**Research & Study Collection
From project**

———————

Testing a teacher version of the Unicef/Washington Group Child Functioning Module (CFM-TV) in Senegal

———————

**West Africa Program
2019**

Authors

Aude Brus, Research Specialist, Humanity & Inclusion
Marijke Deleu, MEAL Manager for the West Africa regional inclusive education projects, Humanity & Inclusion
Mitchell Loeb, Researcher, UN Washington Group on Disability Statistics (WG)

Photo credit

© Régis Binard/ HI

With support from:

Acknowledgements

Table of contents

1- Introduction

1-1- Context

With an increased focus on inclusive education globally and the development of Education Management Information Systems (EMIS), the Washington Group on Disability Statistics (WG) and UNICEF have been encouraged to develop a modified version of the Child Functioning Module (CFM) suitable for teachers in a classroom setting. It is envisioned that results from a teacher/classroom based assessment could be incorporated into EMIS administrative systems in order to address student capabilities and needs and, over time, monitor their education outcomes.

Humanity & Inclusion (HI) is currently implementing three regional inclusive education projects in the West Africa region, covering eleven countries (Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger, Senegal, Guinea Bissau, Morocco, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Togo, Benin, and Madagascar).[1] The need for a simple tool to identify children with functional limitations in a school context, that is applicable in different countries and contexts of the African continent is becoming increasingly important. HIs interest in this project is thus grown out of the operational project need for comparable definitions, approaches to identification and data.

Currently, the Senegal inclusive education project has a focus on the educational transition from primary to secondary school; the project was in need for a tool to identify children with functional limitations in a secondary school setting.

The presence of the HI regional office and the MEAL Manager for the West-Africa regional inclusive education projects (henceforth referred to as the regional MEAL Manager) in the same location as the Senegal inclusive education project creates an opportunity to carry out small scale operational and action based research in a project context.

During the spring of 2019, Humanity and Inclusion (HI) carried out a test of a reduced version of the UNICEF/WG Child Functioning Module (CFM) that was suitable for use by teachers in a classroom setting.

---

[1] The three regional projects are funded by Norad, AfD and EAC.

1-2- Why this study?

The goal of this research is to contribute to the development and testing of the Child Functioning Module / Teacher Version (CFM-TV). A shortened version of the CFM has been developed but has not yet been used and tested in real conditions.

1-3- Objectives of the study

General objectives

The objective is to assess the feasibility and reliability of the CFM-TV.

Specific objectives

The objective of the study was to assess the feasibility and reliability of the CFM-TV. And specifically, to:

- Assess the reliability of the CFM-TV; i.e. interrater reliability, a comparison of results from the same children screened by two different teachers.
- Assess the feasibility/practicability of the CFM-TV in real school/classroom situations.

This report concerns:

- An analysis of the data collected by selected teachers in selected schools/classrooms in Dakar Senegal using the CFM-TV, and
- A review of a follow-up qualitative survey based on focus groups/debriefing session with teachers who have used the CFM-TV in their classroom.

2- Methodology

2-1- Location

This study was carried out within the scope of the Senegal inclusive education project. Three of the current 4 secondary partner schools were selected for testing. The fourth school, located in Ziguinchor - the Casamance region in the South of the country - was excluded because of distance. The three selected secondary schools are located in the peri-urban area of Dakar, namely the municipalities of Guédiawaye, Rufisque and Parcelles Aissainies. All schools were assigned as project partners by the Senegalese Ministry of Education.

2-2- Study design

This study is based on a mixed method approach, comprising of a qualitative and quantitative component. The quantitative component allows for the basic assessment of the filling of the questionnaires and analysis of the results. In addition, 4 out of 7 selected classes were assessed by at least two different teachers (see below Table 1), allowing for an inter rater reliability assessment of the CFM-TV.

Table 1- Classes assessed

Municipality of Dakar	Year of secondary school	Senegalese / French system denomination	Number of teacher that assessed the class
Guédiawaye	1st year	6ieme	2 teachers
	4th year	3ieme	1 teacher
Rufisque	1st year	6ieme	1 teacher
	2nd year	5ieme	2 teachers
Parcelles Aissainies	3nd year	4ieme	2 teachers
	3nd year	4ieme	2 teachers
	4th year	3ieme	1 teacher

The qualitative component allows for the assessment of the feasibility of the CFM/ TV. Focus group discussions (FGDs) with teachers who have used the CFM-TV in their classroom were implemented. Questions covered topics such as how teachers feel about including CFM/ TV into their current standard duties, understanding, and challenges and benefits of the questionnaire.

2-3- Target population & sampling procedures

In total 10 teachers participated in the research. As previously mentioned, partner schools were assigned to the HI project by the Senegalese Ministry of Education; school principals of these schools randomly selected teachers from 3ieme, 4ieme, 5ieme and 6ieme (corresponding with the 4 first years of secondary school) to participate in the project training.

The research made use of the training to add on a one-day training on the Washington Group, its tools, the CFM-TV and the research. Present teachers were asked to volunteer for the project as to guarantee their commitment since no compensation was given for their participation. The only criterion was to assure that at least 4 classes were instructed by 2 participating teachers in order to be able to compare questionnaire results.

Through the random choice of classes and teachers, a random sample of 443 unique students to be assessed was obtained (688 questionnaires were filled out). These students are thus from 4 levels of classes (6th, 5th, 4th and 3rd). In total, 7 classes were randomly selected in the 3 selected schools (2 x 3ieme, 2 x 4ieme, 1 x 5ieme and 2 x 6ieme – see above table 1); at least 2 classrooms per school in the three partner schools.

2-4- Data collection

16 teachers from 3 secondary schools in peri-urban Dakar were trained to use the CFM/ TV during two day training in Dakar (7th and 8th of May 2019). The first day was a general introduction to disability, the different types and models of disability, and discrimination. The training day was facilitated by the HI Senegal project. The second day was entirely dedicated to the WG approach, its tools, the research and the CFM-TV. The training day was facilitated by the HI regional MEAL Manager. The objectives of the training were to ensure a good understanding and acceptance of the CFM/ TV and an active participation in the CFM-TV and the research process. At the training, 10 teachers volunteered to participate in the research process.

Teachers collected data using the CFM/ TV between the 13th of May and the 27th of May. All the data collection was supervised by a focal point from the HI Senegal team who was in

regular contact with the teachers during the data collection and met the teachers for a debrief and to collect the data when data collection was completed. The process was supported by the regional MEAL Manager, supported by the research specialist at the headquarter level, and assisted by the HI Senegal inclusive education project manager in the field.

Two focus group discussions, facilitated by HI, were then organized with 8 teachers; 4 teachers per FGD. The first FGD was held on the 28th of May in a school in Parcelles Aissanies, and comprised of teachers from Parcelles Aissainies and Guédiawaye; the 2nd FGD was held at a school in Rufisque on the 3rd of June; teachers from Rufisque and Guédiawaye participated. In both schools, an effort was made to select a neutral and quite space where the discussion could be held without being frequently interrupted.

2-5- Data processing & analysis

The 688 questionnaires were individually entered in an Excel database by two data entry clerks. Care was taken to anonymize research subjects (students) as well as the 10 teachers (who filled in the questionnaires) by attributing unique codes to each person, as well as the filled in questionnaire. The HI regional MEAL manager supervised data entry and did spot checks to assure quality of data entry.

Data were transferred from Excel spreadsheets to SPSS [a statistical software package] for further manipulation, refinement and analysis. Descriptive analyses (frequency distributions and cross-tabulations, with associated significance testing) were conducted.

After verbal informed consent was obtained for the recording of the discussion, the FGDs were recorded using a SONY handheld voice recorder. They were then transcribed by two data entry clerks in French. The transcription was supervised by the HI regional MEAL manager who carried out spot checks to assure quality of the transcription. The two transcriptions were translated to English using an on-line translator (DeepL).[2]

---

[2] www.deepl.com

2-6- Ethics

The study protocol will respect HI ethics research recommendations[3] – especially:

- Subjects' free and informed consent: all participants will be informed of the study' scope & objectives and findings use,
- A person and community-centered approach: data collection will fit with the cultural context and will be adapted to the needs of the teachers if any,
- Referral mechanisms: as the study is included as an activity of the HI project, if any issue is identified during the testing, possible action/ referral of the children,
- Security of personal and/or sensitive data at all stages of the study: no name collected, transfer of collated data only,
- No authorization from national ethics committee required but schools' clearance will be obtained.

2-7- Limit and bias

It was initially planned to also assess intra rater reliability of the CFM/ TV by screening the same students twice within a short period of time (to ensure the disability status of the child did not change): first in May – after the HI training - and second time in June – before the summer holidays. However, the timeline for the data collection was too optimistic; as of June, classes were no longer in their normal rhythm with teachers and students preparing the exams and the end of the school at the end of June.

The CFM-TV research was carried out in a secondary school setting (an explicit request from the HI Senegal team). Teachers in secondary school are not assigned to a class but to a teaching subject, each class thus has a number of different teachers. The time any given teacher spends with the class depends on the subject taught.

The sample size, 443 students, is neither large nor representative of larger populations of students in Dakar. For these reasons, care should be taken in drawing conclusions beyond the actual sampled population.

---

[3] Brus A (2016). Studies and research at Handicap International: Promoting ethical data management. Guidance Note Collection

3- Findings

3-1- Quantitative component: Inter rater reliability

Ten teachers assessed 443 students. 245 students were assessed twice by different teachers. The database contains 688 student assessments. 4 out of 7 selected classes were assessed by at least two different teachers (see above table 1): 2 classes 4ieme, one 5ieme, and one 6ieme. 3 out of 7 classes were assessed by only one teacher: 2 classes 3ieme and one class 6ieme. As an example, in Table 2 below, 63 of the students were assessed by Teacher #1 and Teacher #2, 33 students were assessed by Teacher #1 and Teacher #7, and Teacher #1 also assessed 28 unpaired students [a total of 124 assessments for Teacher #1].

Table 2- Breakdown of Students Assessed by Teacher ID

TEACHER_ID	Pairs		Total
	No	Yes	
1.00	0	63	63
2.00	0	63	63
1.00	28	33	61
7.00	0	33	33
3.00	0	73	73
4.00	1	73	74
5.00	1	76	77
6.00	0	76	76
8.00	47	0	47
9.00	80	0	80
10.00	41	0	41
Total	198	490	688

Sample description

The age range of students [n=443] was 11-21 years [mean age = 14.8 years, 34 missing]. Female students represented 59.2% of those assessed and males 40.8% [4 missing]. Similar gender differences were observed among students with and without disability. The mean age of female students was 14.7 years, compared to 15.1 years for males [no significant difference]. The mean age of students with disability was slightly, but not significantly, higher than the mean age of students without disability [15.9 and 14.8 years respectively.]

Disability was determined using the guidelines for the Child Functioning Module [CFM] prepared by the Washington Group on Disability Statistics (WG) and UNICEF. Any student who was assessed as having a *lot of difficulty* or *cannot do at all* on any of the questions CF1 to CF 11, or was assessed to have feeling of anxiety or depression *daily* was determined as having disability. Based on this determination, disability prevalence [for 443 unique students] was 5.7% [2 cases missing]. Prevalence rates by gender were not significantly different.

Single assessments by teacher

In reviewing all assessments [n=688], generally, teachers were able to assess students on the individual domains of functioning included [CF1 to CF13]. [Note: CF3 is a screener question for CF4 and will not be considered in the analysis.]

Only for questions CF9 to CF13 were missing values reported for 2.0 - 2.3% of students [14-16 students]. These five domains cover: difficulty accepting changes to routine, difficulty controlling behavior, difficulty making friends and aspects of anxiety and depression.

Comparing Teacher Domain Assessments

When assessing functional difficulty, especially when the 'assessor' is a proxy [in this case teacher], there are a few considerations worthy of attention. Difficulty is measured on a four-point scale: *no difficulty, some difficulty, a lot of difficulty* and *cannot do at all*. The most straightforward or indisputable assessments might be considered as the anchors to this scale: *no difficulty* and *cannot do at all*. An assessment of a *lot of difficulty* may also be considered as relatively straightforward. *Some difficulty* however is much more open to interpretation and represents a gray area that may also be more often, and more significantly, influenced by circumstances beyond the actual functional ability of the student; i.e. personal or other environmental issues. For these reasons, only those with a *lot of difficulty* or *cannot do at all* [or *daily* in the case of anxiety and depression] were considered as having disability.

When comparing Teacher assessments for agreement/disagreement, we will highlight only those instances where there was disagreement to a degree that would alter the

determination of 'disability'. That is, where disagreement was between teachers who classified a student as having a *lot of difficulty* or *cannot do at all* on the one hand and *none* or *some difficulty* on the other.

For **Teacher pairs #1 and #2** [Appendix 4], disagreement was observed only for CF8 [difficulty concentrating on an activity] and CF11 [difficulty making friends]. Teacher #1 assessed the student as having a lot of difficulty where Teacher #2's assessment was *no difficulty*. As a result, two students were classified as *with disability* by Teacher #1, where the assessment of Teacher #2 was *without disability*. ASIDE: Teacher #1 was also more likely to code a student as having *some difficulty* [CF8] and a *few times a year* [CF12/CF13].

Comparing **Teacher #3 with Teacher #4** [Appendix 5], disagreement was noted at CF5 [difficulty being understood], CF6 [difficulty learning things], and CF10 [difficulty controlling behavior]. In each case, Teacher #3 assessed the student as having a *lot of difficulty*, where Teacher #4 did not. The results was 3 students assessed as *with disability* by Teacher #3 and none by Teacher #4.

Comparing **Teacher #5 with Teacher #6** [Appendix 6], disagreement was noted with one student at CF1 [difficulty seeing], and another student at [CF12/CF13 [anxiety/depression]. In both cases, Teacher #6 assessed the student as having *with disability* and Teacher #5 did not. In these cases the disagreement was at the ends of the spectrum; Teacher #6 assessing *cannot see at all* Teacher #5 *no difficulty*, and Teacher #6 assessing *daily* anxiety/depression and Teacher #5 *none*.

Comparing **Teacher #1 with Teacher #7** [Appendix 7], disagreement was noted with five students at CF9 [difficulty accepting changes to routine]. In all cases, Teacher #7 assessed the student as having a *lot of disability* and Teacher #1 assess the same student as having either *no difficulty* [3 cases] or missing [2 cases]. This resulted in five students identified as with disability by Teacher #7 and none by Teacher #1. ASIDE: Teacher #1 was more likely to assess a student as having *some difficulty* on CF5, CF6, CF7, and CF10 and as having anxiety depression a *few times a year*. Teacher #1 on the other hand was more likely to assess a student as having *some difficulty* on CF8.

Comparing Teacher Disability Assessments

Sample size is small, and it is difficult to generalize or reach any conclusions based on these data. Some variations in data reporting were observed but conclusions cannot be drawn based on any observed patterns. One or two teachers were more likely to report some missing data – but the reasons for these 'omissions' are not held within the assembled data. Similarly, some teachers were more likely than others to report *some difficulty* over *no difficulty*. This may be a subjective response, based on the familiarity of the teacher and student and based on the number of hours that a particular teacher spends with a class or a student over several classes.

When assessing disability prevalence by Teacher [Table 3 below] a few results are worthy of note.

Table 3- Breakdown of Disability Prevalence by Teacher ID [Noted in Pairs]

| TEACHER_ID | Disability | | Prevalence | Total |
	No	Yes	%	
1.00	61	2	3.2	63
2.00	63	0	0.0	63
1.00	33	0	0.0	33
7.00	28	5	15.2*	33
1.00 (unpaired)	27	0	0.0	27
3.00	70	3	4.1	73
4.00	74	0	0.0	74
5.00	76	1	1.3	77
6.00	71	3	4.1	74
8.00 (unpaired)	28	19	40.4†	47
9.00 (unpaired)	76	3	3.8	79
10.00 (unpaired)	41	0	0.0	41
Total	648	36	5.3	684

*As reported in the previous section, Teacher #7 reported 5 of 33 students with a *lot of difficulty* where Teacher #1 did not. The result was 15.2% disability prevalence. While this is an outlier, recall that numbers are generally small in this test – and therefore not conclusive.

†Perhaps more striking is the 40.4% prevalence rate reported by Teacher #8. A breakdown of domain results for Teacher #8 is presented in **Appendix 8**. This teacher was more likely than other teachers to score a student with a *lot of difficulty*:

- CF9 [difficulty accepting changes in routine] 15 students (31.9)
- CF5 [difficulty being understood by you] / CF10 [difficulty controlling behavior] / CF11 [difficulty making friends] each with 8 students (17.0%);
- CF6 [difficulty learning things] / CF7 [difficulty remembering things] each with 7 students (14.9%).

3-2- Qualitative component: Focus Group Discussions

Two Focus group discussions were conducted with a total of 8 teachers (4 per FGD).

About the use of the CFM-TV

The teachers claimed that they used generally one – two minutes to complete the questionnaire for most students [those they were more familiar with], though a few students required a little more time.

Certain questions were thought to be more difficult to answer than others. Questions on basic functional domains like seeing, hearing walking and speaking (CF1 to CF5) were deemed simplest to address, while those that focused on more complex activities like learning, remembering, concentrating accepting change to routine, behavior, anxiety and depression (CF6 to CF13) were considered more difficult. The reasons for this varied somewhat but generally teachers referred to the limited time they had with individual students in terms of number of classes with students and hours taught, and the subsequent challenge in identifying these more complex functional domains among students with whom they, as teachers, were not that well acquainted.

Familiarity with students was a theme that appeared often – as in the time used to complete a questionnaire or in difficulty answering certain questions (above). To overcome a situation of an unfamiliar student, some teachers developed a 'technique' to connect a student's name on the questionnaire with physical identity. These teachers asked the students to fill in their name on the questionnaire and then present them a couple at a time so that the teacher could complete the questionnaire while referring to the physical student.

At least one of the teachers had problems with the understanding of the conceptualization of 'functionality' and thus the whole of the questionnaire, even though the training had included ample exercises in this regard; one example that showed this was a question that was asked: 'he was sad because that day he received a bad grade'. In general, 'Concentration' and some other categories were too often interpreted as a pedagogical assessment of the child instead of his general functionality show a lack of true understanding of the concept by the teacher.

Added-value and unexpected effect of the use of the CFM/ TV

Overall, teachers found the exercise interesting and said it allowed them to evaluate their students in a different way (see them in a different light). Teachers said they had never assessed their students in a way that was different from the formal assessment relating to the study subject. They mentioned that "there were students I had never really seen (in the sense of observed) until I was asked to fill in this questionnaire".

In each school, there was at least 1 student who was "newly identified" using the questionnaire (one of which was a depressed student who had lost both parents). Although teachers had been aware of the student's situation, the conversation showed that this had never been formally discussed or acknowledged by the teachers.

About the use of the CFM-TV in secondary schools

There was lively discussion about the appropriate use of the questionnaire in a secondary school environment. Again, 'familiarity' with students came up. Teachers are not very familiar with their students and certain questions (e. g. the question on friendships) were difficult to answer. Teachers raised the issues of whether it might be considered that 'students fill in sections themselves', or whether this is 'an exercise which could be done by a group of teachers, for example in the class council'.

Others difficulties

The research team questions whether if this exercise were not to be carried out in a research context during which teachers are accompanied by a focal point, they would not simply distribute the questionnaire for students to complete themselves. The team noted reluctance on the part of the teacher who finds that his workload is too high (and that s/he should be paid additionally) and the belief that in secondary school it is not his/her role, despite the fact that these same teachers see the positive impact (i.e. allow them to better observe and evaluate their students); a rather paradoxical finding.

Many issues arose regarding the understanding of the consolidation table for the data, it should be simplified and a tabulation table should be given to accompany it.

4- Conclusion

The results of inter rater reliability presented above, focused on points of disagreement between pairs of teachers. That is important to understand whether there are patterns of error that could be addressed and corrected – or whether observed patterns were random. Results indicated that certain teachers had more difficulty than others in completing the questionnaire – and this was based primarily [as corroborated in focus group interviews] on a teacher's familiarity with these students. It should be noted that agreement in student assessments between teachers was far more likely than disagreement.

Many of the issues raised and discussion items from the qualitative interviews as well as some of the quantitative results would indicate that training focused on functioning, disability, the research methodology and the role of the teacher with respect to their student's functioning and eventual participation are vital to the success of such a data collection exercise.

In order to collect relevant and reliable data, it is essential that those who complete the questionnaires have a full understanding of the purpose and intent of the data collection exercise. Part of the challenge in collecting data on disability can be overcome simply by omitting the word 'disability' from the questionnaire and instructions. The purpose is not that teachers determine the disability status of their students – but rather the student's ability to function in selected basic activities. Most of these are very relevant to the education setting and the eventual success of education as a participatory event. Beyond the basic ability to move about and see, hear and speak clearly [all more or less observable and measurable], a student's ability to interact with others and complete more complex tasks such as learning, remembering, concentrating etc. will mark their success within the education system.

Once a teacher has become familiar with their student's learning capabilities, they should be in a position to assess that student's *functional* abilities in these domains. Granted, certain domains may be beyond a teacher's purview, for example, making friends, anxiety or depression; however, depending on the amount of time a teacher spends with a particular class of students, they may be in a unique position to assess these domains also.

This research focused on a very challenging environment (secondary schools) to test this tool for the first time. It would certainly have been easier to start with primary schools. In primary school, a teacher is responsible for a class of pupils on a full-time basis and therefore has a closer relationship with them. At the secondary level, many teachers share their time between several classes, resulting in more distance and less familiarity between teachers and students.

These preliminary findings are therefore promising for roll-out of the CFM-TV to schools but this experience needs to be replicated in all schools levels, at a higher scale and in others schooling and cultural contexts.

All children have the right to an education, and considering that most children spend a considerable amount of time under the guidance of one or more teachers, these teachers are well place to provide an educational overview of a student's ability – and needs – in terms of functioning with the goal of succeeding in school.

If successfully integrated into a school's Education Management Information System (EMIS), these data can provide important information that can be used to assess needs, provide services to meet those needs, track educational achievements and monitor progress over time.

Appendix 1: Focus Group Discussion Guideline

Français	English
Introduction :	**Introduction:**
Bonjour à toutes et tous et bienvenus. Je vous remercie à tous d'avoir répondu présents pour cette rencontre.	Good morning everyone and welcome. Thank you all for being here for this meeting.
Je m'appelle xx et je travaille à Dakar pour HI. Voici XX, un collègue qui va m'aider pour l'organisation de cette rencontre/ prendre des notes...	My name is xx and I work in Dakar for HI. This is XX, a colleague who will help me to organize this meeting/ take notes...
On désirait discuter avec vous car vous avez eu l'opportunité la semaine dernière d'utiliser un questionnaire pour identifier les enfants handicapés dans votre classe et nous aimerions en savoir plus sur cette expérience, comment est-ce que cela s'est passé.	We wanted to talk to you because you had the opportunity last week to use a questionnaire to identify children with disabilities in your classroom and we would like to know more about this experience, how it went.
Mon travail est de guider la conversation en offrant à chacun la possibilité de parler et en veillant à ce que les échanges soient agréables et cordiaux pour tous ceux qui sont dans cette salle. Je pourrais vous interrompre ; je pourrais également vous inviter à synthétiser votre idée parce que mon but est aussi de finir à l'heure: mon objectif est de vous libérer dans 1h30.	My job is to guide the conversation by offering everyone the opportunity to speak and by ensuring that the exchanges are pleasant and enjoyable for all those in this room. I could interrupt you; I could also invite you to synthesize your idea because my goal is also to finish on time, meaning in 1h30.
J'aimerais partager quelques règles de base qui pourront faciliter notre conversation.	I would like to share some basic rules that can make our conversation easier.
Si vous avez un téléphone, merci de l'éteindre ou de le mettre en mode silencieux.	If you have a phone, please turn it off or put it in silent mode.
Si vous avez besoin de sortir pour quelque raison que ce soit, veuillez le faire, mais revenez le plus tôt possible.	If you need to leave for any reason, please do so, but come back as soon as possible.
	If you don't understand a question, feel free to tell us. If you don't want to answer or if you want to leave, let us know. There is no obligation.

Si vous ne comprenez pas une question, n'hésitez pas à nous le dire. Si vous ne voulez pas répondre ou si vous voulez partir, dites-le nous. il n'y a aucune obligation.

Il n'y a pas de bonne ou de mauvaise réponse dans notre conversation d'aujourd'hui. Les gens peuvent avoir des expériences différentes. N'hésitez pas à commenter, partager votre expérience ou vos pensées ou idées, même si elles sont différentes. Le plus important ici est d'avoir une discussion ouverte sur cet outil, ses avantages et ses défauts

Est-ce que vous êtes tous d'accord pour participer ?

Je vous propose d'enregistrer cette conversation: cela nous permettra de sauver tous les éléments importants de cette discussion.

On peut commencer ?

There is no right or wrong answers in our conversation today. People may have different experiences. Feel free to comment, share your experience or thoughts or ideas, even if they are different, the most important thing here is to have an open discussion about this tool, its advantages and disadvantages

Do you all agree to participate?

I propose that you record this conversation: this will allow us to save all the important elements of this discussion.

Can we get started?

1: Confirmation	1: Confirmation
Est-ce que vous avez tous utilisé le questionnaire ?	Did you all use the questionnaire?
2: Expérience	2: Experience
Parfait, est-ce que vous pourriez nous raconter comment cela s'est passé ?	Perfect, could you tell us how it went?
3: Conditions d'utilisation	3: Conditions of use
Est-ce que vous pouvez par exemple nous dire quand est-ce que vous avez rempli le questionnaire ? Quelle technique avez-vous adopté ? Vous avez pensé à la situation enfant par enfant ?	For example, can you tell us when you completed the questionnaire? What technique have you adopted? Have you thought about the situation child by child?

4: Challenges	**4: Challenges**
Comment est-ce que s'est passé le remplissage du formulaire ?	How did the completion of the form go?
Relance : Est-ce que cela était difficile de remplir le tableau ?	Prompting: Was it difficult to complete the table?
Si oui, est-ce que vous pouvez partager des exemples concrets ?	If so, can you share concrete examples?
Exemples :	Examples :
- penser à chaque enfant, - trouver un moment, - manipuler le questionnaire (= remplir la base de données), - comprendre les questions, - transmettre l'information au focal point…	- think about every child, - find a time, - manipulate the questionnaire (= fill in the database), - understand the questions, - give the information to the focal point….
Relance : Est- ce qu'au contraire, vous avez trouvé des choses aidantes ?	Prompting: Did you find anything helpful?
Exemples :	Examples :
- l'appui du FP - la formation, le guide… - le formulaire	- support of the FP - training, guide…. - form in itself
5: Suggestion	**5: Suggestions**
Est-ce que vous avez des suggestions pour améliorer cette expérience pour vos collègues ?	Do you have any suggestions for improving this experience for your colleagues?
Merci à tous !	**Thanks all!**

Appendix 2: Training Agenda (In French)

JOURS	HORAIRES	SESSIONS	QUI?
Mardi 07/05/2019	08h30 - 09h00	Accueil et installation	Equipe projet EIS
	09h00 - 09h10	Mot de bienvenue DEMSG	Représentant DEMSG
	09h10 - 09h30	Mot de bienvenue + Objectifs de la formation + modalités administratives	CdP EIS
	09h30 - 10h00	Mieux se connaitre	CT EI
	10h00 - 10h30	Pause-café	
	10h30 - 11h30	Définition du handicap	CT EI
	11h30 - 13h15	Comprendre les modèles social et médical du handicap	CT EI
	13h15 - 14h00	Pause Déjeuner et prière	
	14h00 - 15h00	Les différentes déficiences	CT EI
	14h30 - 15h45	Discriminations liées au handicap	CT EI
	15h45 - 16h00	Evaluation et clôture de la première journée	CT EI
Mercredi 08/05/2019	09h30 - 10h30	La collecte des données sur les enfants handicapés	CSE Régional
	10h30 - 11h00	Pause-café	
	11h00 - 11h30	Le Groupe de Washington sur les statistiques du handicap	CSE Régional
	11h30 - 13h00	Le module de fonctionnement de l'enfant	CSE Régional
	13h00 - 14h00	Pause Déjeuner et prière	
	14h00 - 14h45	La recherche que nous sommes en train de mettre en œuvre	CSE Régional
	14h45 - 15h30	La version courte du module de fonctionnement de l'enfant à utiliser par les enseignants dans les écoles	CSE Régional
	15h30 - 16h00	Exercices	CSE Régional
	16h00 - 16h30	Clôture de la formation	CDP EIS et CT

Appendix 3: Consolidation table for the data (to be filled out per class) (In French)

Adapted from the recommended questions for EMIS form for children with disabilities (on the presence of children with disability in school) from the *Education Management Information Systems and Children with Disabilities UNICEF booklet*[4] (table 1a page 18). Available in French in *SIGE – Système d'Information de Gestion de l'Éducation et enfants en situation de handicap* (p. 19).[5]

Tableau de consolidation

Nom de l'enseignant :

Date de remplissage :

Contact de l'enseignant :

Classe concernée :

---

[4] https://www.unicef.org/eca/sites/unicef.org.eca/files/IE_Webinar_Booklet_6.pdf
[5] https://www.unicef.org/eca/sites/unicef.org.eca/files/LIVRET%206%20-%20FINAL.pdf

Ecrire dans le tableau suivant le nombre d'enfants (garçons et filles) concernés par des difficultés dans les différents domaines (un enfant peut être compté dans plus d'un domaine, exemple un enfant avec difficulté de vue et difficulté de motricité sera compte deux fois) ? :

Domaines	Vue (CF1)			Ouïe (CF2)			Motricité globale (CF3 et CF4)			Communication (CF5)			Intellectuel (CF6, CF et CF8)			Comportement et socialisation (CF9, CF10 et CF11)			Psychologique (CF12 et CF13)		
	2 – Quelques difficultés	3 – Beaucoup de difficultés	4 – N'y parvient pas du tout	2 – Quelques difficultés	3 – Beaucoup de difficultés	4 – N'y parvient pas du tout	2 – Quelques difficultés	3 – Beaucoup de difficultés	4 – N'y parvient pas du tout	2 – Quelques difficultés	3 – Beaucoup de difficultés	4 – N'y parvient pas du tout	2 – Quelques difficultés	3 – Beaucoup de difficultés	4 – N'y parvient pas du tout	2 – Quelques difficultés	3 – Beaucoup de difficultés	4 – N'y parvient pas du tout	2 – Chaque mois	2 – Chaque semaine	4 – Chaque jour
Garçons																					
Filles																					
TOTAL																					

Ecrire dans le tableau suivant le nombre d'enfants (garçons et filles) concernés par des difficultés dans un seul domaine, dans 2 domaines etc. Le nombre total doit correspondre au nombre total d'enfants avec des difficultés dans la classe. **Les enfants sont concernés s'ils ont un score de 3 ou 4 seulement !**

	1 domaine	2 domaines	3 domaines	4 domaines	5 domaines	6 domaines	Les 7 domaines	TOTAL
Garçons								
Filles								
TOTAL								

Appendix 4: TEACHER_ID #1 versus TEACHER_ID #2

Teacher_ID * CF1 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF1		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	60	3	63
	2.00	63	0	63
Total		123	3	126

Teacher_ID * CF2 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF2		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	62	1	63
	2.00	62	1	63
Total		124	2	126

Teacher_ID * CF4 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF4		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	63	0	63
	2.00	62	1	63
Total		125	1	126

Teacher_ID * CF5 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF5		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	63	0	63
	2.00	62	1	63
Total		125	1	126

Teacher_ID * CF6 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF6		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	62	1	63
	2.00	60	2	62
Total		122	3	125

Teacher_ID * CF7 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF7		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	62	1	63
	2.00	61	2	63
Total		123	3	126

Teacher_ID * CF8 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF8			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	a lot of difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	4	58	1	63
	2.00	62	1	0	63
Total		66	59	1	126

Teacher_ID * CF9 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF9		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	58	5	63
	2.00	63	0	63
Total		121	5	126

Teacher_ID * CF10 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF10		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	62	1	63
	2.00	62	1	63
Total		124	2	126

Teacher_ID * CF11 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF11			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	a lot of difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	58	4	1	63
	2.00	63	0	0	63
Total		121	4	1	126

Teacher_ID * CF12 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF12		
		never	a few times a year	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	49	14	63
	2.00	62	1	63
Total		111	15	126

Teacher_ID * CF13 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF13		
		never	a few times a year	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	49	14	63
	2.00	62	1	63
Total		111	15	126

Teacher_ID * Disability Crosstabulation

Count

		Disability		
		.00	1.00	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	61	2	63
	2.00	63	0	63
Total		124	2	126

Appendix 5: TEACHER_ID #3 versus TEACHER_ID #4

Teacher_ID * CF1 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF1	
		no difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	73	73
	4.00	73	73
Total		146	146

Teacher_ID * CF2 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF2	
		no difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	73	73
	4.00	73	73
Total		146	146

Teacher_ID * CF4 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF4		
		no difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	72	1	73
	4.00	72	1	73
Total		144	2	146

Teacher_ID * CF5 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF5			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	a lot of difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	71	1	1	73
	4.00	72	1	0	73
Total		143	2	1	146

Teacher_ID * CF6 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF6			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	a lot of difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	63	8	2	73
	4.00	68	5	0	73
Total		131	13	2	146

Teacher_ID * CF7 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF7		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	66	7	73
	4.00	68	5	73
Total		134	12	146

Teacher_ID * CF8 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF8		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	72	1	73
	4.00	71	2	73
Total		143	3	146

Teacher_ID * CF9 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF9		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	71	2	73
	4.00	68	5	73
Total		139	7	146

Teacher_ID * CF10 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF10			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	a lot of difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	66	6	1	73
	4.00	72	1	0	73
Total		138	7	1	146

Teacher_ID * CF11 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF11		
		no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	72	1	73
	4.00	73	0	73
Total		145	1	146

Teacher_ID * CF12 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF12			
		never	a few times a year	monthly	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	0	72	1	73
	4.00	10	63	0	73
Total		10	135	1	146

Teacher_ID * CF13 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF13	
		a few times a year	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	73	73
	4.00	73	73
Total		146	146

Teacher_ID * Disability Crosstabulation

Count

		Disability		
		.00	1.00	Total
Teacher_ID	3.00	70	3	73
	4.00	73	0	73
Total		143	3	146

Appendix 6: TEACHER_ID #5 versus TEACHER_ID #6

Teacher_ID * CF1 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF1				Total
		no difficulty	some difficulty	cannot do at all	missing	
Teacher_ID	5.00	75	0	1	0	76
	6.00	71	1	2	2	76
Total		146	1	3	2	152

Teacher_ID * CF2 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF2		Total
		no difficulty	missing	
Teacher_ID	5.00	76	0	76
	6.00	74	2	76
Total		150	2	152

Teacher_ID * CF4 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF4			Total
		no difficulty	some difficulty	missing	
Teacher_ID	5.00	74	2	0	76
	6.00	73	0	3	76
Total		147	2	3	152

Teacher_ID * CF5 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF5		Total
		no difficulty	missing	
Teacher_ID	5.00	76	0	76
	6.00	74	2	76
Total		150	2	152

Teacher_ID * CF6 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF6			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	5.00	76	0	0	76
	6.00	72	1	3	76
Total		148	1	3	152

Teacher_ID * CF7 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF7			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	5.00	76	0	0	76
	6.00	72	1	3	76
Total		148	1	3	152

Teacher_ID * CF8 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF8		
		no difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	5.00	76	0	76
	6.00	73	3	76
Total		149	3	152

Teacher_ID * CF9 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF9			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	5.00	76	0	0	76
	6.00	71	1	4	76
Total		147	1	4	152

Teacher_ID * CF10 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF10			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	5.00	76	0	0	76
	6.00	71	1	4	76
Total		147	1	4	152

Teacher_ID * CF11 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF11			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	5.00	75	1	0	76
	6.00	70	1	5	76
Total		145	2	5	152

Teacher_ID * CF12 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF12					
		never	a few times a year	monthly	daily	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	5.00	74	1	1	0	0	76
	6.00	70	1	0	1	4	76
Total		144	2	1	1	4	152

Teacher_ID * CF13 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF13					
		never	a few times a year	monthly	daily	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	5.00	74	1	1	0	0	76
	6.00	71	0	0	1	4	76
Total		145	1	1	1	4	152

Teacher_ID * Disability Crosstabulation

Count

		Disability		
		.00	1.00	Total
Teacher_ID	5.00	75	1	76
	6.00	71	3	74
Total		146	4	150

Appendix 7: TEACHER_ID #1 versus TEACHER_ID #11

Teacher_ID * CF1 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF1 no difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	33	33
	7.00	33	33
Total		66	66

Teacher_ID * CF2 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF2 no difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	33	33
	7.00	33	33
Total		66	66

Teacher_ID * CF4 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF4 no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	32	1	33
	7.00	33	0	33
Total		65	1	66

Teacher_ID * CF5 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF5 no difficulty	some difficulty	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	32	1	33
	7.00	8	25	33
Total		40	26	66

Teacher_ID * CF6 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF6			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	32	0	1	33
	7.00	3	30	0	33
Total		35	30	1	66

Teacher_ID * CF7 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF7			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	32	0	1	33
	7.00	2	31	0	33
Total		34	31	1	66

Teacher_ID * CF8 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF8			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	0	32	1	33
	7.00	33	0	0	33
Total		33	32	1	66

Teacher_ID * CF9 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF9				
		no difficulty	some difficulty	a lot of difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	27	0	0	6	33
	7.00	24	4	5	0	33
Total		51	4	5	6	66

Teacher_ID * CF10 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF10			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	27	0	6	33
	7.00	13	20	0	33
Total		40	20	6	66

Teacher_ID * CF11 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF11			
		no difficulty	some difficulty	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	27	0	6	33
	7.00	31	2	0	33
Total		58	2	6	66

Teacher_ID * CF12 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF12				
		never	a few times a year	weekly	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	27	0	0	6	33
	7.00	8	24	1	0	33
Total		35	24	1	6	66

Teacher_ID * CF13 Crosstabulation

Count

		CF13			
		never	a few times a year	missing	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	27	0	6	33
	7.00	9	24	0	33
Total		36	24	6	66

Teacher_ID * Disability Crosstabulation

Count

		Disability		
		.00	1.00	Total
Teacher_ID	1.00	33	0	33
	7.00	28	5	33
Total		61	5	66

Appendix 8: TEACHER_ID #8

Frequencies

CF1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no difficulty	47	100.0	100.0	100.0

CF2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no difficulty	44	93.6	93.6	93.6
	some difficulty	3	6.4	6.4	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

CF4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no difficulty	45	95.7	95.7	95.7
	some difficulty	1	2.1	2.1	97.9
	missing	1	2.1	2.1	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

CF5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no difficulty	20	42.6	42.6	42.6
	some difficulty	19	40.4	40.4	83.0
	a lot of difficulty	8	17.0	17.0	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

CF6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no difficulty	16	34.0	34.0	34.0
	some difficulty	24	51.1	51.1	85.1
	a lot of difficulty	7	14.9	14.9	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

CF7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no difficulty	14	29.8	29.8	29.8
	some difficulty	26	55.3	55.3	85.1
	a lot of difficulty	7	14.9	14.9	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

CF8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no difficulty	45	95.7	95.7	95.7
	some difficulty	2	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

CF9

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no difficulty	5	10.6	10.6	10.6
	some difficulty	27	57.4	57.4	68.1
	a lot of difficulty	15	31.9	31.9	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

CF10

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no difficulty	23	48.9	48.9	48.9
	some difficulty	15	31.9	31.9	80.9
	a lot of difficulty	8	17.0	17.0	97.9
	missing	1	2.1	2.1	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

CF11

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	no difficulty	17	36.2	36.2	36.2
	some difficulty	22	46.8	46.8	83.0
	a lot of difficulty	8	17.0	17.0	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

CF12

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	never	1	2.1	2.1	2.1
	a few times a year	23	48.9	48.9	51.1
	monthly	8	17.0	17.0	68.1
	weekly	13	27.7	27.7	95.7
	daily	2	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

CF13

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	never	2	4.3	4.3	4.3
	a few times a year	24	51.1	51.1	55.3
	monthly	13	27.7	27.7	83.0
	weekly	8	17.0	17.0	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Disability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00	28	59.6	59.6	59.6
	1.00	19	40.4	40.4	100.0
	Total	47	100.0	100.0	

Testing a teacher version of the Unicef/Washington Group Child Functioning Module (CFM-TV) in Senegal

The goal of this research was to contribute to the development and testing of the Child Functioning Module / Teacher Version (CFM-TV). A shortened version of the CFM has been developed but has not yet been used and tested in real conditions.

The objective of the study was to assess the feasibility and reliability of the CFM-TV. And specifically, to:
• Assess the reliability of the CFM-TV; i.e. interrater reliability, a comparison of results from the same children screened by two different teachers.
• Assess the feasibility/practicability of the CFM-TV in real school/classroom situations.

So, this report concerns:
• An analysis of the data collected by selected teachers in selected schools/classrooms in Dakar Senegal using the CFM-TV, and
• A review of a follow-up qualitative survey based on focus groups/debriefing session with teachers who have used the CFM-TV in their classroom.