Learning monitoring at low-income schools in COVID-19 context

Abstract

Nowadays, in pandemic context, education has been conditioned to break with the daily school's routine and has engaged to different alternatives to implement changes, especially those related to evaluation. Schools are challenged to follow new guidelines which are issued by the Ministry of Education, such as Priorización Curricular and new learning contexts at home. In this research, it is of a great interest to analyze how to incorporate the process of monitoring and learning assessment in the context of non-face-to-face classes during the pandemic in Chile? This article aim is to analyze the process of monitoring learning in 50 Chilean public schools during covid-19 context. The public schools which have been selected, are part of the Sumo Primero en Terreno program that is implemented by the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) and the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso (PUCV). The methodology is qualitative; interviews were answered by the management teams of these schools. The most relevant conclusions are a wide range of conceptions and monitoring purposes that school leaders have, the systematic nature of the monitoring process, its frequency and the tools to carry it out, the overuse of the multimedia systems and digital gadgets (WhatsApp, telephone, mail and social networks), as well as the difficulties that they face to organize different approaches to guarantee learning to each student.
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1. Introduction

The ECLAC-UNESCO “Education in the Time of COVID-19” report is categorical in noting that the pandemic has strongly impacted the development of the educational process in almost all regions of the world, bringing consequences that will mainly affect those students and families with less socio-economic opportunities (MINEDUC, 2020b; Murillo & Duk, 2020; Rieble & Viteri, 2020; Zhao, 2020). The pandemic caused millions of schools to close their doors during 2020, having to restructure their educational processes, so as to welcome students with remote or hybrid learning activities, using digital devices or printed material to continue the teaching and learning process. The different solutions adopted to address the distance education process have depended on the capacities and resources available to each nation (Álvarez et al., 2020; Bos et al., 2020).

Chile, like many of the world’s countries, was not prepared to provide virtual education, reason for which all the processes deployed have caused great challenges to the education system, especially for the management teams and teachers. Not only did they have to design strategies to organize the virtual school year, but they also had to distribute their leadership to foster the development of new teaching capacities and respond to the student’s emerging school and socio-emotional needs (Harris & Jones, 2020). For their part, teachers had to quickly learn to use various technological platforms and modify their pedagogical and evaluative strategies for their classes.

At the same time, several organizations recommended to support management and teaching in schools, such as: improve access to technologies, develop collaboration, promote socio-emotional well-being, strengthen professional development in teaching, create an enabling environment for learning and establish trust relationships among all actors in the school community (Propuestas Educación Mesa Social Covid-19, 2020b; Reimers & Schleicher, 2020, Propuestas Educación trabajo interuniversitario mesa social 3B COVID 19, 2020).

On the other hand, the Ministry of Education of Chile (MINEDUC) has implemented measures to continue the educational process, among which connectivity is highlighted, as well as access to technological devices of students and the definition of a prioritized curriculum that emphasizes essential objectives that must be achieved by the student at each educational level to respond to the reduction of the face-to-face school year, in addition to adapting the curriculum to the context of each school (MINEDUC, 2020b). Because of the latter, the management teams established new forms of monitoring to demonstrate reliably how students are learning. This article addresses the process of learning monitoring in 50 public schools during the pandemic, with the aim of enriching the discussion and reflection on the subject.

1.1. Learning monitoring during COVID-19

School management teams and teachers have had to overcome several challenges during 2020 and one of the key aspects is monitoring in this new scenario, in which students and teachers have stayed in their homes and conducted educational work. Ulloa and Gajardo (2017) argue that “monitoring is primarily understood as the search for coherence between what is planned and what is actually taught” (p.13), the latter being the most difficult aspect to determine in schools, since a permanent evaluation is required (Nercellas, 2016).

For Guach and Peña (1995) monitoring is:

A continuous process that accompanies and is part of professional praxis where observation, feedback, critical and reflective debate takes place on the teacher’s performance in the classroom and its impact on the learning of students, as well as in the training and
development of professional competencies that contribute to an efficient practice. (p. 4)

Mokate (2003) states that “the purpose of monitoring is to detect timely the strengths and weaknesses of implementation processes in order to make adjustments conducive to optimal management of initiatives” (p. 8). Because of the pandemic, it is clear that these adjustments are necessary to better cope with changes in educational processes given the need to stay at home and continue with the educational process.

The Ministry of Education of Chile in its Framework for Good School Leadership establishes a specific dimension for the monitoring process, noting that management teams must: “Monitor the comprehensive implementation of the curriculum and learning achievements in all the educational fields of students for the improvement of teaching processes and pedagogical management” (MINEDUC, 2015, p. 25). This is very complex in times of pandemic, because many of the students do not have internet access to participate in online classes, which required the management and teaching teams for the development of different ways to reach students with learning activities for a prioritized and flexible curriculum in the schools (MINEDUC, 2016; MINEDUC, 2020a).

However, the return of learning activities by students is low, either because of connectivity problems, because of their geographical location, socio-emotional and economic status, among others, so that the students’ learning cannot be really evidenced.

In this regard, a study conducted by the Ministry of Education and the World Bank in August 2020 found that only 27% of students in vulnerable schools had school coverage (MINEDUC, 2020b). In this reality, the knowledge of demographic data by the schools is relevant to determine which students should be given the most support and in which areas the aid should be targeted, adapting educational processes to the context of the pandemic and impacting on educational improvement (Agencia de la Calidad, 2018a). In this sense, the feedback is relevant, since students must “receive timely and clear feedback to define the aspects achieved, the procedural errors encountered in a task, and the steps to be taken to advance the learning in progress” (Educación, 2020, 2020, p. 7).

These new monitoring strategies should emphasize the diversification of the teaching of all students, which was a challenge for the teachers and management teams who had to integrate the pedagogical use of video calls. These were carried out through various platforms such as Zoom, Google Meet, WhatsApp, Teems, among others, adapting the educational material and incorporating rubrics with new spaces for instructions, feedback and self-evaluation or co-evaluation (Gálvez & Crino, 2020).

1.2. Formative assessment for learning monitoring

One of the key aspects of the new pandemic scenario for learning monitoring is to evaluate students effectively to show what they are learning and give feedback on time. It is in this context that formative evaluation is relevant, which allows in a timely manner and in the educational process to strengthen the students’ learning (Hebles et al., 2017; Castillo & Cabrerizo, 2009; Foster, 2017). Anijovich and Cappelletti (2017) state that the formative evaluation focus on the students to adapt teaching practices. In Chile, the Decree 67 of the Ministry of Education establishes.

On the one hand, to strengthen the integration of formative evaluation into teaching in order to diagnose and monitor in a more constant and systematic way the students’ learning, making pedagogical decisions in a timely manner; and, on the other hand, to enrich the way in which it is summarily evaluated and qualified, to better represent and communicate learning and to contribute to motivat-
ing and supporting the learning of students. (MINEDUC, 2018, p.10).

The fact is that evaluation is called to be an activity necessary to account for the quality of the educational process and the results of teaching and learning ( Förster & Zepeda, 2017). To do this, educational institutions must stop using hetero-evaluations, with a focus on the summation and the qualification, and move toward a participative, formative evaluation, with the presence of self-evaluations for self-regulation of learning from the students (Anijovich, 2017; Educación 2020, 2020; Mottier, 2010). In addition to installing in schools an evaluative culture that involves making a paradigm shift from the importance of qualification and summative evaluations to learning processes and formative evaluations (Popham, 2013). In this regard, Anjovich and Capelletti highlight the pedagogical role of formative evaluation, since “it provides useful information to reorient teaching (if necessary)” (2017, p. 12), and invites the constant feedback and accompaniment of students in the construction of essential learning (MINEDUC, 2020a). “Good feedback accelerates learning because it produces motivation and commitment to learning and encourages learning and improving” (MINEDUC, 2020a, p. 5). For its part, UNESCO (2020), referring to evaluation for learning monitoring, points out that the aspects of confinement, anxiety, socio-economic and educational gaps must be taken into account in order to provide feedback to students during the learning process.

Therefore, the flexibility in a remote education from the curricular and evaluative perspective implies an articulated and integrated work between managers, teachers, students, families, subjects and the digital to strengthen processes of responsibility and self-regulation in students. Thus the evaluation, as part of the monitoring of learning, can be seen as the “process that feeds back all actors involved in education and even the educational system as such” (Escobar, 2014, p. 127).

2. Method

The objective of this research is to describe how Chilean school management teams address the learning tracking process in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, during the 2020 school year. This study is part of a larger project called Sumo Primero that aims to develop competencies for curriculum management in public school management teams, located in the XVI regions of the Chilean territorial organization. The research was conducted with a qualitative methodology (Flick, 2015).

2.1. Design

A descriptive methodological design (Maxwell, 2005) was used to carry out the research with the application of an in-depth group interview (Valles, 1999; Holstein & Gubrium, 1995), with the purpose of knowing how the management teams, composed of Chief of Pedagogical Technical Unit (position of pedagogical leadership that in Chile is carried out both by women and men) and Director of educational institutions in the country, address the monitoring of the learning of students during COVID-19. After applying the interviews and transcribing them, categories were assigned to the responses using ATLAS.ti 9; these categories emerged by grouping related elements that responded to the objectives proposed for this research, starting with an open coding to identify the broader themes. From this, an axial coding was constructed to recognize the most relevant relationships and identify the key and “critical” aspects in response to the questions that guided the research. Two researchers independently analyzed the corpus of data. Once the categories were agreed, they codified the textual corpus to establish reliability.
2.2. Participants

The study population included the 200 Chilean public schools participating in the Sumo Primero program in 2020, of which the non-probabilistic, intentional sample (Latorre et al., 2003) consisted of 50 schools which agreed to participate in the interview, meeting the criteria of insufficient and low average categorization of the school establishment according to the Education Quality Agency (Agencia de la Calidad de la Educación, 2019), geographical representation (schools located in the north, center and south of the country), participation in interview of both key actors of the management team: Director and Head of Pedagogical Technical Unit. Prior to the interview, the participants signed an informed consent. Table 1 characterizes the participating schools where the management teams work.

Table 1. Characterization of the fifty public schools categorized as insufficient or medium-low, in which the management teams of the research work, Chile, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Region of Tarapacá</td>
<td>Iquique</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Región de Valparaíso</td>
<td>Quilpué</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Region of Tarapacá</td>
<td>Iquique</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Región de Valparaíso</td>
<td>Quilpué</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Region of Antofagasta</td>
<td>Antofagasta</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Región de Valparaíso</td>
<td>Valparaíso</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Region of Antofagasta</td>
<td>Antofagasta</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Región de O’Higgins</td>
<td>Rancagua</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Region of Antofagasta</td>
<td>Antofagasta</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Región del Maule</td>
<td>San Clemente</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Region of Antofagasta</td>
<td>Antofagasta</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Región del Maule</td>
<td>Villa Alegre</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Region of Atacama</td>
<td>Chañaral</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Región del Maule</td>
<td>Talca</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Region of Atacama</td>
<td>Freirina</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Región del Ñuble</td>
<td>Chillán</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Region of Atacama</td>
<td>Chañaral</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Región del Ñuble</td>
<td>Pinto</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>La Serena</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Región del Bio Bio</td>
<td>Santa Bárbara</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>La Serena</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Región del Bio Bio</td>
<td>Lebu</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>La Serena</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Región de Aysén</td>
<td>Coyhaique</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>La Higuera</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Región de Aysén</td>
<td>Coyhaique</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Región</th>
<th>Comuna</th>
<th>Categoría</th>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Región</th>
<th>Comuna</th>
<th>Categoría</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>Vicuña</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Región de Aysén</td>
<td>Aysén</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>Ovalle</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Región Metropolitan</td>
<td>Macul</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>Ovalle</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Región Metropolitan</td>
<td>La cisterna</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>Punitaqui</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Región Metropolitan</td>
<td>Lo Prado</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>Illapel</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Región Metropolitan</td>
<td>San José de Maipo</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>Illapel</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Región Metropolitan</td>
<td>El Bosque</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>Salamanca</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Región Metropolitan</td>
<td>Peñaflor</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>Monte Patria</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Región Metropolitan</td>
<td>Peñaflor</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Region of Coquimbo</td>
<td>Coquimbo</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Región Metropolitan</td>
<td>Peñaflor</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Region of Valparaíso</td>
<td>San Esteban</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Región Metropolitan</td>
<td>Peñaflor</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Region of Valparaíso</td>
<td>Quilpué</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Región Metropolitan</td>
<td>La Florida</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Region of Valparaíso</td>
<td>Panquehue</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Región Metropolitan</td>
<td>Talagante</td>
<td>Medium Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.3. Tool

An in-depth interview was applied in virtual mode through the Google Meet platform, which was recorded with the tool system. This interview was conducted in an hour and thirty-minute session, using the active-reflective technique (Valles, 1999; Hostein & Gubrium, 1995). This implies an interaction in which participants, interviewees, and interviewers are assumed to be openly interacting, guided by flexible conversation questions. The questions raised were: How do you understand learning monitoring in the context of a pandemic, how often do you implement learning monitoring at school? And what are the difficulties in implementing pandemic monitoring at school? The creation of the questions was done by the team of researchers according to the research question of the study on how the management teams approach the learning monitoring in a health crisis situation by COVID-19? All interviews were recorded and transcribed in an integrated way for further processing and analysis. For transcription and recording of information, the recommendations of MacLellan et al. (2003) were followed.

The information was processed through a thematic content analysis (Valles, 1999; Bardin,
1986). Both deductive and inductive categories were considered. The first were derived from the revised literature. The inductive categories consider the findings obtained (Mayring, 2000). Due to the volume of information involved in the responses of the 50 interviews, a code book (MacQueen et al., 1998) was created which guided the group’s analysis work, where researchers analyzed the corpus of data independently to later agree on the categories raised and proceed to textual coding. Atlas.ti software was used to perform qualitative data analysis (Friese, 2017).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Monitoring of Management Learning during the Pandemic

Regarding how the school’s UTP principals and heads of schools understand monitoring in the context of a pandemic, they mainly point out that it is a relevant process of information from and about student learning, which is collected in the educational process by introducing feedback and the necessary adjustments to improve programming. In addition, it involves reflection and decision-making as a result of the information found in this monitoring process.

Monitoring is understood and visualized in the different stages of our students’ development and in the different learning levels to be developed online. Monitoring is relevant, and is done through digital resources. Monitoring the learning process and evaluating achievement, from a formative perspective, allows adjustments to be made, updated information to be obtained, and feedback students. (ED897)

Monitoring is very important, since information that will allow analysis and use of evidence can be collected to track the progress of each of the students; it also affects the outcome of the learning, the continuous improvement of teaching processes and allows to observe the progress and deficit to make immediate feedback. The formal evaluation is focused on the accomplishments expected and achieved by students. It must provide evidence that is believed and is useful for the decision-making with learners. It allows teachers to improve practice. (ED1245)

However, other managers view it as a complex process for online classes; also, as bureaucratic with supervision orientation and with the only purpose of establishing compliance of the program.

Monitoring is a continuous, ongoing and systematic process that occurs along with the teaching-learning process by monitoring curriculum compliance. (ED1893)

It is understood as one more barrier within the difficult scenario of the process. On the one hand, it is thought that the registration of evidence is somewhat cumbersome (registration forms) and on the other, the evaluation appears to be one of the major complications of the process, considering that the evaluation must be carried out synchronously (for which there are no resources on the part of the holder). (ED489)

Monitoring and evaluation are complex process within the new guidelines and the process involved in distance education, considering that there is no physical contact and interaction that should occur between teacher and student. (ED10753)

In this regard, we observe two views on the part of the management teams on monitoring learning during pandemic, some understand it from a more quantitative perspective, emphasizing the amount of learning obtained without considering how and for what such learning was achieved, and others, more qualitatively, by emphasizing advances and achievements in a much more descriptive way, considering the characteristics of students, their individual differences and consulting the results in pedagogical decision-making. In addition, controversy is observed, understanding teacher-focused monitoring as the process that accounts for compli-
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and explain their students’ learning outcomes (Volante et al., 2015).

Figure 1 shows the categories generated from the responses of the management teams on understanding the learning monitoring during COVID-19.

Finally, the understanding of feedback, guidance and socio-affective bonds are identified as emerging elements, which are related and key for monitoring to be carried out alongside the participation of the family/guardians, such as that of students, which it is pointed out sometimes as scarce. In this regard, Education 2020 (2020), states that it is necessary to constantly provide feedback to students, giving a clear definition of those to be evaluated and how this process will be carried out, generating conversations and agreements with students, making calls or video calls, promoting self-evaluation or co-evaluation.

3.2. How and how often the management teams implement learning monitoring

Regarding the implementation of monitoring, elements linked to pedagogical resources such as media are evidenced in the management discourse; understanding that distance education set the pedagogical framework. Out of the most used pedagogical resources were the guides, works and/or tasks (66 %) as strategies for evidencing performances that allow to carry out a learning monitoring. Later, there are the subcategories guidelines (13%) as a resource to systematize what students have done, and these indicate dichotomously the presence or absence of an action at a higher level of depth that would allow to account for a descriptor or level of performance of a given task. Direct observation in synchronous classes (9 %) is followed, which varies since the adaptations of both teaching and students to understand this new system as a learning environment indicates in greater or lesser average their adaptation to implement monitoring. In addition to having connectivity and technological resources irregularly. Finally, the sub-category questions (6%) and forms (6%)
focuses on pedagogical resources that are used at some point in the synchronous or asynchronous classroom to know the understanding level of any learning objective and/or the existence of concerns, doubts, among other information relevant to learning achievement (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. Strategies of how 50 Chilean public schools implement learning monitoring, 2020

Based on MIDE UCE results, 2020.

The most common and used media by the management teams in the implementation of monitoring is WhatsApp app (32%) given its versatility as a communication vehicle, because it allows to send and write messages, audios, images, videos and/or video calls. Followed by phone call (25%), virtual platforms and/or social networks (18%), video calls (14%) and email (11%). It is noted that most of the media mentioned are virtual and therefore require an internet connection depending on the telecommunications company that provides data to use certain applications and social networks.

The latter agrees with what is proposed by MIDE UC, i.e., to feedback and monitor learning by all available means: calls, short videos, text messages, WhatsApp, written comments, especially with the students who most require help, feed them directly through calls so that they have the certainty that they have understood the instructions and can clarify their doubts immediately (MIDE UC, 2020).

In relation to the frequency of the learning monitoring in schools, most (28%) would be done daily and (28%) biweekly, weekly (16%) and to a lesser extent monthly (4%). It is striking that the managers of some schools were unable to clearly specify the frequency (24%), pointing out that it depends on each teacher, showing that there would be no institutional definition about the times at which such a process should be carried out.

We need to specify an institutional guideline on how and when to monitor the learning of students in the difficult scenario of online classes due to Covid. (ED8348)

It should not be forgotten that the monitoring process allows “to lay the foundation for pedagogical decision-making regarding teaching and learning processes” (MINEDUC, 2016, p. 3).
3.3. Difficulties in implementing monitoring during pandemic

67% of the management teams report that the main difficulty in implementing monitoring in the context of a pandemic is the diverse educational conditions of the pandemic itself, due to the different synchronous and asynchronous modalities that have been implemented the classes, the geographical location of the schools, the emotional and uncertain environment of children and their families, which is another difficulty (33%) arising from the use of digital and virtual resources that allow to maintain synchronous or asynchronous communication with the students.

This health crisis is presented as a difficult process that allows us to observe the participation and fellowship of students who live a difficult period, which is more relevant than the curriculum implemented. (ED114)

Because of the pandemic, it has been difficult to have a better performance of this type of assessment. (ED4356)

The means by which remote work is done have not helped. (ED306)

The difficulty of systematically monitoring learning during pandemic has been to have digital resources and inputs to address the emotional state of students, which is the result of the pandemic itself. (ED2119)

We do not have the digital tools to enable us to perform these processes because of the connectivity problems of students and their families. Some teachers have been able to monitor and apply some training evaluations, but not in all cases, not all subject teachers, as remote work is led by head teachers. (ED11704)

In addition to the findings presented, Murillo and Duck (2020) raise that the difficulties for the educational process during pandemic, beyond the connectivity problems, are the management of the digital world. In a high percentage, schools in Latin America do not have the conditions and skills to take on the challenge of online education.

On the other hand, it is essential, in these crisis contexts involving distance education, to incorporate other evaluative agents such as students and families, through strengthening and raising awareness of self-assessment and link with families who observe student performance at home. In this regard, Aguilar-Gordón (2020), points out that one of the challenges for the fulfillment of the role of the family in the learning process:

Is permanent communication to foster participation, collaboration, problem solving, balanced use of social networks and other technological inputs, the issuance of ideas, feelings and thoughts according to the needs and interests of children and young people. (p. 222)

Finally, the difficulties in being able to monitor what students have actually learned in a pandemic context, which involved a synchronous and asynchronous, non-face teaching and learning process, require rethinking and deepening on more qualitative evaluative practices, where students must have more autonomy through instruments that invite reflection and self-regulation of their learning as self-evaluations and rubrics. Thus, the assessment is not exclusively focused on teachers, but also on students who engage in the process and establish assessments about their own performance (Moreno, 2021).

4. Conclusions

The learning monitoring is a basic and necessary condition in every educational context, being instituted as an unavoidable pedagogical principle that must have its didactic and practical application in every teaching-learning situation. In the current pandemic conditions suffered since 2020, which has led to the dispersion of didactic-pedagogical contexts, with closed classrooms and an assisted use of
alternative methodologies, especially those that could be implemented by virtual systems, with unequal effects by social condition, availability of resources, socio-economic conditions of families, geographical dissemination and distance from schools, has turned the application of ordinary interaction systems in a very complex situation, both for the educational management, and for the schools. Therefore, alternatives for educational interaction can be sought from the analyzed process of learning monitoring, which requires a wide variety of initiatives because of their diversity, according to the specific needs of each student, and the personal circumstances of each student.

However, when it comes to conceptualizing this process on the part of managers, there is a great diversity of conceptions, almost all of them associated with the aspects of supervision, information, animation and/or accountability, being only that the fifth part focuses such action on learning as a mechanism for guiding it.

However, exception is given to the use of ad hoc tools to carry out such a task, showing that in two thirds of cases guides, work or tasks are used as elements that make it easier to track what has been done. However, the frequency with which such follow-up is done is aimless, with frequencies not defined and in which only a quarter refer to it daily or weekly and, in some cases, monthly; therefore, most do not report precisely what temporary systematicity is established for such a task, considering that it is not foreseen or is not known.

The mechanisms to implement it are based on a communication process where the most common media are used, such as WhatsApp, telephone, social networks and e-mail, so they can be considered as means that guarantee the bidirectionality of information, considering that there are cases where such systems are not available, such as remote rural areas or families with limited resources to access to networks.

In short, besides the restrictive and limiting conditions generated by the pandemic, others derived from the infrastructures of the school system are added, such as the teacher’s own training, the system of management or organization of the curriculum and the diversity of situations to which the curriculum has to be adapted, either because of the students or the diversity of socio-economic and geographical situations of the students and their families, but also because of the institutional dynamics of the schools in which teachers and managers are involved.

5. Limitation and Prospective

The main limitations of the study relate to the number of schools analyzed. In total, 50 schools were analyzed which resulted in a dimensioned sample of the total number of schools participating in the Sumo Primero program. On the other hand, the virtual modality of conducting the interviews, due to the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, limited a greater deepening and approach in the answers to the questions about learning monitoring. From a prospective perspective, the article presents relevant findings on the learning monitoring in public schools located in different regions of the country, which would be interesting to contrast with other schools, with face-to-face procedures for gathering information.
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