concert avec pour le conseil à propos la construction/réhabilitation du collège ?

SRI 1.3: accroître la sensibilisation des communautés à l'importance de la scolarisation et particulièrement celle des filles

1. Votre organisation a-t-elle déjà organisé des campagnes de sensibilisation pour la scolarisation des enfants ? Pour les filles en particulier ? Décrire vos stratégies.

2. La sensibilisation est-elle ponctuelle ? Pendant quelle période le faite-vous ? avez-vous un plan d'action partagé avec le CGE ?

3. Ces campagnes sont-elles planifiées avec l'école ? Quels sont les moments choisis pour mener ces campagnes ?

4. Est-ce qu'il y a eu changement dans l'opinion des parents sur l'éducation des enfants après ces campagnes? Chez les filles ? Comment mesurez ces changements ?

5. Est-ce que les campagnes ont augmenté le nombre d'enfants inscrits? Notamment le nombre de filles ?

6. Attendez-vous un soutien financier du projet pour faire la sensibilisation ?

7. Y a-t-il des marraines ou parrains en faveur de la scolarisation des filles ?

8. Pensez-vous cette l'école est meilleure pour les filles plus que les autres collèges?

9. Faites-vous un plaidoyer pour permettre aux élèves enceintes ou précocement mariées de revenir à l'école ? Si oui, expliquez comment vous procédez.

10. Avez-vous déjà résolu des problèmes d'abandon ?

School _____ Region F K T
Interviewer_____ CBO Focus Group

11. Que peuvent faire les comités de gestion pour accroître l'appui de votre organisation a la scolarisation des enfants notamment celle des filles ?

RIC 2 : Amélioration de l'environnement de l'enseignement-apprentissage

SIR 2.1 & 2.2

1. Pensez vous que les élèves qui fréquentent cet établissement reçoivent une meilleure éducation que ceux des autres collèges? Si oui comment expliquez vous cela?.

2. Votre organisation apporte-elle un soutien pédagogique aux élèves ? Si oui comment ?

3. Les enseignants ou le principal vous sollicitent-ils en tant que personne-ressource ?

4. Faites-vous des dons en matériel pédagogique ?

5. Faites des dotations en manuels ou autres soutiens ?

6. Payez-vous des cours particuliers aux élèves ?

7. Organisez-vous le tutorat pour les élèves ? Combien cela vous coûte t-il? ?

8. Votre organisation offre t-elle des allocations aux élèves nécessiteux ?

9. Votre organisation soutien les filles en particulier ?

10. Quel est le résultat de cet apport financier ?

11. Est ce que le principal du Collège s'absente souvent de l'école ?
    Si oui savez vous pourquoi ?
    Avez-vous pris une quelconque mesure pour remédier a cela ?

12. Est ce que l'absence des enseignants est perçue comme un problème dans la communauté?
    Si oui quelle en est la fréquence ?
    Avez-vous pris des mesures pour remédier a cela ? Lesquelles?

School _____ Region F K T
Interviewer_____ CBO Focus Group

13. Est ce que l'absence des élèves est perçue comme un problème dans cet établissement?
Est-ce un problèmeme sérieux?
Est-ce que l'absence des filles est plus fréquente que celle des garçons ?
Qu'avez-vous fait pour y remédier ?

SIR 2.3

1. Est ce votre organisation utile les ordinateurs du collège ou son réseau Internet pour vos besoins propres? Quelle en est la fréquence ?

RIC 3 : L'augmentation de la participation du pouvoir local et des communautés à la gestion et au financement d'éducation

SRI 3.1 : Accroissement du financement local de l'enseignement

1. Les contributions aux écoles ont-elles augmenté depuis l'avènement du projet ?

2. Quelle est la nature de cette contribution ? Décrivez
Si en numéraires, quel est le niveau de contribution en $ _____

3. Les OCB accèdent-ils facilement à l'école ? Sinon, quels sont les blocages ?

4. Votre association est-elle membre du CGE ?

5. Comment votre organisation participe t-elle à la gestion des fonds quelles donne au collège ?

6. Votre organisation est-elle invitée à participer par le CGE, Le principal ?

7. Quelles sont vos relations avec le CGE : Cordiales ? Conflictuelles ?

8. Comment travaillez-vous avec le CGE ?

9. Comment sont vos relations (bonnes, conflictuelles)

10. Que fait votre organisation si elle n'est d'accord avec la direction de l'établissement ou des décisions prises par le conseil de gestion?

10. Le CGE est-il toujours au courant de ce que vous faites à l'école ?

11. Votre association prend-elle des initiatives pour apporter plus de moyens financiers à l'école ? Citez des exemples d'initiatives prises.

12. Avez-vous déjà organisé une levée de fonds en faveur du collège ?

School _____ Region F K T
Interviewer_____ CBO Focus Group

13. Pouvez-vous dire quel montant collecté ? $ _____
14. Avez-vous reçu une formation en levée de fonds ? Si oui, qui vous a formé ?

15. Faites-vous des contributions ponctuelles ou régulières ?

16. Pensez-vous que la contribution financière soit utile pour le collège ? Expliquez.

17. A qui remettez-vous l'argent ?

18. Comment assurez-vous le contrôle de l'argent que vous donnez ?

19. Avez-vous une idée de comment cet argent est dépensé ?

20. Est-ce que votre organisation a une fois été informée du budget de l'établissement?
Si est ce que, l'information vous parvient régulièrement ?
Savez vous comment les fonds sont utilisés ?

21. Comment votre organisation est –elle informée des décisions de la direction de l'établissement et de celles du conseils de gestion? Etes vous régulièrement en contact avec ces deux structures ?

SIR 3.2

1. Y'a t-il des membres de votre organisation qui ont participe a des formations sur comment mieux appuyer les collèges?
   Si oui, quand ?
   Sur quoi portez cette formation ?
   Est ce que cette formation était utile pour vous?

2. Pensez vous qu'une telle formation peut aider les organisation comme la votre a mieux s'impliquer dans l'assistance aux collèges?

3. Y a-t-il d'autres organisations de base qui n'appuient pas les colleges et qui auraient pu le faire si on le leurs demandait? Si oui, citez les.

4. Que peut faire le conseil de gestion de l'établissement pour les impliquer?
5.

Demandez aux participants de discuter entre eux pour fournir une réponse aux questions suivantes. Ils doivent s'entendre sur l'ordre de priorité de leurs choix.

Question: S'il y'avait trios choses a faire pour améliorer le collège, lesquelles proposeriez vous? Classez les par ordre d'importance.

School _____ Region F K T
Interviewer_____ CBO Focus Group

Questions à l'IMAM

1. Que pensez-vous de la scolarisation des enfants ?

2. Que pensez-vous de la scolarisation des filles ?

3. Partagez-vous votre opinion avec la communauté que vous dirigez ?

4. Vous est-il arrivé d'intervenir en faveur de l'éducation des enfants/filles auprès des familles ?

5. Décrivez comment vous procédez.

6. Organisez-vous des conférences sur des thèmes relatifs à l'éducation ? Quand avez-vous organisé la dernière rencontre? Sur quoi portez t-elle ? Y'avez t-il beaucoup de participants?

7. Avez-vous déjà résolu des problèmes d'abandon ?

8. Rendez-vous visite aux parents pour leur parler de la scolarisation des enfants ?

Ecole _____ Region F K T
Interviewer _____ GUIDE D'ENTRETIEN : CGE

Introduction

1. Quand est-ce que le CGE a-t-il été créé ?
2. De combien de membres est-il composé ? Combien de femmes y t-il ?

3. Combien de villages et de communautés qui envoient leurs enfants dans cette école sont représentés ?

4. Combien ont envoyé des enfants dans cette école ?

5. Décrivez rapidement votre parcours professionnel (si entrepreneur, dans quel service ?

6. Comment sont sélectionnés les membres du CGE, et par qui ? (élection, nomination)

7. Combien de fois change t-on les membres du CGE ?

8. A quand remonte la dernière réunion du CGE ?

9. Combien de fois se réunit-elle ? En général, combien de membres participent à chaque réunion en moyenne ?

10. Qui dirige les réunions ? Comment sont elles organisées ?

11. Est-ce que les élèves sont admis aux réunions du CGE ? Pour quoi et pour quelles raisons ?

Rôles et Responsabilités

1. En général, quelles sont les principales fonctions du CGE dans cette école (Citez-les).

Ecole _____ Region F K T
Interviewer _____ GUIDE D'ENTRETIEN : CGE

2. Y a-t-il une charte ou un manuel qui décrit les responsabilités du CGE ? Est-ce que les membres du CGE en reçoivent des copies ?

3. Combien de membres du CGE sont membres de l'APE ?

4. Est-ce que le CGE est différent de l'APE ?

5. Est-ce que le CGE constitue une amélioration ? Expliquez pourquoi il s'agit d'un bienfait ou non pour l'école.

6. Comment envisagez-vous la contribution du CGE pour l'amélioration de l'éducation ?

7. Comment fonctionne votre CGE ? (Est-ce que vous êtes organisés en comités ? Est-ce que les différents membres ont différentes fonctions ? Décrivez.

8. Qui sont les membres les plus actifs du CGE ? Expliquez pourquoi ?

9. Qui sont les partenaires du CGE dans l'école et à l'extérieur ?

10. A qui le CGE rend-il compte sur ses activités, ses problèmes…etc. ?

Ecole _____ Region F K T
Interviewer _____ GUIDE D'ENTRETIEN : CGE

O.S Impact : Améliorer l'accès et la qualité de l'éducation, notamment pour les filles

1. Selon vous, est-ce que le PAEM a amélioré l'accès des élèves, le maintien et la performance dans votre école communautaire ? Pour les filles aussi ?

2. Qu'avez-vous observé et quelles preuves pouvez-vous donnez de cette amélioration ? (Pour compléter le tableau sur les données de l'école)
    - est-ce que l'assiduité s'est améliorée ?
    - est-ce que les étudiants sont plus ponctuels
    - est-ce qu'ils ont plus de possibilité de faire leurs devoirs ?
    - ont-ils de meilleurs résultats aux examens et apprennent-ils mieux ?
    - est-ce que les parents sont plus impliqués et aident ils plus ?
    - sont ils plus intéressés par les leçons ?
    - ont-ils moins tendance à abandonner ?
    - Autre chose ?

RC 1 : Accroissement de l'accès à l'enseignement moyen (données physiques

SR1 et 2 Davantage de CEM construits et Amélioration des infrastructures des établissements cibles

1. Est-ce que le CGE a participé au processus de sélection pour la localisation de la nouvelle école qui vient d'être construite OU (2) de prise de décision pour la réhabilitation nécessaire ?

2. Quel a été le rôle du CGE dans la construction ou la réhabilitation de l'école ?

3. Est-ce que cette construction/réhabilitation est achevée ?

4. Quelles étaient les contributions nécessaires pour la communauté ?

5. a-t-elle satisfait à cette contribution ? Si non, quelle condition n'a pas été satisfaite ?

6. Quels étaient les besoins en contribution pour la collectivité ?

7. A-t-elle satisfait ce besoin? Si non, quel besoin n'a pas été satisfait ?

8. Dans quelle mesure la communauté a-t-elle été impliquée dans la construction ou la réhabilitation de l'école ? Décrivez les contributions, et citez les groupes.

RIC 2 : L'environnement d'apprentissage et d'enseignement amélioré

1. Quelles sont les quelques contraintes à un enseignement/apprentissage de qualité dans cette école et comment luttez-vous contre ces contraintes ?

2. Quels sont les problèmes liés aux enseignants ?

3. Est-ce que l'absentéisme est un problème dans cette école ? En moyenne, quel est le nombre de jours d'absence d'un enseignant dans une semaine ? généralement pendant combien de jours est-il absent ?

4. Quelles sont les raisons de cette absence ?

5. Quelle est la politique en vigueur dans votre école pour pallier les absences des enseignants ? Comment est-ce que le CGE lutte contre ce phénomène ?

6. Comment est-ce que le CGE appuie-t-il les enseignants ?

Ecole _____ Region F K T
Interviewer _____ GUIDE D'ENTRETIEN : CGE

7. Quels sont les problèmes liés à la gestion de l'école ?

8. Est-ce que l'absentéisme du chef d'établissement est un problème dans cette école ? En moyenne, combien de jours le chef d'établissement est-il absent au cours d'une semaine ?

9. Quelles sont les raisons de l'absence du chef d'établissement ?

10. Quelle est la politique en vigueur dans votre école pour lutter contre les absences du chef d'établissement ? comment est-ce que le CGE lutte t-il contre ce phénomène ?

11. Dans quelle mesure appuyez-vous le chef d'établissement ?

12. Quels sont les quelques problèmes liés aux élèves ?

13. Pensez-vous que cette école est plus accueillante et plus conviviale pour les filles ?

14. Y a-t-il des politiques et règlements gouvernementaux qui affectent les filles ?

15. Que fait votre école si une fille tombe en état de grossesse ? Si une fille accouche? Si la fille se marie ? Qui prend la décision ?

16. Que faites vous, si vous découvrez qu'un enseignant a un comportement déplacé vis-à-vis d'une élève? Y a-t-il un règlement pour vous guider dans ce cas? Est-ce que vous demandez un conseil ? Chez qui ? Est-ce que vous soumettez ce cas à l'attention des autorités compétentes ?

17. Avez-vous eu des cas de harcèlement des filles de la part des garçons ? Quelles mesures prenez-vous dans des cas de harcèlement des filles de la part d'un garçon ou d'un groupe de garçons ? Y a-t-il un règlement pour vous guider dans ce cas ? Est-ce que vous recherchez un conseil ? Chez qui ? Est-ce que vous soumettez ce cas à l'attention des autorités compétentes ou à ses parents ?

RIC 3 : Accroissement de la participation du pouvoir local et des communautés à la gestion et au financement de l'éducation.

SRI 3.1 Accroissement du financement local de l'enseignement moyen

1. Qui paye ou qui fournit les fonds pour payer les factures d'électricité, de téléphone et des autres services ? En moyenne, quel montant cela représente t-il par mois ? Est-ce que les factures sont régulièrement payées et à temps ?

2. Qu'est-ce que les collectivités locales (pas le ME) sont supposées faire pour l'école ? Faire la distinction entre le conseil régional et les collectivités locales.
3. Est-ce que les collectivités locales ont rempli leurs obligations ? Si non, qu'est-ce

4. Qu'ils n'ont pas fait et pourquoi ?

5. Est-ce que les collectivités locales ont augmenté les fonds alloués à cette école ? **(pour les écoles réhabilitées seulement ou les écoles non PAEM seulement**)

6. Quel montant avez-vous reçu cette année de la part des collectivités locales.

7. Que faites-vous pour travailler ou motiver l'appui de la part des autorités locales ? (spécifier)

8. Qu'est-ce que la communauté fournit à l'école ? Selon quelle périodicité ? Combien ? D'où proviennent ces fonds ? Spécifier.

9. S'agit-il de la contribution de l'ensemble de la communauté ou celle des parents ? S'agit-il de contributions volontaires ou obligatoires (par ex : frais de scolarité)

10. Dans quelle mesure (%) les ressources de la communauté contribuent-elles aux charges d'exploitation (courantes)

11. Par quelles voies ces fonds sont envoyés à l'école ? A travers le CGE ou le directeur ? Qui gère ces fonds et en tient la comptabilité. Quels sont les mécanismes mis en place pour empêcher toute perte ou tout détournement ?

12. Y a-t-il des relations entre le montant de la contribution/appui de la communauté et le montant reçu de la part des autorités locales et/ou du ME ?

SRI 3 .2 : Fonctionnement effectif des Comités de Gestion des Ecoles
CGE : Formation Renforcement des Capacités

1. Est-ce qu'un membre de votre CGE a reçu une formation dans le cadre du PAEM ? Combien ?

2. Où et quand est-ce que cette formation a eu lieu ? Comment était-elle organisée (après les cours, pendant les week-ends, tous les mois)

3. Quels sont les sujets et compétences appris par le membre du CGE au cours de la formation ?

4. Est-ce la formation a été utile pour le CGE ? dans quelle mesure ?

5. Etiez-vous satisfait du contenu de la formation / de la manière dont elle a été organisée / de la manière dont les cours ont été dispensés ? Expliquez.

6. Comment pourrait-on améliorer la formation afin qu'elle vous soit plus utile (type et quantité)

7. Quels sont les domaines qui n'ont pas été couverts dont vous pensez qu'ils pourraient aider le CGE à mieux faire son travail ?

8. En tant que membre du CGE, quel est le plus grand défi que vous pourriez relever par une formation complémentaire, plus d'information, ou un meilleur renforcement des capacités. Décrivez.

9. Est-ce que votre CGE a reçu une formation continue ou des visites d'appui sur le site ?

10. Pensez-vous que les autres partenaires de l'école (chef d'établissement, les enseignements, les parents, et autres) ont reçu une formation suffisante ou ont-ils besoin d'une meilleure formation ? Si oui, qui, et quel type de formation ?

Amélioration de l'Ecole

11. Qu'est-ce que le CGE a fait dans cette école pour aider dans l'appui à l'école, ses enseignants et/ ou ses élèves ? Décrivez.

12. Est-ce que le CGE a développé un plan d'amélioration de l'école ? Décrivez.

13. Quel en a été le processus ? A-t-il consulté les parents ou la communauté ? Qui est responsable de la mise en œuvre de ce plan ? du financement du plan ?

14. Comment est-ce le CGE peut-il savoir que l'école suit le plan et que des progrès sont réalisés dans l'amélioration ?

15. Est-ce que le CGE a mis en œuvre ou supervisé la mise en œuvre de projets ou d'activités visant l'amélioration de l'école ou l'appui aux élèves ? Décrivez.

16. Est-ce que le CGE a entrepris une action spécifique pour l'amélioration de l'accès des filles, leur maintien, leur performance et leur bien-être à l'école ?

17. Est-ce que le CGE recherche des ressources et un appui dans les autres programmes sectoriels (du gouvernement ou autre ? Comment ?

18. Est-ce vos communautés et vous avez noué des partenariats avec les entreprises locales ou les autres entités afin d'aider les écoles ?

19. Comment est-ce que le CGE interagit-il avec les parents, la communauté et les élèves ?

20. Comment est-ce que le CGE mobilise t-il la communauté et communique t-il ou partage t-il les informations ? organisez-vous des réunions publiques, des fora, publie t-il ses résultats ? Est-ce que le CGE publie ses registres et ses comptes?

21. comment collecte t-il des informations et comment reçoivent-il un feedback de la communauté ?

22. Rencontrez-vous les parents ? Dans quelles circonstances ?

23. Est-ce que la communauté a été satisfaite de la manière dont les fonds ont été utilisés ? Exemples ?

24. Quelle est la manière pour mobiliser des fonds ?

25. Est-ce que le CGE peut compter sur la communauté pour continuer à fournir des fonds complémentaires ?

Gestion de l'Ecole

26. Est-ce que le CGE participe à la gestion de l'école ? Comment ?

27. Est-ce que le CGE participe dans la prise de décisions personnelles et dans la discipline des enseignants ? Donnez des exemples.

28. Quel est le rôle que joue le CGE pour lutter contre l'absentéisme des enseignants et des élèves ?

29. Est-ce que le CGE procède à un suivi de la performance de l'école, de l'enseignant et de l'élève ? Comment procède-t-il ? Effectuez-vous des visites des salles de classe ? avez-vous une présence à l'école ?

30. Si un problème survient à l'école, à qui vous adressez-vous ?

31. Quel est le processus de prise de décision liée à l'école et à son budget ? Est-ce que le CGE y participe ?

32. Est-ce que le CGE a accès aux états financiers de l'école ? Est-ce qu'il procède à une revue de ces documents ?

33. Quelles sont les relations entre le CGE et le chef d'établissement ?

34. Est-ce le CGE reçoit des rapports (écrits ou oraux) sur la situation de l'école ou sur la performance des élèves de la part du chef d'établissement ?

35. Quel est le mode de résolution des conflits au sein du CGE ?

36. Est-ce qu'il y a d'autres conflits qui surviennent à l'école ? Comment sont-ils résolus ?

SRI 3.3 : Efficacité de la planification au niveau régional

1. Est-ce que le CGE participe à la préparation du plan annuel de l'école et une demande de budget qui sont soumis à l'IA et/ou au conseil régional ?

2. Est-ce que le CGE communique avec l'IA ? Combien de fois ? Pour quelle raison ?

Demandez aux participants de discuter entre eux pour fournir une réponse aux questions suivantes. Ils doivent s'entendre sur l'ordre de priorité de leurs choix.

Question: S'il y'avait trios choses a faire pour améliorer le collège, lesquelles proposeriez vous? Classez les par ordre d'importance.

Ecole_____ Région F K T

Interviewer _____ Guide d'Entretien : CHEF D'ETABLISSEMENT

Introduction

- Depuis combien de temps êtes un chef d'établissement ?_____
- Est-ce votre première école ? O N
- Etiez-vous directeur de cette école avant la réhabilitation ? O N
- Etes-vous également un enseignant dans cette école ? O N
- Dans quelle matière ?

- En général, quelles sont les principales responsabilités du chef d'établissement de l'école et de ses adjoints ?

- Quel est l'objectif principal du PAEM ?

- Quelles sont les changements ou modifications introduits dans le cadre du PAEM ? Donnez quelques exemples.

- Y a-t-il un document ou un manuel de description de vos responsabilités ? O N En avez-vous une copie ? Est-ce suffisant pour vous guider ? O N

O.S Impact : Améliorer l'accès et la qualité de l'éducation, notamment chez les filles

- Combien de communautés envoient leurs enfants dans cette école ? _____
- D'après vos estimations, quel est le pourcentage d'élèves de cette école provenant d'un autre collège ? _____ Pourquoi ? (proximité, qualité)

- Selon vous est-ce que le PAEM a augmenté l'accès des élèves, le maintien et la performance dans votre école communautaire ? O N Pour les filles aussi) O N
- Qu'avez-vous observé et quelle preuve pouvez-vous donner de cette amélioration ? (pour compléter le tableau des données de l'école)) Comment ?

    - est-ce qu'il y a une amélioration dans l'assiduité ? O N
    - est-ce que les élèves sont plus ponctuels ? O N
    - est-ce qu'ils font leurs devoirs plus qu'avant ? O N
    - réussissent-ils mieux aux examens et apprennent-ils mieux ? O N
    - Est-ce que les parents sont plus impliqués et plus présents ? O N
    - Plus intéressés par les leçons ? O N
    - Ont-ils moins tendance à abandonner ? O N
    - Autre chose ? O N

RIC 1 : accroissement de l'accès à l'enseignement moyen (données physiques)

SRI 1 et 2 : Davantage de CEM construits et amélioration des infrastructures des établissements cibles

1. Dans quelle mesure, la réhabilitation de l'école ou la construction de nouvelles écoles a pu aider les élèves ?

- environnement plus confortable spécifier : _____
- des classes mieux équipées spécifier :_____
- plus de matériels pour l'enseignement et l'apprentissage spécifier : _____
- plus de références dans la bibliothèque spécifier : _____
- présence d'équipement technologique / ordinateur spécifier : _____
- plus de sécurité, sans danger spécifier : _____
- autre : spécifier _____

2. Dans quelle mesure, cela a pu vous aider à devenir un meilleur chef d'établissement, ou à mieux faire votre travail ?

3. Avez-vous participé au processus de sélection dans le cadre de la nouvelle école ? O N **OU** (2) de prise de décision de la réhabilitation ? O N
4. Quelle a été votre rôle, s'il y en a eu, dans la construction ou la réhabilitation de l'école ?

5. Est-ce que cette construction ou cette réhabilitation est achevée ? O N
6. Quelles ont été les exigences en matière de contribution de la part de communauté ?

7. Avez-vous satisfait ces exigences ? O N Si non, quelles sont celles que vous n'avez pas satisfaites ?

8. Quelles ont été les exigences en matière de contribution de la part de collectivité ?

9. A-t-elle satisfait ces exigences ? Si non, quelles sont celles qu'elle n'a pas satisfaites ?

10. De quelle autre manière est-ce que la communauté a-t-elle été impliquée dans la construction et la réhabilitation de l'école ? Donnez une description de ces contributions et les noms des groupes ?

11. Quelle a été la responsabilité de l'IA pour la construction /réhabilitation de l'école ?

12. A-t-elle satisfait à ces exigences ? O N
13. Est-ce que l'école a ouvert à la date prévue ? O N

- quelle était la date prévue de l'ouverture des classes ? _____
- à quelle date a-t-elle été ouverte ? _____
- avez-vous ouvert un registre pour l'inscription à l'école ? _____

12. Est-ce que cette école a fonctionné suivant le nombre requis de jours pour l'année académique ? O N
13. Est-ce que la construction/ réhabilitation de votre école était achevée à l'ouverture des classes ? O N Etait-elle équipée à l'ouverture des classes ? O N
14. Est-ce que tous les enseignants étaient sur place à l'ouverture des classes, pour toutes les matières enseignées ? O N Le sont-ils maintenant ? O N
15. Est-ce que vos enseignants sont payés à temps depuis l'ouverture des classes ? O N Si non, pourquoi ?

16. Avez-vous atteint le taux d'inscription maximum ? O N Est-ce que vos classes sont surchargées ? O N Avez-vous assez de chaises pour tous les élèves ? O N

17. Avez-vous assez de ressources pour les frais maintenance et de réparation des infrastructures et de l'équipement ? O N
18. Est-ce que les communautés qui envoient leurs enfants de cette école aident l'école ou participent dans la maintenance ou l'entretien, ou bien dans les autres activités visant l'amélioration des infrastructures physiques de l'école ? O N De quoi s'agit-il ? Comment ?

19. Est-ce que le ME a fourni un budget de fonctionnement ou d'autres besoins en ressources promis depuis que l'école fonctionne ? O N
20. Est-ce que l'école a été incluse dans le calendrier des visites d'inspection de l'IA, et dans le programme d'appui ? O N

- Comment de fois l'école a-t-elle reçu la visite
    - Du conseiller pédagogique
    - De l'inspecteur de spécialité
    - Des inspecteurs de vie scolaire.

21. Y a-t-il quelque chose que l'école n'a pas fourni, (en termes d'équipement et de matériels) ou que vous n'avez pas encore reçu ? Si oui expliquez.

SRI 3 : accroître la sensibilisation des communautés à l'importance de l'enseignement moyen, notamment pour les filles.

1. Y a-t-il eu une programme / une activité de sensibilisation dans cette école communautaire ? O N
2. Qu'est-ce qui a été fait ? Par qui ? Décrivez le programme ?

3. Avez-vous participé dans cette campagne ? O N
4. Si oui, qu'avez-vous fait (en qualité d'apprenant ou du point de vue de la publicité) ?

5. Dans le cadre des résultats obtenus dans ces programmes, pensez-vous que la communauté est mieux sensibilisée? O N Pourquoi ?

6. Quelle différence cette activité/campagne a –t-elle eu sur les enfants ? Pour les filles ?

7. Pensez-vous que cette école est plus accueillante ou plus conviviale pour les filles ? O N
8. Y a-t-il une politique ou un règlement qui affecte les filles. O N Si oui, expliquez.

9. Que fait votre école si une fille se trouve enceinte ?
   Si elle a un enfant ?
   Pour le mariage qui prend la décision ?

10. Que faites vous, si vous découvrez qu'un enseignant a un comportement déplacé vis-à-vis d'une élève? _____
    Y a-t-il un règlement pour vous guider dans ce cas? O N Est-ce que vous demandez un conseil ? O N chez qui ? _____ Est-ce que vous soumettez ce cas à l'attention des autorités compétentes ? O N
11. Avez-vous eu des cas de harcèlement des filles de la part des garçons ? O N Quelles mesures prenez-vous dans des cas de harcèlement des filles de la part d'un garçon ou d'un groupe de garçons ?

    Y a-t-il un règlement pour vous guider dans ce cas ? O N Est-ce que vous recherchez un conseil ? O N Chez qui ? _____ Est-ce que vous soumettez ce cas à l'attention des autorités compétentes ou à ses parents ? O N

RIC 2 : L'environnement d'apprentissage et d'enseignement améliorés

SIC 2.1 Accès aux matériels didactiques

1. Est-ce que tous vos enseignants ont des guides de l'enseignant sur les matières qu'ils enseignent ? O N
2. Est-ce que la plupart de vos élèves ont des manuels scolaires ? O N Si non, quel pourcentage n'en a pas ? _____ Plutôt les filles ? _____ Plutôt les garçons ? _____ Quels sont les sujets dans lesquels il y a moins de manuels ?
3. Qui fournit les manuels dans les écoles? (les écoles ou les parents) _____
4. Est-ce que vous laissez vos élèves emporter leurs manuels à la maison (si ce sont des manuels qui appartiennent à l'école ?) O N
5. Est-ce que les élèves ont un accès régulier à la bibliothèque ? O N Ont-ils l'autorisation d'emporter les livres de la bibliothèque à la maison ? O N
6. Comment aidez-vous vos enseignants à se procurer le matériel d'apprentissage ou didactique ?

SIR 2.2 environnement d'apprentissage et méthodes pédagogique amélioré

1. Est-ce l'environnement de cette école est propice à l'apprentissage ? O N Décrivez ?
2. Dans quelle mesure le cadre de la classe est-elle un bon environnement d'apprentissage ? Donnez des exemples ?
3. Que faites-vous pour améliorer l'environnement d'enseignement et d'apprentissage ?
4. Que fait votre école pour aider les élèves les plus faibles à apprendre ?
5. Est-ce que votre école a mis en place des cours de soutien pour les élèves ? O N
6. Que fait votre école pour aider les filles à apprendre ?

Y a-t-il un programme spécial ? O N Pensez-vous que c'est nécessaire pour aider les filles à apprendre ? O N qu'avez-vous fait pour gérer :

- l'absentéisme et le retard
- les maladies des élèves
- les problèmes que rencontres les filles et qui affectent leur participation et leur apprentissage ?

7. Est-ce que les parents viennent à l'école pour vous parler de problèmes liés à l'école ou aux élèves ? O N Si oui, quelle est la fréquence ? _____ De quoi vous parlent-ils ?
8. Est-ce que le programme scolaire prévoit une plage pour les enseignants pour que vous puissiez rencontrer les parents d'élèves ? O N Quelle est la dernière fois que vous les avez rencontrés ? _____
9. Est-ce que vous rendez visite à vos parents d'élèves pour discuter de leurs performances et comportement des élèves ? O N
10. Quels sont les signes qui vous montrent qu'un enseignant est un bon enseignant ?
11. Qu'avez-vous fait pour améliorer la performance des enseignants ?
12. Comment faites-vous pour motiver les enseignants ?
13. Comment faites-vous avec les enseignants qui ne sont pas performants ?
14. Tenez-vous des rencontres régulières avec le personnel ? O N Quelle est la périodicité ? _____ De quoi parlez-vous ?
15. Est-ce que vous rencontrez les enseignants ou organisez-vous des rencontres pour discuter de stratégies pédagogiques nouvelles ou différentes ? O N
16. Est-ce que vous observez l'enseignement dans les salles de classes ? O N Suivant quelle périodicité ? _____ Si non, ou rarement, pourquoi ?
17. Après avoir fait cette observation, est-ce que vous discutez de ce que vous avez observé et est-ce que vous donnez des conseils ? O N
18. Est-ce que votre école a un 'cercle de qualité' ? O N Quand est-ce qu'elle se réunit ?
    Qui organise ces cercles ?
    Comment sont choisis les sujets de discussions ?
    Est-ce que la participation se fait sur une base volontaire ou bien est-ce obligatoire ?
19. Est-ce que ces rencontres se tiennent pendant les heures de cours ou après. _____
20. Est-ce que l'absentéisme des enseignants est un problème dans cette école ? O N
    En moyenne, quel est le pourcentage d'enseignants qui est absent au cours d'une semaine ? _____
    Généralement quelle est la durée de l'absence d'un enseignant ?_____
21. Quelles sont les raisons des absences des enseignants ?

22. Avez-vous un déficit d'enseignant ? O N Que faites-vous avec les élèves lorsque l'enseignant est absent.

23. Quel est le règlement en vigueur dans votre école pour gérer les absences des enseignants ?

    Que faites vous pour pallier ce problème ?

24. Qu'est-ce qui peut vous empêcher d'arriver ou d'être à l'école avant le début des cours ?

25. En moyenne combien de fois êtes-vous absent dans un mois ? _____
    Combien de fois arrivez-vous en retard dans le mois ? _____
26. Qu'avez-vous fait pour une bonne gestion de l'école et de ses ressources ?

27. Tenez-vous un registre de présence des élèves et des enseignants ? O N Pouvez-vous me montrer ce registre ?

28. Avez-vous un budget pour l'école et une comptabilité ? O N pouvez-vous me le montrer ? _____
29. Quel est le montant mensuel disponible pour la gestion de l'école et pour les autres dépenses qui sont à votre charge ? _____
30. Disposez-vous de fonds que vous pouvez utiliser pour l'achat de matériels d'apprentissage ou de supports pédagogiques ? O N Quelle a été votre dernière dépense pour l'école ?

SIR 2.3 Amélioration de la formation continue

1. Avez-vous participé aux programmes de formation du PAEM pour la direction de l'école ? O N Si non, pourquoi ?

2. Est-ce que la formation à laquelle vous avez participée était bien organisée ? O N
    - Y avait-t-il assez de formateurs disponibles pour vous aider à répondre à vos questions ?
    - Est-ce que le lieu était approprié ?
    - Est-ce que la nourriture et l'hébergement étaient acceptables ?
    - Avez-vous reçu d'autres supports que le manuel ?

3. Est-ce ce que vous avez appris au cours de la formation quelque de chose de nouveau pour vous ? O N Est-ce que ce sont des choses que vous connaissiez avant pour la plupart ? O N
4. Est-ce que cette formation vous a aidé à être un meilleur chef d'établissement ? O N Si oui, pourquoi ? Si non, pourquoi ?

5. Avez-vous utilisé le contenu de la formation pour mieux gérer votre école ? O N
   Comment ?
   - pour un leadership en matière d'instruction ?
   - pour la gestion fiscale ?
   - pour la gestion du personnel ?
   - pour vos relations avec la communauté ?
6. Etiez-vous satisfait de cette formation ? O N Si oui, pourquoi ? Si non pourquoi ?

7. Comment peut-on améliorer la formation afin qu'il vous soit plus utile ? (type et nombre de formation)

8. Quels sont domaines qui n'ont été couverts et dont vous pensez qu'ils pourraient vous aider à mieux faire votre travail ?

9. En votre qualité de chef d'établissement de l'école, quel est votre plus grand défi dont pensez qu'il pourrait être atteint par une formation complémentaire, plus d'information ou un meilleur renforcement des capacités ? Décrivez.

10. Depuis la première formation, avez-vous reçu un équipement de suivi de la part de quiconque sur la manière d'appliquer ce que vous avez appris en matière de gestion de l'école. O N Si oui, de la part de qui et quoi ? Etait-ce utile ? O N

11. Qui évalue vos performances en tant que chef d'établissement ?
    Quand est-ce que vous avez été évalué pour la dernière fois ?_____
12. Est-ce que d'autres directeurs d'école, un conseiller pédagogique ou des inspecteurs ont participé à votre formation ? O N
13. Si vous rencontrez un problème dans la gestion de l'école, à qui vous adressez-vous ?

14. Etes-vous membre de l'Association des Chefs d'Etablissement ? O N Si oui, dans quelle mesure cela vous a-t-il aidé à être un meilleur chef d'établissement ?

15. Avez-vous participé à la formation sur la motivation des chefs d'établissement ? O N
    En quelle qualité – chef d'établissement non enseignant ou en qualité d'enseignant ?

16. Comment avez-vous choisi les enseignants qui y ont participé ?

17. Après la formation, avez-vous noté un changement ou une amélioration dans leur manière d'enseigner ou dans la performance des étudiants ou leur participation à l'apprentissage ? O N Décrivez.

18. Quelles sont opportunités que vous avez offertes aux autres enseignants pour apprendre ce qui a été présenté durant cette formation ?

SRI 2.4 : Accès accru aux TIC

1. Avez-vous été formé à l'utilisation
   - d'un ordinateur
   - de l'Internet
   - d'autres équipements audio-visuels
2. Est-ce que vous utilisez l'ordinateur pour la gestion de l'école ? Décrivez

3. Quels sont les critères que vous utilisés pour allouer du temps aux enseignants pour l'utilisation de l'ordinateur ? Décrivez.

4. Est-ce que les élèves ont la possibilité d'utiliser l'ordinateur ou l'Internet ? O N
5. Est-ce qu'il y a un programme ou calendrier pour les élèves ? O N Sur quel base ? (selon la matière, le niveau, autre)

6. Comment gérez-vous les problèmes de logiciels ou d'équipements ou de pannes ?

SRI 2.5 Accès à la formation aux compétences à la vie active

1. Est-ce que le nouveau programme de formation aux compétences à la vie active est enseigné aux élèves de cette école ? O N
2. Dans quelle mesure ce programme de formation aux compétences à la vie active a affecté le comportement ou l'attitude de vos élèves ?

3. Quelles ont été les réactions des parents au nouveau programme de formation aux compétences à la vie active ?

RIC 3 : Accroissement de la participation du pouvoir local et des communautés à la gestion et au financement de l'éducation

SRI 3.1 Accroissement du financement local de l'enseignement moyen

1. Qui paye ou qui fournit les fonds pour payer les factures d'électricité, de téléphone et des autres services ? _____

En moyenne, quel montant cela représente t-il ? _____ Est-ce que les factures sont régulièrement payées et à temps ? O N

2. Qu'est-ce que les collectivités locales (pas le ME) sont supposées faire pour l'école ?
   Faire la distinction entre le conseil régional et les collectivités locales

3. Est-ce que les collectivités locales ont rempli leurs obligations ? O N Si non, qu'est-ce qu'ils n'ont pas fait et pourquoi ?

4. Est-ce que les collectivités locales ont augmenté les fonds alloués à cette école ? O N
   Quel montant avez-vous reçu cette année de la part des collectivités locales.

5. Que faites-vous pour travailler ou motiver l'appui de la part des autorités locales ?

6. Qu'est-ce que la communauté fournit à l'école ?
   Selon quelle périodicité ?
   Combien ?
   D'où proviennent ces fonds ? Spécifier.

7. S'agit-il de la contribution de l'ensemble de la communauté ou celle des parents ?

   S'agit-il de contributions volontaires ou obligatoires (par ex : frais de scolarité)

8. Dans quelle mesure (%) les ressources de la communauté contribuent-elles aux charges d'exploitation (courantes)

9. Comment est-ce que ces fonds sont envoyés vers l'école ?

   A travers le CGE ou le chef d'établissement ?
   Qui gère ces fonds et en tient la comptabilité.
   Quels sont les mécanismes mis en place pour empêcher toute perte ou tout détournement ?

10. Y a-t-il des relations entre le montant de la contribution/appui de la communautaire et le montant reçu de la part des autorités locales et/ou du ME ? O N

11. Quelles sont les actions que vous pouvez mettre en œuvre pour une meilleure implication de la communauté ?

    Décrivez. Quelle est la dernière action que vous avez mise en œuvre et quand l'avez-vous mise en œuvre ?

Ecole_____ Région F K T
Interviewer _____ Guide d'Entretien : CHEF D'ETABLISSEMENT

SR1 3.2 Fonctionnement effectif des Comités de Gestion des Ecoles

1. Y a-t-il un CGE dans cette école ? O N Combien de fois se réunit-elle ?
   Qui sont les membres ?

2. Quel est votre rôle en tant que président du CGE ?

3. Quels sont les principaux rôles et responsabilités du CGE ?

4. Est-ce que les membres du CGE ont bénéficié d'une formation ? O N Y avez-vous participé ? O N Était-ce utile pour vous ? O N
5. Qu'est-ce le CGE a fait dans cette école pour aider et appuyer l'école, ses enseignants et/ou ses élèves ? Décrivez.

6. Est-ce que le CGE a développé un plan d'amélioration de l'école ? Décrivez.

7. Quels sont les progrès réalisés ?
   Est-ce qu'il a consulté les parents ou la communauté ?

8. Est-ce que le CGE a mis en œuvre ou supervisé des projet ou activités visant l'amélioration de l'école ou l'appui aux élèves ? O N Décrivez.

9. Est-ce que le CGE a entrepris une activité spécifique visant l'amélioration de l'accès des filles, leur maintien, leur performance, et leur bien-être à l'école ? O N
10. Est-ce que les SMC recherche des fonds ou un appui auprès des autres programmes sectoriels (gouvernements ou autres) ? Comment ?

11. Est-ce que les communautés ont noué un partenariat avec les entreprises locales ou d'autres entités pour venir en appui aux écoles ? O N
12. Comment est-ce que le CGE interagit-il avec les parents, la communauté, et les parents ?

13. Comment est-ce qu'il mobilise la communauté et comment communique-t-il ou partage-t-il les informations ? est-ce qu'ils tiennent des réunions ouvertes, des fora, publient-ils des résultats ? Est-ce que le CGE publie ses registres et comptes ?

14. Comment procède-t-il pour collecter des informations et recevoir un feedback de la communauté ?

15. Est-ce que le CGE participe à la gestion de l'école ? Comment ?

16. Est-ce que le CGE participe à la prise de décisions personnelles et à la discipline des enseignants ? Donnez des exemples.

17. Quel rôle joue le CGE pour lutter contre l'absentéisme des enseignants et des élèves.

18. Est ce que le CGE procède à un suivi de la performance de l'école, des enseignants, et des élèves ? Comment fait-il ? Est-ce qu'il visite les classes. Est-ce qu'ils ont une présence à l'école ?

19. Si vous avez un problème à l'école, est-ce que vous consultez le CGE ?

20. Comment sont prises les décisions liées à l'école et au budget ? Est-ce que le CGE participe à ce processus ?

21. Est-ce que le CGE a accès aux états financiers ? Est-ce qu'il procède à une revue de ces états financiers ?

22. Pensez-vous que le CGE vous a été utile dans vos tâches gestion ? Comment ?

23. En tant que chef d'établissement, avez-vous eu des désaccords avec le CGE ? Comment les résolvez-vous ?

24. Est-ce qu'il y a d'autres types de conflits qui surviennent à l'école ? Comment sont-ils résolus ?

SRI 3.3 Efficacité de la planification au niveau régional

1. Est-ce que vous préparez tous les ans un plan de développement de l'école ainsi qu'une demande de budget que vous soumettez à l'IA et/ou au conseil régional ? O N
2. Quels en sont les différents points ?

3. Quel le processus de préparation ? Qui le prépare ? A qui le communique –t-il ? Est-ce qu'il est affiché ?

4. Pensez-vous que le plan de développement de l'école est inclus dans le plan régional pour l'éducation ?

5. Est-ce que vous participez ou contribuez au plan annuel pour l'éducation de l'IA ? Comment ?

6. Est-ce que les chefs d'établissement sont consultés en tant que groupe dans le processus de planification pour l'éducation ?

   Combien de fois ?
7. Est-ce que vous siégez dans un des comités de planification régionale ? O N
8. Quel type d'informations est échangé régulièrement entre l'école et les autorités régionales chargées de l'éducation ?

Quelles sont les trois choses qui peuvent être faites dans cette écoles (autres que tout ce qui ce rapporte aux salaires et émoluments) qui pourraient faire de vous un meilleur chef d'établissement, aider les enseignants à faire un meilleur travail et les élèves à mieux apprendre ?

Ecole_____ Région F K T

Interviewer _____ Guide d'Entretien : CHEF D'ETABLISSEMENT

Nom d'école: _____ Région: F T K
Name of interviewer :_____ Classroom Guide

Sujet: _____ Niveau: _____Nombres des élèves : ♀ _____ ♂ _____
Ratio élevés/livres: _____ Enseignants ♀ ♂ V C B L M
Il y a une plan de leçon préparé: O N (demande á voir)
Il y a les manuel(s) d'enseignant: O N
Les enseignants ont –ils participé a la formation du projet PAEM: O N

Carte de la salle de classe devant de classe

Dessin une plan de classe. Il faut note la place pour les fenêtres, le port, les chaises de chaque élève. Note á chaque chaise le genre de l'élèves. Chaque cinq minutes note la place reste l'enseignant—(utilise 1, 2, 3, etc.).

Questions posées par l'enseignent **Niveau cognitif** (demandes aux élèves á faire: réponse rote-**R**, réponse application, réponse analyse/synthéase, réponse d'evaluation-**E**) **Réponse d' enseignant aux réponses** + -				- **Questions posées par les des élevés** **Réponse l'enseignant aux questions** + -			
♀	♀	♂	♂	♀	♀	♂	♂

Nom d'école: _____ Région: F T K
Name of interviewer :_____ Classroom Guide

Il y a les élèves qui veulent poser une question mais l'enseignant ne repond pas?# ♀ _____ # ♂ ____

Minutes	Qu'a fait l' enseignant a chaque portion de temps?
5	
10	
15	
20	
25	
30	
35	
40	
45	
50	
55	
60	

Types des groupes: (Estimer la quantité des temps utilisée pour chaque type de groupe)

_____ L'ensemble des élèves _____sous-groupe ____ interaction entre élèves
_____l'élève pris individuellement

Nom d'école: _____ Région: F T K
Name of interviewer :_____ Classroom Guide

Matériel didactique: cocher les choses existant dans le salle de classe ; cercler le matériel utilisé pendant le présentation de leçon

☐ livres référence ☐ tableau noir # ____ ☐ posters ☐ objets a manipuler ☐ carte
☐ globe ☐ tableau d'affichage ☐ autres (liste)

Il y a des étagères pour les livres? O N Il y a un magasin qui ferme? O N

Techniques motivationnelles:

☐ La visite éducative ☐ La pédagogie de projet ☐ Le brainstorming
☐ La détermination du profil motivationnel ☐ La communication du plan de cours
☐ La communication du plan de leçon ☐ Approche par problème

Estimez les temps dévolu à l'enseignement:

Lecture _____ l'Activités _____
Enseignant parle _____ Elevés Parlent _____

1. Est-ce que l'enseignent annonce les objectifs avant de commencez la leçon ? O N
2. Est-ce que les instructions données aux élèves pour faire la tâche sont claires, complètes et faciles a comprendre ? O N
3. Est-ce que l'enseignant donne un feedback aux étudiantes en rapport avec leurs questions ou les taches à faire ? O N
4. Est-ce que l'enseignant se réfère a l'information dejá connue (connaissance á priori) par les élèves dans cette leçon? O N
5. Est-ce que l'enseignant encourage les élèves qui ne participent pas ? O N
6. Est-ce que l'enseignent donne une assistance spéciale aux élèves en difficulté ? O N
7. Est-ce que l'enseignant renforce les élèves à utiliser l'information présentée pendant la leçon dans les autres activités scolaires? Y N
8. Est-ce que l'enseignant planifie sa leçon et ses activités scolaires en fonction du niveau cognitif très haut (cette a dire l'application, l'analyse, l'évaluation, etc.) nécessaire pour certains eleves? O N
9. Est-ce que l'enseignant utile les stratégies pour assister les élevés a mieux comprendre la leçon? O N
10. Est-ce que l'enseignant traite également les filles que les garçons ?
Si non, est-ce que l'enseignant favorise les filles ou les garçons ?
11. Est-ce que la leçon prend en compte le niveau cognitif des élèves ? O N
12. Est-ce que l'enseignant évalue le travail des élèves pendant la leçon et détermine si les élevés sont engagés et persistent? O N
13. Est-ce que l'enseignant contrôle des élèves pendant la leçon ? Y N
14. Les contenus sont-ils adaptés à tous les élèves ou sont-ils plus adaptés aux filles, aux garçons ? O N
15. Les contenus enseignés respectent t-ils la personnalité des élèves ? O N
16. Les contenus enseignés correspondent-ils au niveau des élèves filles et garçons ? O N
17. Quel type de supports sont utilisés ?
18. Sont-ils adaptés à tous les élèves ? O N
19. Sont-ils plus adaptés aux filles ? O N Aux garçons ? O N
20. Lorsque l'enseignante pose une question, est-ce qu'il (ou elle) laisse un temps de réflexion avant de recueillir les réponse ? O N
21. Les élèves éprouvent-elles plus de difficultés pour s'exprimer ?
22. Quelle est la qualité des réponses des filles par rapport à celles des garçons ?
23. Dans la participation des élèves, l'enseignant confie t-il (ou elle) des tâches spécifiques aux élèves ? O N
24. Quels types de tâches aux filles ?
25. Quels types de tâches aux garçons ?

Nom d'école: _____ Région: F T K
Name of interviewer :_____ Classroom Guide

l'environnement est motivant pour les élevés :
l'interaction entre les eleves et l'enseignant:

Bon ←——————————→ Sévère
Expliquez :

L'interaction entres les élèves (bien regarder celle qui se passe entre les filles et garçon):

Inclusif ←——————————→ Exclusif
Expliquez :

Les élèves semblent-ils: très motivé motivé peu motivé pas motivé du tot
Expliquez : (% des élevées s'implique/ne s'implique pas, notamment l'interaction entre les filles et les garçon, etc.)

Questions il faut demander á l'enseignant après avoir observé la leçon:

Si il y a une différence dans l'interaction entre les filles et les garçons, démontrez le ratio aux enseignants que vous avez observés pendant une leçon.

1. Etes-vous étonnés par ce ratio?
2. Pensez-vous ce ratio est normal pendant votre présentation de la leçon? Si non, qu'est-ce qui est la cause de la différence aujourd'hui ?

3.. Quelles stratégies utilisez-vous pendant la présentation de la leçon pour suivre la participation et l'engagement des filles?

4.Comment mesurez vous l'impact des stratégies que vous employez dans votre classe pour encourager les filles ?

5. Comment évaluez-vous l'environnement en classe pour assurer votre support aux élèves?

6. Comment mesurez vous que l'interaction entre vous et vos élèves est positif ?

7. En général, pensez-vous le climat entre votre classe est hostile et sévère ou positif et motivant ?

8. Quels sont les stratégies que vous employez pour améliorez la situation?

Nom d'école: _____ Région: F T K
Name of interviewer :_____ Classroom Guide

9. Comment mesurez-vous si vos élèves ont bien compris la leçon?

10. Quelles stratégies utilisez-vous pour aider les élevées faibles ? Notamment ceux qui ne comprennent pas la leçon ?

11. Combien de fois pendant la semaine donnez-vous des devoirs?

12. Y' a-t-il des difficultés pour les élèves a faire leurs devoirs?

13. Que faites-vous quand les élèves ne font pas leurs devoirs?

14. Si le problème persiste parlez-vous à leurs parents?

15. Participez-vous dans la formation PAEM ?
16. Utilisez-vous l'information dans la formation ? Comment ?

Commison d'education Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Interviewees :

Introduction

1. Quelle est la composition actuelle de la CE ?

2. Qui peut être membre de la commission d'éducation du conseil régional ?

3. Comment sont choisis les membres de la commission d'éducation du conseil régional ?

4. Comment les écoles y sont-elles représentées ?

5. Quels sont les pouvoirs, les rôles et les responsabilités qui sont dévolus á la CE par la décentralisation, en matière de planification de l'éducation ?

7. Quels sont les objectifs majeurs du PAEM ?

8. De quelle manière la CE s'est-elle impliquée dans le processus d'implantation du projet ?

9. La CE est-elle en mesure de satisfaire les conditions exigées par le projet ?

10. De quel ordre sont les difficultés que rencontre la CE dans ce domaine ? Sont-elles liées
    aux limites de son mandat ?
    au manque de compétence technique ?
    au manque de ressources ?

11.Quels sont les besoins de la CE qu'il faudrait satisfaire pour lui permettre de mieux assumer les défis du projet et les exigences de l'éducation en général, et de l'enseignement moyen en particulier ?

12. Le conseil régional assume-t-elle intégralement les pouvoirs et responsabilités qui lui sont dévolus en matière d'éducation ?

14. Si non quels sont les volets ou domaines qu'elle n'assume pas réellement ?

Accroissement de l'accès et amélioration de la qualité de l'éducation, particulièrement chez les filles

15. Dans quelle mesure le projet a-t-il permis de

- accroître les possibilités d'accès à l'enseignement moyen?
- améliorer la qualité de l'enseignement et les performances des élèves ?
- créer des conditions favorables aux filles ? Si oui préciser.

Augmentation des établissements et amélioration des infrastructures

16. Par rapport à la construction et/ou la réhabilitation des établissements :

- Quel a été le rôle joué par la CE ?

17. Par rapport au choix des sites d'implantation du projet

- A-t-on tenu compte de la carte scolaire ?
- Le choix opéré correspond-il à une demande de la communauté ?
- Y a-t-il eu des problèmes ou contraintes particulières ? (précisez si oui)

18. Par rapport au fonctionnement des établissements

- Le ministère a –t-il fourni un budget de fonctionnement convenable ?
- Les enseignants sont-ils régulièrement rémunérés et à temps ?
- Les communautés contribuent-elles à l'entretien ou prennent-elles d'autres initiatives en vue d'améliorer l'environnement scolaire?
- Qu'est-ce que le CE a fait concrètement pour appuyer les établissements d'enseignement moyen ? Pour les filles plus spécialement ?

Accroissement du financement local de l'enseignement moyen

19.Pouvez-vous donner des exemples qui prouvent que les communautés contribuent (en ressources de toutes sortes) à appuyer les établissements ?

20.Peut-on estimer le pourcentage d'augmentation des fonds alloués aux établissements ?

21.Des milieux du secteur privé ont-ils été impliqués dans l'appui aux établissement?

22. A quel niveau ? Régional ? Départemental ? Local ?

23. Si oui, indiquer de quelle manière et pour quel(s) domaine(s) ? Pouvez-vous donner des exemples précis ?

24. Quelle proportion représente l'ensemble des contributions de ces entités dans les ressources de fonctionnement des établissements ?

25. Quelles sont les dispositions mises en place pour répondre au besoin de transparence ?

26. Existe-t-il un cadre de concertation pour la coordination des actions des différents intervenants dans le secteur de l'éducation aux niveaux régional, départemental, local ?

27. Y a-t-il des problèmes de coordination des interventions dans le milieu scolaire ? Si oui pouvez-vous préciser ?

Amélioration de l'environnement d'enseignement apprentissage

Accès accru aux matériels didactiques

28. Par rapport aux matériels didactiques

- La CE a-t-elle doté ou contribué à doter les établissements de manuels scolaires, guides d'enseignement et autres matériels scolaires ? Si oui, préciser

- Etaient-ils disponibles dès la rentrée ?

- Y a-t-il d'autres entités qui contribuent à l'acquisition de matériels didactiques pour les établissements ? Si oui préciser.

Fonctionnement effectif des comités de gestion des établissements

28. Le mode de fonctionnement des CGE est-il bien défini et codifié ?

29. Quelles sont les catégories représentées dans les CGE ?

30. Quelles sont les limites de compétence des CGE ?

31. Ont-ils accès directement aux instances des pouvoirs locaux et ministérielles ou passent-ils nécessairement par les chefs d'établissement ?

32. Ont-ils compétence à exercer une autorité quelconque sur le personnel enseignant (absentéisme, discipline, etc.), sur l'évaluation des résultats scolaires?

33. Qui assume le rôle d'arbitre en cas de conflit entre les CGE et l'établissement ?

Efficacité de la planification au niveau régional

34. Que recouvre la planification de l'éducation à l'échelle régionale ?

35. Va-t-elle au-delà des investissements en infrastructures, personnels et autres intrants ?

36. Prend-elle en charge des aspects académiques ou curruculaires ?

37. Les membres de la commission ont-ils reçu une formation spéciale leur permettant d'assumer leur charge en matière de planification et de budgétisation ?

38. Si oui était-elle suffisante ? Si non de quel type formation auraient-ils besoin ?

Relation de la CE avec IA-IDE dans la planification de l'éducation

39. En quoi consiste les différences de rôles entre la CE et l'IA dans le processus de
    planification de l'éducation ?
    le financement ?
    la gestion ?

- Que recouvre la planification de l'éducation à l'échelle régionale ? Expliquez.

- Va-t-elle au-delà des investissements en infrastructures, personnels et autres intrants ?

- Les CE s ont-il le droit de formuler les politiques ? Si oui, précisez.

- La décentralisation requière une planification ascendante. Décrivez le processus que vous suivez pour planifier de bas a haut.

- Quel est le rôle de la CE dans ce processus ?

- De quelle manière les besoins des établissements sont-ils pris en charge dans la planification ascendante ?

- Avez-vous un plan et calendrier pour des conférences ou des réunions avec les collectivités et les acteurs au niveau des écoles ? Précisez.

Commison d'education Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

- Le PAEM encourage différents acteurs á contribuer en ressources au fonctionnement des établissements et de l'éducation. Comment la planification de la CE prend6elle en compte ces ressources ? Y a-t-il un système de suivi et rapportage ?

- La CE fait-elle un rajustement aux budgets de fonctionnement des établissements qui ont reçus un appui financier supplémentaire ?

- Quels sont les rôles et responsabilités l'IA dans la planification de l'éducation ? dans l'allocation des ressources ?

- En quoi consistent les différences de rôles entre la CE et l'IA dans le processus de planification de l'éducation et de financement?

- Qui contrôle le processus de la planification ascendante ?

- Y a-t-il des dispositions ou un cadre permettant à la CE et à l'IA d'œuvrer en vue d'une planification intégrée de l'éducation ? Expliquez.

- Quelles sont les mesures prises par le conseil régional pour soutenir et appuyer les collèges d'enseignement moyens ?

- Y a-t-il eu des mesures spéciales en faveur des aux filles ?

Guide Comité de gestion communautaire

CGC Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Introduction

Quelle est la composition actuelle du CGC ?

Qui peut être membre du CGC ?

Comment sont choisis les membres du CGC?

Quels sont les rôles et les responsabilités du CGC ?

Les écoles sont -elles des domaines d'intervention du CGC?

Quels sont les objectifs majeurs du PAEM ?

De quelle manière le CGC s'est-il impliqué dans le processus d'implantation du projet ?

Accroissement de l'accès et amélioration de la qualité de l'éducation, particulièrement chez les filles

Le projet a-t-il permis

- D'accroître les possibilités d'accès à l'enseignement moyen?
- D'améliorer les performances des élèves ?
- De créer des conditions favorables aux filles ? Si oui (justifier).

Augmentation des établissements et amélioration des infrastructures

Par rapport à la construction et/ou la réhabilitation des établissements :

- Quel a été le rôle joué par le CGC ?

Guide Comité de gestion communautaire

CGC Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Par rapport au choix des sites d'implantation du projet

- Quelle a été l'implication de le CGC ?
- Les constructions ou réhabilitations ont-elles été livrées à la date prévue ?

Par rapport au choix des sites d'implantation du projet

- Est-il fondé sur des critères précis ? Lesquels ?
- A-t-on tenu compte de la carte scolaire ?
- Correspond-il à une demande de la communauté ?
- Y a-t-il eu des problèmes ou contraintes particulières ? (précisez si oui)

Par rapport au fonctionnement des établissements

- Les communautés contribuent-elles à l'entretien ou prennent-elles d'autres initiatives en vue d'améliorer l'environnement scolaire?
- Qu'est-ce que le CGC a fait pour appuyer les établissements d'enseignement moyen ?
- Quels sont les types d'appui que le CGC a déjà apporté aux établissements
  Entretien ou maintenance ?
  Matériels didactiques ?
  Financement ?
  Autres ?
- Quelles sont les dispositions mises en place pour répondre au besoin de transparence ?

Efficacité de la planification au niveau régional

- Existe-t-il un cadre de concertation pour la coordination des actions des intervenants des différents secteurs de la vie de la communauté (santé, éducation, environnement, etc.) ?
- Y a-t-il des problèmes de coordination de ces interventions ? Si oui pouvez-vous préciser ?

L'IA Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Interviewees :

Guide d'entretien : IA

Introduction

On va poser des questions pour mieux apprécier l'impact et l'efficacité du projet PAEM, et comprendre comment l'IA s'est organise pour l`appuyer et les implications de l`adoption d`un tel modèle, pour votre institution.

Impacte : Accroissement de l'accès et amélioration de la qualité de l'enseignement et des performances des élèves

Le projet a-t-il permis

- D'accroître les possibilités d'accès et le maintien à l'enseignement moyen?
- D'améliorer la qualité de l'enseignement dans les collèges ciblés ?
- De créer des conditions favorables aux filles ? Si oui (justifier).

Demander à l'IA de faire remplir le tableau ci-joint, pendant l'entretien.

Rôles et responsabilités :

1. Quels sont les pouvoirs, les rôles et les responsabilités de l'IA dans le cadre de décentralisation?

2. Quels sont les objectifs majeurs du PAEM ?

3. De quelle manière l'IA s'est –elle impliquée dans l'implantation du projet PAEM sur le plan de…?
   - La planification
   - L'exécution et le financement
   - Le supervision et le suivi

4. Est-ce que l'IA répond actuellement aux exigences du PAEM ? (voir dessous)

5. Quelles sont les nouvelles responsabilités que l'IA a dû accepter et ajouter à cause du PAEM ?

6. Est-ce qu'il a fallu augmenter le staff chargé de la gestion des établissements moyens, le nombre d'inspecteurs ?

7. Est-ce que l'IA a dû changer les procédures et les modes de l`offre des services éducatifs et gérer autrement les établissements, à cause du PAEM ?

8. L'IA a-t-il la capacité d'accueillir et supporter davantage de collèges si le projet est élargi ?

9. Quels sont les blocages, les contraintes et les défis sur les plans politique, de la gestion et du financement, auxquelles l'IA devra faire face pour développer l'enseignement moyen dans un système décentralisé ?

Construction de collèges et amélioration des infrastructures des établissements cibles

a. Y a-t-il eu une implication particulière de l'IA dans la construction et/ou la réhabilitation des établissements ? si oui, préciser ?

b. Les normes de constructions édictées par le ministère ont-elles été respectées ?

c. Les constructions ou réhabilitations ont-elles été livrées à la date prévue ?

d. Les populations ont-elles contribué dans les constructions ou réhabilitations ?

Amélioration de l'environnement d'enseignement-apprentissage

Les établissements ont-ils tous démarré avec un personnel enseignant suffisant et adéquat pour les différentes disciplines ?

L'IA Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Vous êtes responsables du recrutement des vacataires. Avez-vous fait de la discrimination positive pour recruter plus de femmes enseignantes ?

Les enseignants sont-ils régulièrement rémunérés et à temps ?

Les budgets de fonctionnements ont-ils été fournis aux établissements PAEM ?

A-t-on doté les établissements de manuels scolaires, guides d'enseignement et autres matériels scolaire ?

Qu'est-ce qui a été fait dans l'environnement de travail des enseignants pour améliorer leurs conditions d'enseignement ?

- Par l'IA ?
- Par les IS ?
- Par les IVS ?
- Par les CPI ?
-

Quel est le rôle joue par l'IA dans la formulation des programmes de compétences pour la vie active ? Sont-ils disponibles ?

S'agit-il d'un programme intégré ou d'un additif au programme préexistant ?

Amélioration de la formation continue

a. Existe-t-il des ressources exclusivement affectées à la formation par le ministère?

b. L'IA intervient-elle dans le choix des enseignants devant bénéficier d'une formation ?

c. Quels sont les critères de sélection dans ce cas ?

d. Y a-t-il un programme de formation continue ?

e. Si oui a-t-il donné lieu à l'élaboration de modules ou matériaux de formation disponibles ?

f. Y a-t-il suffisamment de formateurs qualifiés sous la tutelle de l'IA, au regard des besoins de formation des professeurs de collège?

g. Les personnels des IA ont-ils été impliqués dans la formation dispensée aux professeurs et principaux de collège, dans le cadre du projet PAEM?

h. L'IA dispose-t-elle de chiffres précis sur le nombre et le % des enseignants ayant bénéficié de la formation continue ?

i. Avez-vous le sentiment que les enseignants et les chefs d'établissement appliquent ce qu'ils ont appris lors des formations ?

j. Quelles pourraient être les mesures incitatives pour encourager les enseignants à partager leurs expériences ?

3.1 Accroissement du financement local de l'enseignement moyen

1. Y a-t- il un accroissement du financement local de l'enseignement moyen ? Quelle est l`origine de cet accroissement ? L'IA, le Conseil régional, le conseil rural, autres ? Collectivités. Préciser.

L'IA Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

2. Y a –t-il des actions qui montrent que les collectivités locales et les communautés de base contribuent à appuyer l'éducation et plus particulièrement à l'enseignement moyen ?

3. Les collectivités locales ont-elles réussi à impliquer des milieux du secteur privé dans l'appui aux écoles ? Si oui, indiquer de quelle manière et pour quel(s) domaine(s) ? Pouvez-vous donner des exemples précis ?

4. Quels sont les problèmes de transparence ?

5. Quelles sont les dispositions mises en place pour répondre au besoin de transparence ?

6. Existe-t-il un cadre de concertation pour coordonner les actions des différents intervenants dans le secteur de l'éducation ?

7. L'IA a-t-il mis en place, un système pour le suivi ?

8. Y a-t-il des problèmes de coordination des interventions dans le secteur de l`éducation? Si oui pouvez-vous préciser ?

3.2 Fonctionnement effectif des comités de gestion des établissements

1. Tous les CEM sont-ils dotés d'un CGE ?

L'IA Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

2. Le mode de fonctionnement des CGE est-il défini et codifié ?

3. Quel est le rôle du CGE ? Les responsabilités primaires ?

4. Les CGEs ont-il un rôle dans la gestion d'établissement ? Ont-il le droit de prendre les décisions sur—par exemple--la discipline des enseignants, la dépense du budget de fonctionnement, etc. ? Si non, pour quoi ?

5. Quelles sont les limites de compétence des CGE ?

6. Ont-ils compétence à exercer une autorité quelconque sur le personnel enseignant (absentéisme, discipline, etc.), sur l'évaluation des résultats scolaires?

7. Ont-ils accès directement aux instances des pouvoirs locaux et ministérielles ou passent-ils nécessairement par les chefs d'établissement ?

8. Quels sont les rapport que l'IA entrtien avec les CGEs ? Quelles sont les occasions ou les modes d'interaction ?

9. L'IA a-t-elle affecte quelqu'un à la gestion et au suivi des CGEs ?

10. Avez-vous implanté un système de suivi et de contrôle financière pour les CGE ?

11. Dans quelle mesure les CGEs ont-il contribue à l'amélioration des établissements ?

12. Les membres de CGE ont-ils bénéficié d'une formation ? si oui, dans quel domaine ?

13. Qui assume le rôle d'arbitre en cas de conflit entre les CGE et l'établissement ?

3.3 Efficacité de la planification au niveau régional

1. Que recouvre la planification de l'éducation à l'échelle régionale ? Expliquez.

2. Va-t-elle au-delà des investissements en infrastructures, personnels et autres intrants ? Comment ?

3. Les IAs ont-elles le droit de formuler les politiques ? Si oui, précisez.

4. Prend-elle en charge des aspects académiques ou curriculaires ? Précisez ?

5. La décentralisation requiert une planification ascendante. Décrivez le processus que vous suivez pour planifier de bas en haut ?

6. Quel est le rôle de l'IA dans ce processus ?

7. De quelle manière les besoins des établissements sont-ils pris en charge dans la planification ascendante ?

8. Avez-vous un plan et calendrier pour des conférences ou des réunions avec les chefs d'établissements, les CGE ou les APE ? Précisez.

9. Le PAEM encourage différents acteurs à appuyer les établissements d`enseignement en ressources. Comment la planification de l'IA prend en compte ces ressources ? Y a-t-il un système de suivi et de rapportage ?

10. L'IA fait-elle un rajustement des budgets de fonctionnement des établissements qui ont reçus un appui financier supplémentaire ?

11. Quels sont les rôles et les responsabilités du conseil régional dans la planification de l'éducation ? dans l'allocation des ressources ?

12. En quoi consistent les différences de rôles entre la CE et l'IA dans le processus de planification de l'éducation et le financement?

13. Qui contrôle le processus de la planification ascendante ?

14. Y a-t-il des dispositions ou un cadre permettant à la CE et à l'IA d'œuvrer en vue d'une planification intégrée de l'éducation ? Expliquez.

15. Le conseil régional assume-t-il intégralement ses compétences en matière d'éducation ?

16. Si non quels sont les volets ou domaines qu'il n'assume pas réellement ?

17. Quelles sont les mesures prises par le conseil régional pour soutenir et appuyer les collèges d'enseignement moyens ?

18. Y a-t-il eu des mesures spéciales en faveur des aux filles ?

L'IA Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Annee 2005/2006

Item	#	Item	#
# des établissements moyens		# des établissements PAEM construits et réhabilites	
# des élèves aux établissement moyens (total/Filles/garçons)		# des élèves aux établissement moyens PAEM • Construits (T/F/G) • Réhabilites (T/F/G)	
# des élèves aux niveaux 6eme auxétablissement moyens (total/Filles/garçons)		# des élèves aux niveaux 6eme aux établissement moyens PAEM • Construits (T/F/G) • Réhabilites (T/F/G)	
# d'enfants 13-16 ans dan		N A	NA
GER 2004/2005		GER 2005/2006	

L'IDEN Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Interviewees :

Introduction

On va poser des questions pour mieux apprécier l'impact et l'efficacité du projet PAEM, et comprendre comment l'IDE s'est organise pour l`appuyer et les implications de l`adoption d`un tel modèle, pour votre institution.

Impacte : Accroissement de l'accès et amélioration de la qualité de l'enseignement et de la performances des élèves

Le projet a-t-il permis

- D'accroître les possibilités d'accès et la maintien à l'enseignement moyen?
- D'améliorer la qualité de l'enseignement dans les collèges ciblés ?
- De créer des conditions favorables aux filles ? Si oui (justifier).

Demander à l'IDE de faire remplir le tableau ci-joint, pendant l'entretien.

Rôles et responsabilités :

1. Quels sont les pouvoirs, les rôles et les responsabilités de l'IDE dans le cadre de décentralisation?

2. Quels sont les objectifs majeurs du PAEM ?

3. De quelle manière l'IDE s'est –elle impliquée dans l'implantation du projet PAEM sur le plan de…?
   - La planification
   - L'exécution et le financement
   - La supervision et le suivi

4. Est-ce que l'IDE répond actuellement aux exigences du PAEM ? (voir dessous)

5. Quelles sont les nouvelles responsabilités que l'IDE a dû accepter à cause du PAEM ?

6. Est-ce qu'il a fallu augmenter le staff chargé de la gestion des établissements moyens ? le nombre d'inspecteurs ?

7. Est-ce que l'IDE a dû changer les procédures et les modes d'offre de services éducatifs et gérer autrement les établissements à cause du PAEM ?

8. L'IDE a-t-elle la capacité d'accueillir et de supporter davantage de collèges, si le projet est élargi ?

9. Quels sont les blocages, les contraintes et les défis sur les plans politique, de la gestion et du financement, auxquels l'IDE devra faire face pour développer l'enseignement moyen dans un système décentralisé.

Construction de collèges et amélioration des infrastructures des établissements cibles

a. Y a-t-il eu une implication particulière de l'IDE dans la construction et/ou la réhabilitation des établissements ? si oui, préciser ?

b. Les normes de constructions édictées par le ministère ont-elles été respectées ?

c. Les constructions ou réhabilitations ont-elles été livrées à la date prévue ?

d. Les populations ont-elles contribué dans les constructions ou réhabilitations ?

L'IDEN Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Amélioration de l'environnement d'enseignement-apprentissage

Les établissements ont-ils tous démarré avec un personnel enseignant suffisant et adéquat pour les différentes disciplines ?

Vous êtes responsables du recrutement des vacataires. Avez-vous fait de la discrimination positive pour recruter plus de femmes enseignantes ?

Les enseignants sont-ils régulièrement rémunérés et à temps ?

Les budgets de fonctionnement ont-ils été fournis aux établissements PAEM ?

a. A-t-on doté les établissements de manuels scolaires, guides d'enseignement et autres matériels scolaires ?

b. Qu'est-ce qui a été fait dans l'environnement de travail des enseignants pour améliorer leurs conditions d'enseignement ?
    - Par l'IDE ?
    - Par les IS ?
    - Par les IVS ?
    - Par les CPI ?

c. Quel est le rôle joue par l'IDE dans la formulation des programmes de compétences pour la vie active ? Sont-ils disponibles ?

d. S'agit-il de programmes intégrés ou d'additifs au programme préexistant ?

L'IDEN Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Amélioration de la formation continue

a. Existe-t-il des ressources exclusivement affectées à la formation par le ministère?

b. L'IDE intervient-elle dans le choix des enseignants devant bénéficier d'une formation ?

c. Quels sont les critères de sélection dans ce cas ?

d. Y a-t-il un programme de formation continue ?

e. Si oui a-t-il donné lieu à l'élaboration de modules ou matériels de formation disponibles ?

f. Y a-t-il suffisamment de formateurs qualifiés sous la tutelle de l'IDE, au regard des besoins ne formation des professeurs de collège?

g. Les personnels des IDE ont-ils été impliqués dans la formation dispensée aux professeurs et principaux de collège dans le cadre du projet PAEM?

h. L'IDE dispose-t-elle de chiffre précis sur le nombre et le % des enseignants ayant bénéficié de la formation continue ?

i. Avez-vous le sentiment que les enseignants et les chefs d'établissement appliquent ce qu'ils ont appris lors des formations ?

j. Quelles pourraient être les mesures incitatives pour encourager les enseignants à partager leurs expériences ?

L'IDEN Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

3.1 Accroissement du financement local de l'enseignement moyen

1. Y a-t- il un accroissement du financement local d de l'enseignement moyen ? Quelle est l'origine de cet accroissement ? L'IDE, le Conseil régional, le conseil rural, autre ?. Préciser.

2. Y a –t-il des actions qui montrent que les collectivités locales et les communautés de base contribuent à appuyer l'éducation et plus particulièrement à l'enseignement moyen ?

3. Les collectivités locales ont-elles réussi à impliquer des milieux du secteur privé dans l'appui aux établissements ? Si oui, indiquer de quelle manière et pour quel(s) domaine(s) ? Pouvez-vous donner des exemples précis ?

4. Quels sont les problèmes de transparence ?

5. Quelles sont les dispositions mises en place pour répondre au besoin de transparence ?

6. Existe-t-il un cadre de concertation pour coordonner les actions des différents intervenants dans le secteur de l'éducation ?

7. L'IDE a-t-il mis en place un système pour le suivi ?

8. Y a-t-il des problèmes de coordination des interventions dans le secteur de l'éducation? Si oui pouvez-vous préciser ?

3.2 Fonctionnement effectif des comités de gestion des établissements

1. Tous les CEM sont-ils dotés d'un CGE ?

2. Le mode de fonctionnement des CGE est-il défini et codifié ?

3. Quel est le rôle du CGE ? Les responsabilités primaires ?

4. Les CGEs ont-il un rôle dans la gestion d'établissement ? Ont-il le droit de prendre les décisions sur—par exemple--la discipline des enseignants, la dépense du budget recourant, etc. ? Si non, pour quoi non ?

5. Quelles sont les limites de compétence des CGE ?

6. Ont-ils compétence à exercer une autorité quelconque sur le personnel enseignant (absentéisme, discipline, etc.), sur l'évaluation des résultats scolaires?

7. Ont-ils accès directement aux instances des pouvoirs locaux et ministérielles ou passent-ils nécessairement par les chefs d'établissement ?

8. Quels sont les rapports que l'IDE entretien avec les CGEs ? Quelles sont les occasions ou les modes d'interaction ?

9. L'IDE a-t-il affecté quelqu'un à la gestion et le suivi des CGEs ?

10. Avez-vous implanté un système du suivi et contrôle financier pour les CGE ?

11. Dans quelle mesure les CGEs ont-il contribué à l'amélioration des établissements ?

12. Les membres de CGE ont-ils bénéficié d'une formation ? si oui, dans quel domaine ?

13. Qui assume le rôle d'arbitre en cas de conflit entre les CGE et l'établissement ?

3.3 Efficacité de la planification au niveau régional

1. Que recouvre la planification de l'éducation à l'échelle régionale ? Expliquez.

2. Va-t-elle au-delà des investissements en infrastructures, personnels et autres intrants ? Comment ?

3. Les IDEs ont-il le droit de formuler les politiques ? Si oui, précisez.

4. Prend-elle en charge des aspects académiques ou curriculaires ? Précisez ?

5. La décentralisation requiert une planification ascendante. Décrivez. Le processus que vous suivez pour planifier de bas en haut ?

6. Quel est le rôle de l'IDE dans ce processus ?

7. De quelle manière les besoins des établissements sont-ils pris en charge dans la planification ascendante ?

8. Avez-vous un plan et calendrier pour des conférences ou des réunions avec les chefs d'établissements, les CGE ou les APE ? Précisez.

9. Le PAEM encourage différents acteurs appuyer les établissements et l'éducation en ressources. Comment la planification de l'IDE prend-elle en compte ces ressources ? Y a-t-il un système de suivi et de rapportage ?

10. L'IDE fait-il un rajustement aux budgets de fonctionnement des établissements qui ont reçus un appui financière supplémentaire ?

11. Quels sont les rôles et les responsabilités du conseil régional dans la planification de l'éducation ? dans l'allocation des ressources ?

12. En quoi consistent les différences de rôles entre la CE et l'IA et l'IDE dans le processus de planification de l'éducation et la financement?

13. Qui contrôle le processus de la planification ascendante ?

14. Y a-t-il des dispositions ou un cadre permettant à la CE et à l'IA et l'IDE d'œuvrer en vue d'une planification intégrée de l'éducation ? Expliquez.

15. Le conseil régional assume-t-il intégralement ses compétences en matière d’éducation ?

16. Si non quels sont les volets ou domaines qu’il n’assume pas réellement ?

17. Quelles sont les mesures prises par le conseil régional pour soutenir et appuyer les collèges d’enseignement moyens ?

18. Y a-t-il eu des mesures spéciales en faveur des aux filles ?

L'IDEN Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Annee 2005/2006

Item	#	Item	#
# des établissements moyens		# des établissements PAEM construits et réhabilites	
# des élèves aux établissement moyens (total/Filles/garçons)		# des élèves aux établissement moyens PAEM • Construits (T/F/G) • Réhabilites (T/F/G)	
# des élèves aux niveaux 6eme auxétablissement moyens (total/Filles/garçons)		# des élèves aux niveaux 6eme aux établissement moyens PAEM • Construits (T/F/G) • Réhabilites (T/F/G)	
# d'enfants 13-16 ans dan		N A	NA
GER 2004/2005		GER 2005/2006	

Nom l'école _____ Règion F K T
Interviewer :_____Group Interview Guide: Parent

Pour les questions qui demandent des nombres-"combien d'entre vous"-demander aux parents de lever la main.

Introduction

- Habitez-vous dans d'autres villages?
- Combien de vos filles et de vos garçons sont élèves dans cette école?
- Pouvez-vous nous parler du PAEM ?

(Accès)

1. Combien d'entre vous …. ?:
   - ont transféré leurs enfants d'une autre école pour l'inscrire dans ce collège?
   - ont inscrit leurs enfants dans cette école après l'entrée en sixième ?
   - a laissé son enfant hors du système scolaire avant d'être l'inscrire dans cette école?

2. Qui d'entre vous aurait arrêté aurait gardé son enfant à la maison s'il n'y avait pas cette école construite ou réhabilitée ? (noter si la décision est différente selon qu'il s'agit de fille ou de garçon),

3. Avant l'ouverture de ce collège avez-vous gardé des élèves files ou garçon à la maison? Qui dans votre famille a décidé d'inscrire votre enfant à l'école? La mère? Le père? Père et mère ensemble?

4. Comment vous ou votre famille avait vous su l'existence de cette école ? L'avait vous découverte grâce à une campagne de sensibilisation ? Par canal avez-vous été informé ?

5. Votre famille a t-elle contribué en numéraire, investissement humain ou matériel à la construction ou réhabilitation de cette école ? Expliquez.

6. Pourquoi avez-vous pris la décision d'inscrire votre enfant dans cette école ?
    - C'est la seule école disponible
    - Elle est plus proche de la maison
    - Il y a de meilleurs équipements
    - Il y a une meilleure qualité d'enseignement
    - C'est mieux pour des filles
    - Autre

(Enseignement-apprentissage)

7. Pensez-vous que votre enfant va mieux apprendre dans cette école ? Expliquez ? (résultats d'examen, etc…)

8. Qu'est ce qui explique que votre enfant apprend mieux dans cette école ?

- environnement plus confortable (spécifier :----------)
- des classes mieux équipées (spécifiez :----------)
- plus de matériels pour l'enseignement-apprentissage (spécifiez :--)
- plus de références dans la bibliothèque (spécifiez : ----------)
- présence d'équipement des technologies d'information et de communcation/ordinateur
- (spécifiez : ----)
- plus de sécurité, sans danger (spécifier :----------)
- enseignants plus les performants (:----------) spécifiez
- autre :(----------) spécifiez

9. Combien d'entre vous a acheté des livres pour leurs enfants?

10. Sinon vos enfants ont-ils pu avoir les livres dont ils ont besoin ?

11. Vos enfants ont-ils le droit d'amener les manuels de l'école à la maison ?¶

12. Si l'école distribue des livres à vos enfants, vos enfants ont-ils plus de chance d'en avoir que s'ils étaient dans une autre école?

13. Vous a t-on jamais demandé un appui financier ou matériel pour la classe? Donnez des exemples.

14. Pensez-vous qu'il y a moins d'élèves par classe dans cette école que dans les autres ?

15. Vos enfants sont-ils autorisés à amener les livres de la bibliothèque à la maison ?

16. Pensez-vous que votre enfant est plus motivé et plus intéressé dans cette école que dans l'école qu'il a fréquenté avant ? Pourquoi ?

17. Les enseignants font-ils des choses différentes où ont-ils une approche spéciale que les autres école ne font pas?

18. Que vous disent les enfants sur ce qu'ils apprennent d'original de la part de leurs professeurs? Donnez quelques exemples.

19. Les enseignants ou l'école organisent-ils des cours particuliers ou cours de renforcement pour les élèves? Avez-vous payé pour ce fait? Pour quel montant?

20. Est ce que les enseignants donne du travail à faire à la maison? Plus que dans les autres écoles ? moins que dans les autres écoles ? Il n'y a pas de différence ? Pourquoi pensez-vous cela ?

21. Comment vous rendez-vous compte que vos enfants travaillent mieux dans cette école? Recevez-vous des informations sur le travail de vos enfants? Quelle en est la fréquence? Sous quelle forme recevez-vous cette information ?

22. Est ce qu'un professeur vous a jamais demandé de leur parler de vos enfants?

23. Les professeurs ou le principal vous ont-ils jamais rendu visite à la maison pour parler de vos enfants?

24. Pensez-vous que les filles sont mieux traitées dans cette école que dans les autres ? Expliquez?

25. Qu'est qui fait que c'est bon pour les filles?

26. Quelqu'un d'entre vous a t-il jamais eu de problème de mauvais traitement de sa fille dans cette école?

27. Pensez-vous que les filles enceintes peuvent revenir à à l'école après la naissance du bébé? Sinon, expliquez.

28. Si le père est un élève de cette école quelles sont les mesures à prendre ? qu'est ce qui peut arriver

29. Qu'est ce qui peut arriver si un enseignant maltraite une fille de cette école ?

30. En cas de problème avec un professeur ou un élève, qui pouvez voir vous aider et vous conseiller ?

31. Vos enfants s'absentent-ils souvent ? Combien de fois par mois ? Pour quelles raisons ?

32 Entre vos filles et vos garçons, qui s'absentent le plus ? Pour quelles raisons ?

33. Vos enfants sont-il souvent en retard? Combien de fois par mois ? Pour quelles raisons ?

34. Que dire de vos professeurs ? Sont ils souvent absents ? Combien de fois par mois, en général ? Pourquoi ?

35. Vos professeurs arrivent-ils souvent en retard ? Combien de fois par mois en général ? Pour quelles raison ?

36. Que se passe t-il lorsque le professeur est en retard?

37. Y a t-il un moyen de savoir quels professeurs s'absentent et quelle en est la fréquence ?

38. L'école affiche t-elle un tbleaau de présence que vous pouvez voir?

39. Avez-vous des enfants qui utilisent les ordinateurs et Internet ?

(Participation)

40. Les parents sont-ils consultés pour les affaires de l'école ? A quel propos, quand, et comment

41. Avez-vous jamais vu le budget de l'école affiché publiquement ? Connaissez-vous le montant d'argent dépensé dans cette école ? Savez-vous d'où vient l'argent de cette école?

42. Qu'avez-vous payé pour que votre enfant soit inscrit dans cette école?

43. Avez-vous jamais contribué en numéraire, investissement humain pour soutenir cette école? C'est pourquoi ?

44. Avez-vous jamais participé à l'amélioration de cette école? Expliquez?

45. Vous ou quelqu'un dans la famille participe t-il aux réunions ou autres événements à l'école ? Expliquez.

46. Avez-vous une idée de ce qui est réalisé par le CGE?

47. Avez-vous jamais été consulté par le CGE pour une quelconque décision à prendre? Si oui, comment ? et à quel propos ?

48. Comment vous mettez-vous au courant des décisions prises ou d'autres questions concernant l'école?

49. Si les parents ne sont pas d'accord sur les décisions du CGE ou du principal comment peuvent-ils alors faire?

50. Si les parents ont des problèmes avec les décisions prises qui peuvent-ils aller voir?

Demandez aux participants de discuter entre eux pour fournir une réponse aux questions suivantes. Ils doivent s'entendre sur l'ordre de priorité de leurs choix.

Question: S'il y'avait trios choses a faire pour améliorer le collège, lesquelles proposeriez vous? Classez les par ordre d'importance.

PRF Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Interviewees :_____

Introduction

On va poser des questions pour mieux apprécier l'impact et l'efficacité du projet PAEM, et comprendre comment le PRF s'est organisé pour l`appuyer et les implications de l`adoption d`un tel modèle, pour votre institution.

Impacte : Accroissement de l'accès et amélioration de la qualité de l'enseignement et de la performances des élèves

1. Le projet a-t-il permis
   - D'accroître les possibilités d'accès et le maintien à l'enseignement moyen?
   - D'améliorer la qualité de l'enseignement dans les collèges ciblés ?
   - De créer des conditions favorables aux filles ? Si oui (justifier) ?

Rôles et responsabilités :

2. Quelle est la composition actuelle du PRF ?

3. Comment le personnel est-il choisi ?

4. Quels sont les rôles et responsabilités du PRF ?

5. Quels sont les objectifs majeurs du PAEM ?

6. Quel est le niveau d'implication du PRF dans les actions de formation du projet ?

7. Selon quelle fréquence visitez-vous les collèges en principe et actuellement ?

8. Qu'est-ce que vous faites pendant les visites ?

- Un contrôle (de qui et quoi, comment)
- Un appui (de qui et quoi, comment)
- Un suivi (de qui et quoi, comment)
- Autre

9. Faites-vous le contrôle des systèmes de gestion, etc.

10. Menez-vous des observations des enseignants pendant des leçons ?

11. Comment utilisez-vous ces observations ?

12. Est-ce que vous les partager avec le chef d'établissement et/ou les enseignants ? Comment ?

13. Avez-vous jamais assisté à un «cercle de qualité » ? Expliquez.

14. Quelles sont les nouvelles responsabilités que vous avez dû accepter et ajouter à cause du PAEM ?

15. Est-ce qu'il a fallu augmenter le staff chargé de l'inspection des établissements moyens ? le nombre d'inspecteurs ?

16. Est-ce que vous avez dû changer les procédures et les modes de l'inspection et d'appui aux établissements à cause du PAEM ?

17. Avez-vous la capacité d'accueillir et supporter davantage de collèges si le projet est élargi ?

18. Quels sont les blocages, les contraintes et les défis sur les plans politique, de la gestion, et du financement auxquels vous devrez faire face pour développer l'enseignement moyen dans un système décentralisé ?

Environnement d'enseignement-apprentissage et matériels didactiques

1. Qu'est-ce qui a été fait dans l'environnement de travail des enseignants pour améliorer leurs conditions d'enseignement ?
   - Par le PRF ?
   - Par les CPI en particulier?
   - Par les IS en particulier?
   - Par les IVS en particulier ?

2. Vous est-il arrivé d'observer une amélioration dans la qualité de l'enseignement-apprentissage ?
   - Les enseignants ont-il changé les méthodes d'enseignement et de pédagogie ? Comment ?
   - Les enseignants se sont-ils servi des méthodes et matériels introduits par la formation PAEM ?
   - Les enseignants ont-il utilisé en classe des matériels didactiques qu'ils ont fabriqués eux-mêmes ?
   - Les élèves sont-ils plus motivés et engagés en classe ?
   - Les filles sont-elles à l`aise en classe ?

3. Le PRF a-t-il déjà confectionné des matériels didactiques mis à la disposition des professeurs de collège ? si oui préciser.

4. Qu`est ce que le PFRF fait de particulier pour les filles des collèges ?

PRF Region : F K T Interviewer :_____

Amélioration de la formation continue

1. Le PRF dispose-t-il de ressources affectées à la formation ? Si oui, d'où proviennent ces ressources ? du ministère ? des collectivités locales ? d'autres organismes ?

2. Y a-t-il un programme de formation continue ?

3. Procédez- vous à des analyses de besoins en formation ? Si oui, ont-elles donné lieu à l'élaboration de modules ou matériaux de formation disponibles ?

4. Les chefs d'établissements sont-t-ils impliqués dans le choix du programme de formation des professeurs ?

5. Le PRF a-t-il suffisamment de formateurs qualifiés en son sein ?

6. Y a –t-il des critères préétablis dans le choix des enseignants devant bénéficier d'une formation continue ?

7. Quelle a été le degré de participation du PRF dans de développement du programme de formation offerte par le projet PAEM ?

8. Quelle a été le degré de participation du PRF dans la formation offerte par le projet PAEM ?

9. Y a-t-il une réelle appropriation par le PRF, de l'approche proposée dans cette formation ?

10. Penser-vous que ce style de formation peut être répliqué à grande échelle ? Si non quels seraient les ajustements nécessaires ?

11. Avez-vous des chiffres précis sur le nombre et le % des enseignants ainsi que des chefs d'établissements ayant bénéficié de la formation continue ?

12. Avez-vous le sentiment que les enseignants et les chefs d'établissement appliquent ce qu'ils ont appris lors des formations reçues ?

13. Quelles pourraient être les mesures incitatives pour encourager les enseignants à partager leurs expériences ?

Accès accru à la formation aux compétences à la vie active

1. Y –t-il des membres du PRF qualifiés pour l'enseignement des compétences pour la vie courante ?

2. Les programmes de compétences pour la vie courante sont-ils disponibles ?

3. Si oui, sont-ils appliqués aux élèves des collèges ?

4. S'agit-il de programmes intégrés ou d'additifs aux programmes préexistant ?

Nom de l'école_____ **Région: F K T**
Interviewer : _____ **Profile d'école**

Nom chef d'etablissement :_____

Intervention: ☐ construction ☐ réhabilitation ☐ formation seulement

Chef d'Etablissements: ♂ ♀ Formation CE: O N

Enseignants :
♂ _____ # ♀ _____

Disciplines: #____maths #____ SVT #____ PC #____ français
#____ géographie/histoire # ____anglais #____ économie familiale
#____ langue II

Niveau de qualification :
PCEM_____♂ _____♀ PEM_____♂ _____♀ PES _____♂ _____♀

Niveau académique : B _____♂ _____♀ L _____♂ _____♀ M _____♂ _____♀ Autre, précisez

Statut :
Fonctionnaire _____♂ _____♀ Contractuel_____♂ _____♀
Vacataire_____♂ _____♀

Nombre d'enseignements ayant reçu la formation PAEM: ♂ _____ ♀ _____

Effectif des élevés:

Par Niveau					
	♂	♀		♂	♀
7			**9**		
8			**10**		

Effectif des élevés avant la réhabilitation: (Collège réhabilitation seulement)

Par Niveau					
	♂	♀		♂	♀
7			**9**		
8			**10**		

Demander a voir: cocher les documents de gestion dont dispose le chef d'établissement au complet
☐ tableau bord ☐ Inventaire des ressources de l'établissement ☐ plan de répartition des cours et des salles ☐ le calendrier des compositions ☐ Le cahier de présence des enseignants ☐ Affichez vous les absences pour en informer la communauté Oui Non
☐ Cahier de présence des élèves

Nom de l'école_____ Région: F K T
Interviewer : _____ Profile d'école

Y a-t-il des enseignants absents aujourd'hui? Oui ☐ Non ☐
Pourquoi ?

Infrastructures: cocher les choses existant á l'école (vérifier)
☐ bibliothèque ☐ toilettes séparées pour F / G ☐ source d'eau ☐ mur de clôture
☐ portes et fenêtres ferment correctement ☐ électricité ☐ téléphone ☐ l'équipement pour les sciences ☐ l'équipement sportif ☐ autre (lister)

ICT: Demander á voir
☐ l'ordinateur Oui Non fonctionne Oui Non utilisation libre : Oui Non :
enseignants : : ☐ Internet ☐ autre l'équipement TIC
élèves: ☐ Internet ☐ autre l'équipement TIC
(liste) _____

Qui est responsable de la maintenance des équipements en TIC ?
_____

Qui a reçu la formation en TIC? ☐ Enseignants ☐ élèves ☐ CGE ☐ parents ☐ autres_____

Qui est autorise à utiliser les équipements TIC? ☐ Enseignants ☐ élèves ☐ CGE ☐ parents ☐ autres_____

Apres vous, quels sont les impacts de la construction / réhabilitation / formation sũr :

l'absentéisme enseignants	a diminué	inchangé	a augmenté
Ponctualité des enseignants	plus ponctuels	inchangés	moins ponctuels
l'absentéisme des élevés	a diminué	inchangé	a augmenté
Ponctualité des élevés	plus ponctuelle	inchangée	moins ponctuelle

Regardez dans chaque salle de classes de l'école. S'il y a les différences entre les classes, notez. (Fournitures, espace, matériels didactique, etc.)

Nom l'école _____ **Région F K T**

Interviewer _____ Guide d'entretien Groupe de discussion : Élèves

Pour les questions qui demandent des nombres-"combien d'entre vous"-demander les élèves de lever la main.

Introduction

Pouvez-vous nous parler du PAEM ?

(Accès)

1. Combien d'entre vous:
   - Sont transférés d'un autre collège ?
   - Sont inscrits dans cette école après l'entrée en sixième ?
   - Étaient en dehors du système scolaire avant d'être inscrit dans cette école?

2. Qui d'entre vous aurait arrêté ses études si le collège n'avait pas été construit ou n'avait pas été réhabilité ? (Noter de la différence des réponses pour des filles et des garçons, s'il sa lieu)

3. Qui a pris la décision de vous inscrire dans cette école ?Votre famille ou vous-même ou votre famille et vous-même ?

4. Comment vous ou votre famille avait vous su l'existence de cette école ? L'avait vous découverte grâce à une campagne de sensibilisation ?

5. Votre famille a t-elle contribué en numéraire, investissement humain ou matériel à la construction ou réhabilitation de cette école ?

6. Pourquoi a t-on pris la décision de vous inscrire à cette école ?
   - C'est la seule école disponible
   - Elle est plus proche de la maison
   - Il y a de meilleurs équipements

Nom l'école _____ **Région F K T**

Interviewer _____ Guide d'entretien Groupe de discussion : Élèves

Il y a une meilleure qualité d'enseignement
C'est mieux pour des filles
Autre

(Enseignement apprentissage)

7. Pensez-vous mieux apprendre dans cette école ? Expliquez ?(Résultats d'examen, etc.…)

8. Qu'est ce qui explique que vous apprenez mieux dans cette école ?
   Environnement plus confortable (spécifier : ----------)
   Des classes mieux équipées (spécifiez : ----------)
   Plus de matériels pour l'enseignement apprentissage (spécifie :--)
   Plus de références dans la bibliothèque (spécifiez : ----------)
   Présence d'équipement des technologies d'information et de communication/ordinateur (spécifiez : ----)
   Plus de sécurité, sans danger (spécifier :----------)
   Enseignants plus les performants (:----------) spécifiez
   Autre : (----------) spécifiez

9. Combien d'entre vous a des manuels personnels où peut avoir les manuels dont il a besoin ? Combien d'entre vous n'ont pas manuels ?

10. Avez-vous le droit d'amener les manuels de l'école pour le travail à domicile ?

11. Les élèves de cette école ont-ils plus de chance d'avoir des manuels que ceux des autres écoles?

12. Vos professeurs utilisent-ils des supports pédagogiques quant-ils enseignent? Citer quelques exemples.

13. Y a t-il assez places pour tous les élèves dans vos classes ?

14. Avez-vous le droit d'amener chez vous les livres de la bibliothèque ?

15. Les professeurs de cette école enseignent-il ou organisent-il leurs salles de classe de manière différente que ce que faisaient vos professeurs dans vos anciennes écoles ? Expliquez ?

Nom l'école _____ **Région F K T**

Interviewer _____ Guide d'entretien Groupe de discussion : Élèves

16. Le professeur passe t-il plus de temps à exposer qu'à poser des questions ?

17. Le professeur vous permettent-il de poser des questions en la classe ?

18. Travaillez parfois en groupes de coopération ou par paire en classe ?

19. Le professeur réarrangent-il les tables bancs pour faciliter le travail de groupe ?

20. Vos professeurs utilisent-ils des projets qui exigent l'emploi l'ordinateur, l'Internet ou la bibliothèque ?

21. Comment font vos professeurs pour vous motiver dans l'apprentissage en classe ?

22. Que pensez-vous que vos professeurs pourraient faire pour que les leçons soient plus intéressantes.

23. Le professeur vous fait-il la rétroaction (feedback) de votre travail ? Pendant la leçon, sur vos devoirs à la maison, après la leçon?

24. Quand vous ne comprenez pas parfois, demandez vous de l'aide à votre professeur? Expliquez comment vous procédez.

25. Votre professeur ou l'école offre t-il des cours particuliers ou des cours de renforcement? Ces cours sont-ils payant ? Si oui combien faut-il payé ?

Nom l'école _____ **Région F K T**

Interviewer _____ Guide d'entretien Groupe de discussion : Élèves

26. Vos professeurs donnent-ils des devoirs à la maison ? Quelle en est la fréquence? Quels sont les professeurs qui ne le font pas ?

27. Pensez-vous que les professeurs traitent des garçons et des filles différemment dans la classe ? Expliquez.
28. Pensez-vous que c'est mieux et plus facile d'être une fille ou d'être un garçon dans cette école? Expliquez.

29. Que ceux qui aiment les sciences lèvent la main. Qui aime les maths ? (Noter nombre de filles et nombre de garçons) Demander aux autres de dire pourquoi ils ne les aiment pas.

30. Combien de filles a dû quitter à cette école cette année pour cause de grossesse? L'école leur permet-elle de revenir après? Si non, pourquoi ?

31. En cas de problème avec un professeur ou un élève, qui pouvez voir vous aider et vous conseiller ?

32. Les élèves s'absentent-ils souvent ? Combien de fois par mois ? Pour quelle raison ?

33. Entre filles et garçons, qui s'absentent plus ? Pour quelles raisons ?

34. Les élèves de cette école sont-il souvent en retard? Combien de fois par mois ? Pour quelles raisons ?

35. Entre filles et garçons, qui arrivent plus souvent en retard? Pourquoi ?

Nom l'école _____ **Région F K T**

Interviewer _____ Guide d'entretien Groupe de discussion : Élèves

36. Que dire de vos professeurs ? Sont ils souvent absents ? Combien de fois par mois, en général ? Pourquoi ?

37. Que se passe t-il lorsque le professeur est absent ? Qui enseigne alors ?

38. Vos professeurs arrivent-ils souvent en retard ? Combien de fois par mois en général ? Pour quelles raison ?

39. Que se passe t-il lorsque le professeur est en retard?

40. Les élèves ont-ils l'autorisation d'utiliser les ordinateurs et l'Internet dans cette école ? Quelle en est la fréquence d'utilisation ?

41. Pour genre d'activité les utilisez-vous les ordinateurs et Internet ? (Participation)

42. Les élèves sont-ils membres du CGE ? Qui est membre ?(Combien de filles, combien de garçons)

43. Les élèves sont-ils consultés pour les affaires de l'école ? A quel propos, quand, et comment ?

44. Les élèves participent-ils aux activités d'amélioration de l'école ? Décrivez comment.

45. Vos parents rendent-ils visite à vos professeurs au sujet de votre travail et performance à l'école ? Combien de fois durant le dernier trimestre?

46. Est ce que vos parents viennent aux réunions ou autres événements à l'école ? Expliquez.

Nom l'école _____ **Région F K T**

Interviewer _____ Guide d'entretien Groupe de discussion : Élèves

47. Quelqu'un dans votre famille a t-il participé aux activités d'amélioration ou des projets D'école ? Expliquez.

48. Qu'est ce qui vous permettrait de mieux étudier ? Demander aux filles d'abord et aux garçons ensuite.

49. Pourquoi vous a t-on choisis pour nous parler aujourd'hui ? Etes vous les meilleurs élèves de vos classes?

Nom de l'école_____ Région: F K T
Interviewer : _____ Guide FG Enseignants

Introduction

- Quels sont les objectifs généraux du PAEM ?

- Combien d'entre vous ont participé à des formations PAEM/SITT (Et les autres) ? Levez la main.

- Comment était cette formation ?

- Qui, parmi vous était là avant la réhabilitation du collège ?

- Qui enseigne pour la première fois ?

- Combien de vacataires y a-t-il dans ce groupe ?

O.S. Impact : ***Amélioration de l'accès et la qualité de l'éducation, particulièrement chez les filles***

1. À votre avis, le PAEM a-t-il amélioré l'accès, le maintien et la performance des élèves de votre école ?

2. Comment pouvez-vous apprécier cette amélioration ?
   - Les élèves sont-ils plus assidus ?
   - Sont-ils plus ponctuels ?
   - Sont-ils plus disposés à faire leurs devoirs à la maison ?
   - Réussissent-ils mieux dans les études et examens ?
   - Les parents sont-ils plus impliqués pour soutenir les élèves ?
   - Les élèves sont-ils plus intéressés par les leçons ?
   - Quoi d'autre ?

SRIC 1 : Accroissement de l'accès à l'enseignement moyen (données physiques)

SRI 1 et 2 : Davantage de CEM construits et amélioration des infrastructure des établissement ciblés

1. Comment, le cas échéant, la réhabilitation ou les nouvelles constructions sont-elles utiles pour les élèves ?

   - Plus de confort dans votre environnement : (spécifiez:_____)
   - Les salles de classe sont mieux équipées : (spécifiez:_____)
   - Plus de matériel d'enseignement apprentissage : (spécifiez:_____)
   - Plus de livres à la bibliothèque ?
   - Matériel et équipement informatiques : (spécifiez:_____)
   - Plus de sécurité :(spécifiez:_____)
   - Quoi d'autre : (spécifiez:_____)

2. Comment, le cas échéant, la réhabilitation ou les nouvelles constructions vous permettent de mieux enseigner et de mieux faire votre travail ?
   - Plus de confort dans votre environnement de travail : (spécifiez:_____)
   - Les salles de classe sont mieux équipées : (spécifiez:_____)
   - Plus de matériel d'enseignement apprentissage : (spécifiez:_____)
   - Plus de livres dotation à la bibliothèque ?
   - Matériel et équipement informatiques : (spécifiez:_____)
   - Plus de sécurité :(spécifiez:_____)
   - Quoi d'autre : (spécifiez:_____)

SRI 3 : accroître la sensibilisation des communautés à l'importance de la scolarisation et particulièrement celle des filles

1. Y a t-il eu un programme/activité de sensibilisation sur la scolarisation des enfants pour la communauté ?

2. Avez-vous participé à cette campagne ?

3. Si oui, comment avez-vous procédé ? (En tant que participant ou responsable)

4. Quels ont été les résultats pour les élèves ? Pour les filles ? Pour les garçons ?

5. Ces écoles sont-elles plus accueillantes pour les filles ?

RIC 2 : Amélioration de l'environnement d'enseignement apprentissage

SRI 2.1 : Accès accru aux matériels didactiques

1. Avez-vous des supports pour les disciplines que vous enseignez ?

2. La majeure partie de vos élèves ont-ils les manuels dont ils ont besoin pour apprendre dans votre discipline ? Si non, quel pourcentage d'élèves n'a pas de manuels ? Plus de filles ? Plus de garçons ? Dans quelles disciplines les élèves ont-ils moins de manuels ?

3. Qui a donné les manuels ? L'école ? Les parents ? Autre précise.

4. Permettez-vous aux élèves d'amener ces manuels à la maison (s'ils appartiennent à l'école) ?

5. Assignez-vous à vos élèves un temps d'étude à la bibliothèque ? Les élèves sont-ils autorisés à amener à la maison la livres/matériel ?

6. Est-ce que c'est vous-même qui fabriquez votre matériel didactique ? Si oui, donnez quelques exemples.

7. Avez-vous reçu une formation en fabrication de matériel didactique de la part du PAEM ? Sinon, dans quelle mesure cette formation vous serait-elle utile ?

SRI 2.2 : Salle de classe améliorée et environnement d'enseignement

1. L'environnement est-il favorable à l'apprentissage ?

2. Dans quelle mesure l'environnement est-il favorable à l'apprentissage ?
- Avez-vous la possibilité d'organiser les tables bancs comme vous l'entendez ?
- Y a-t-il assez de tables et de chaises ?
- Avez-vous la possibilité d'afficher les travaux des élèves ou autre matériel pédagogique sur les murs ou dans la classe ? Donnez des exemples.

4. Que faites vous pour soutenir les élèves faibles ?

5. Que faites vous pour soutenir les filles ? A demander aux professeurs de sciences et de math, en particulier.

6. Sur quels critères vous fondez vous pour confirmer que vos élèves sont engagés et participent activement à la leçon ?

7. Comment fait le principal pour vous aider à mieux enseigner ?

8. Tenez-vous des réunions régulières avec le corps enseignant ? Quels sont les sujets traités ?

9. Est ce que dans votre école, le principal a-t-il jamais organisé des rencontres avec les enseignants ou trouver de occasions pour une discussion sur différentes stratégies d'enseignement ?

Nom de l'école_____ Région: F K T
Interviewer : _____ Guide FG Enseignants

10. Votre principal vous rend-il visite pour vous observer en classe ? Quelle en est la fréquence ? Au cas où il ne vous rend pas visite, pouvez expliquer pourquoi ?

11. Après l'observation de la classe, y a-t-il une séance de discussion avec le directeur ?

12. Votre école organise t-elle son cercle de qualité ? Qui y participe ? Les enseignants et le principal ? Quelle en est la fréquence ? Est-ce une obligation ? Que faites-vous dans le cercle de qualité ? Pensez-vous que cela soit utile ?

13. Votre établissement organise t-il des études pour les élèves ou bien avez-vous un service de tutorat ?

14. Que fait votre établissement en ce qui concerne :
- L'absentéisme et le retard des élèves
- La maladie des élèves
- Les problèmes qui affectent la participation et l'apprentissage des filles ?

15. Les enseignants organisent-ils des cours de renforcement privés ?

16. A quoi sont dus vos retards à l'école ? Vos absences ?

17. En moyenne, vous êtes absent combien de fois par mois ?

18. Quelle est la politique dans votre école concernant les absences des professeurs ?

19. Que font vos élèves lorsque vous êtes absent ?

20. Votre principal est-il tous les jours à l'école ? Et durant toute la journée ?

21. En moyenne, combien de fois par mois est-il absent ? Pourquoi ?

22. En général, le principal arrive t-il après ou avant l'heure ? Quels sont ses retards, par mois en moyenne ?

23. Que pensez-vous des absences du principal ?

24. Les parents d'élèves vous rendent-ils visite pour parler du travail de leurs enfants ? Quelle en est la fréquence ? S'ils ne le font pas, quelle en est la raison ?

25. En dehors des rencontres parents professeurs, rencontrez-vous les parents d'élèves ? Rendez-vous visite aux parents d'élèves à leur domicile ?

26. Quel soutien est donné aux enseignants par la communauté ?

27. Les parents vous ont-ils jamais aidé en classe ? (Personnes-ressources, encadrement, etc.).

SIR 2.3 : Amélioration de la formation continuée (à demander aux enseignants qui en ont bénéficié, après le focus group)

1. Pourquoi vous a-t-on choisi pour participer à la formation PAEM?

2. La formation à laquelle vous avez participé était-elle bien organisée ?

   Y avait-il assez de formateurs pour aider à répondre à vos questions ?
   La période choisie était-elle convenable ?
   La nourriture et l'hébergement étaient-ils acceptables ?
   Avez-vous reçu des outils autres que le manuel ?

3. Avez-vous appris quelque chose de nouveau ? S'agissait-il en grande partie, de choses que vous connaissiez déjà ?
   - Avez-vous jamais participé à une formation sensible au genre ?
   - La formation des enseignants en genre vous parait-elle indispensable?
   - Est-ce que le projet vous a donné une orientation aux questions de genre pour que vous puissiez traiter équitablement filles et garçons ?

4. La formation vous a t-elle aidé à mieux enseigner ? Si oui pourquoi ? Si non, pourquoi ?

5. Avez-vous été capable d'utiliser ce que vous avez appris dans la formation dans votre enseignement ?

6. Qu'avez-vous utilisé de ce que vous avez appris dans cette formation dans votre enseignement ?
   - Dans votre préparation
   - Dans le déroulement de la leçon
   - Dans l'évaluation des apprentissages
   - Pour soutenir les élèves faibles
   - Pour aider les filles.

7. Avez-vous été satisfait de cette formation ? Si oui pourquoi ? Sinon pourquoi ?

8. Comment cette formation pourrait-elle être améliorée ?

9. Depuis la première formation, avez-vous reçu un suivi sur comment appliquer ce que vous avez appris ?
    - Le principal
    - Les conseillers pédagogiques, les inspecteurs de spécialité, les inspecteurs de vie scolaire
    - Le Projet

10. Le principal, les conseillers pédagogiques, ou inspecteurs ont-ils participé à cette formation ?

11. Y a-t-il des observations de votre classe de la part de ces personnes sur l'utilisation que vous avez faite des techniques apprises lors de la formation dans la salle de classe ? Le cas échéant, qu'ont-ils dit ?

12. Avez-vous eu l'occasion de partager avec vos collègues ce que vous avez appris depuis cette formation ?
    - Est-ce que quelqu'un parmi les enseignants vous a sollicité pour cela ?
    - Le principal vous a-t-il demandé de partager ?

13. Seriez-vous d'accord de partager avec les collègues si l'occasion vous en est donnée ?

14. Qu'avez-vous remarqué comme changement chez vos élèves dans leurs performances scolaires et dans leur participation en classe ?

SRI 2.4 : Accroissement de l'accès aux TIC

1. Avez-vous été formé à l'utilisation de
    - l'ordinateur
    - Internet
    - D'autre matériel audio-visuel

2. Utilisez-vous l'ordinateur ou l'Internet dans la préparation des leçons ? Si oui, expliquez ce que vous faites.

3. Pendant combien de temps par semaine utilisez-vous l'ordinateur ou l'Internet ?

4. Est-ce suffisant ?

5. Les élèves sont-ils autorisés à utiliser l'ordinateur ou l'Internet ?

6. Si oui, utilisez-vous l'ordinateur et Internet en tant que support de votre enseignement ? Expliquez ce que vous faites.

7. Y a-t-il une tranche horaire allouée aux élèves pour utiliser l'ordinateur et Internet ? Comment est fait ce découpage ? Par discipline, par niveau, autre)

8. Comment les étudiants font-ils ? (Projets, recherche, etc.)

SRI 2.5 : Augmentation de la formation aux compétences à la vie active

1. Le nouveau programme relatif aux compétences à la vie active est-il enseigné aux élèves?

2. Si oui, quelles techniques ont été utilisées?

3. S'agit-il d'enseignement intégré au programme ou s'agit-il d'enseignement extra curricula ire ?

4. Les professeurs ont-ils été formés dans l'enseignement des nouveaux programmes de compétences à la vie active ? Si oui, combien ?

5. Comment le programme de compétences à la vie active a-t-il changé le comportement ou les attitudes de vos élèves ?

RIC 3 : Accroissement de la participation du pouvoir local et des communautés à la gestion et au financement de l'éducation

1. Comment la communauté dans laquelle se trouve l'école soutient-elle les enseignants et les élèves dans l'enseignment-apprentissage ? Expliquez

2. Qu'est ce que les organisations ont fait ?

3. Que faites-vous pour impliquer la communauté ?

SRI 3.2 : Fonctionnement effectif des Comités de Gestion des Ecoles

1. Que est-ce qui a été fait par le CGE de cette école pour aider l'environnement de l'enseignement apprentissage ? Expliquez.

2. Le CGE a-t-il fait quelque chose, en particulier pour les enseignants ? (Par exemple logement, nourriture, primes, cadeaux, etc.)

3. À quelle fréquence rencontrez-vous le CGE ? A quelle fin ?

4. Pensez-vous que le CGE est utile pour l'école ? Expliquez

5. Les professeurs participent-ils à la planification et/ou à mise en œuvre des projets d'école ? Expliquez.

Demandez aux participants de discuter entre eux pour fournir une réponse aux questions suivantes. Ils doivent s'entendre sur l'ordre de priorité de leurs choix.

Question: S'il y'avait trios choses a faire pour améliorer le collège, lesquelles proposeriez vous? Classez les par ordre d'importance.

Guide IA

Pour les Inspecteurs d'Académie : ils sont responsables du recrutement des vacataires. On pourrait peut-être leur demander s'ils font de la discrimination positive pour recruter plus de femmes enseignantes

Guide CGE

Pour les CGE : nombre d'hommes et nombre de femmes membres et dans les instances de décision. Lors de la discussion de groupe nous pourrons observer si les femmes prennent spontanément la parole.

Guide Elève

On pourrait demander en plus aux élèves à la question numéro 1

Connaissez-vous dans votre école des élèves qui :

sont transférés d'un autre collège ?¶
sont inscrits dans cette école après l'entrée en sixième ?¶
étaient en dehors du système scolaire avant d'être inscrit dans cette école?

De quels manuels disposent les élèves selon les disciplines ? **(autour de la question numéro 9**)

A demander aux élèves et aux enseignants et aux priniapaux :
Observe t-on des conflits élèves-élèves ? oui……non……
Observe t-on des conflits entre filles et garçons ?
Comment l'enseignant(e), les principaux essaient t-ils de régler les conflits ?

Guide Observation de l'école et de la classe

Observation de l'ENSEIGNEMENT APPRENTISSAGE (pour Diane)

Les contenus

Les contenus sont-ils adaptés à tous les élèves ou sont-ils plus adaptés aux filles, aux garçons ?
Les contenus enseignés respectent t-ils la personnalité des élèves ?
Les contenus enseignés correspondent-ils au niveau des élèves filles et garçons ?

Les supports

Quel type de supports sont utilisés ?
Sont-ils adaptés à tous les élèves ?
Sont-ils plus adaptés aux filles ?
Sont-ils plus adaptés aux garçons ?

Les interactions

Les élèves semblent-ils
très motivés ……motivés…… peu motivés ……pas motivés du tout……
Lorsque l'enseignant(e) pose une question, est-ce qu'il (ou elle) laisse un temps de réflexion avant de recueillir les réponses ?

Les élèves filles éprouvent-elles plus de difficultés pour s'exprimer ?
Comment l'enseignant(e) encourage t-il (ou elle) les élèves en difficulté : utilise t-il (ou elle) les gestes, l'expression du visage, le regard etc.
Quelle est la qualité des réponses des filles par rapport à celles des garçons ?
Dans la participation des élèves, l'enseignant(e) confie t-il (ou elle) des tâches spécifiques aux élèves ? oui …… non……
Quels types de tâches aux filles ?
Quels types de tâches aux garçons ?

LA GESTION DE L'ESPACE CLASSE

L'enseignant(e) s'approche t-il (ou elle) des garçons ? si oui combien de fois ?

OBSERVATION DES ASPECTS GENRE A L'ECOLE

LES PERFORMANCES DES ELEVES AU DERNIER SEMESTRE

Comment appréciez-vous la performance des filles et celle garçons ?
Les résultats aux compositions du premier semestre :
Combien de filles trouve t-on classées dans les 10 premières places ?
Combien de filles trouve t-on classées dans les 10 dernières places ?

INFORMATIONS SUR LES ELEVES

Vous vivez chez votre père et mère mère seulement père seulement tuteur autre
Quel est votre lieu de résidence ?
Comment venez-vous à l'école ? à pied…en voiture …en calèche ……autre si autre précisez.
Quelqu'un vous aide t-il à faire du travail scolaire à la maison oui……non……
Qui achète les fournitures demandées par l'école?

LA COURS DE L'ECOLE

La surface de la cour vous paraît-elle suffisante pour les effectifs de l'école ? oui…… non……
Existe t-il un espace de jeu ? oui…… non……
Quels sont les jeux pratiqués par les filles ?
Quels sont les jeux pratiqués par les garçons ?
Quel espace est occupé par les filles ?
Quel espace est occupé par les garçons ?
Les filles et les garçons jouent-ils ensemble ? Si oui décrivez les types de jeux mixtes pratiqués ?

L'EMPLOI DU TEMPS DES ELEVES DANS LA SEMAINE

On peut choisir deux jours de semaine et le week end

Horaire	Lundi	Mardi	Samedi	Dimanche
H de réveil				
6h-7h				
7h-8h				
8h-13h				
13h-15h				
15h-17h				
17h-19h				
19h-22h				
H de coucher				