

## The teachers' call for active opposition to a competence- based approach in schools – from elementary schools to university

### **Presentation :**

The “competence” is now entering schools – and universities. A large number of teachers are, as is known, hostile to neo-liberalism and its irruption into schooling. How does it make sense that no strong front is opposing the competence? When the word “competence” is used in front of them – or, when they are told to use it, what do the teachers who are hostile to neo-liberalism say or do?

This call is made with the goal to enable an oppositional rhetoric in all schools (from elementary schools to universities). This oppositional rhetoric is to be capable of drawing a clear enough line around this “concept”; because the implications of the competence entering schools are definitely non-neglectable. The competence itself is seen as a resource and works through the exploitation – or mobilisation – of resources. Through it, the student and the future salaryman alike become resources; and the world itself (if it only is useful to acquire or have someone acquire competences) becomes a resource.

We, co-signatories, elementary school, primary school, secondary education (middle school and high school) and higher education teachers (universities and grandes écoles), jointly state our firm and solemn opposition to the “competence approach”’s arrival in our classes and lecture halls: we recuse this approach as a violent gesture towards the education we need to provide; we recuse it as it noxiously changes the relation needed, in this education, between us, our students, and the world we inhabit.

The competence is a notion coined in the management of man by man, with destructive effects in all parts of society. In the last twenty-five years, education sciences have contributed to acclimating this notion into the pedagogical field: by pretending to bypass polemics, they claim to have built a concept of “pedagogical” competence unrelated to its management origins. In doing so, education sciences have dulled our vigilance; above all, they organised immense confusion (using that same word). However, which reading imposes itself? In Parcoursup <sup>1</sup>? In the assessments that await our students throughout their schooling, or even throughout their life? Is it so clearly the pedagogues’ reading? Is it not (also) (more so) the human resources’ manager’s reading? Even when acclimated to the educational field only and claiming to be cut-off from its management roots (through the advice and efforts of possibly sincere pedagogues), the notion of “competence” cannot be disconnected from the neo-liberal blueprint with which it is linked: the individual at the centre; and the logic of self-improvement (improving one’s self as a resource)...

The competence is a concept (it is not just a word). One cannot relay it innocently.

Therefore, the problem with the competence is not only that it can be of use to neoliberal management (and that the competences in official educational texts are in fact meant to become, almost without a glitch, the competences required in a neo-liberal employment market); the problem with the competence is the competence itself. This notion, in fact, encompasses a reversal and a subversion or a destitution of teaching.

To say it in a few words: by teaching with competences, we cease to deliver (designate) a world to our students (a world given each time through the means of the discipline or disciplines we are teaching); in place of it, we have the

1. the platform through which students apply for higher education programs.

mission of arming a small and self-centred individual with “capacities” (abilities, skills <sup>2</sup>) to defend themselves in a “life” (possibly hostile, complex, competitive and anxiety-inducing). However, this is not delivering a world; it is only the reproduction of life (enable the petty self’s survival in a more and more hostile environment). Teaching with competences necessarily implies that one encounters the world only in a second phase; the world, the objects of the world (the poem, the theorem, the small animal), now only come into the classroom as materials to be used in the acquisition and honing of the competences of the petty selves. The objects taught do not come into the classroom for their self and because they deserve to be seen, shown, taught, welcomed... but to be put to use in the accumulation of my skills, of my resources. The competence approach has the world’s oblivion as its background. Teaching’s goal is completely different. And it is dual; because teaching does not aim to arm the individual with what could possibly lack in them (to live or survive) within an environment and in a world; teaching’s goal is to give the world to the student; and to continue the existence of this world (it is fragile) (it disappears if it is not transmitted). The competence pedagogy negates the intentionality of teaching. In this aspect, it stands opposite to any and all teaching.

But, with the competence approach, a second and consequential problem arises. As soon as one stops conceiving teaching from the discipline, but thinks of teaching and its end from an institutionalised set of external and cross-disciplinary competences, the question ensues of the instance, the institution provided with the overwhelming power to decide the competences needing to be acquired by the student population. It can now be assessed that the standards of the different schooling systems in European countries are reiterations of recommendations given by the OECD or the Council of Europe; and similar standards, slightly different or locally adapted, apply throughout the world. In other words, it is the political power (the respective governments of different countries) that has hold of the standards; and that can modify them (and modify them following the whims of its current worries: emergence of health competences, citizen, informational, emotional, psycho-social, etc., competences depending on the crisis to be controlled). Is it necessary to say why such a system represents a danger?

On the contrary, when one teaches with a disciplinary focus (i.e., in the framework given by school subjects), what is taught is “guaranteed” and

2. in English in the text.

“discussed” (sometimes heatedly) by the experts of a given discipline; whether one agrees with the national program finally agreed upon (and there are a thousand reasons to disagree), the decision is taken within a discipline, with its own history, its institutions, its habits, its inertia, its defaults, its grandeurs. And in each discipline, the teacher is free to articulate within their teaching the many contradicting movements coexisting here (because each discipline is alive; mathematics and philosophy, though very ancient, are alive; sociology and economics, though very young, are alive too). Each discipline is shaped by hardship and contradiction. And each discipline, in addition, comes to clash with its neighbours, and dialogs, and discusses with them (interdisciplinarity). (And new knowledge is born from these dialogs, interferences, couplings, – even, sometimes, a new discipline...) In opposition to this, the logic of the competence means to say (from up high) (from above the disciplines) what the disciplines must do, and what their purpose is. The competence approach is not interdisciplinary (as it pretends to be), but extra-disciplinary. It is an abduction of teaching (of the disciplines) by the managerial political power. This fact constitutes an important political danger.

\*

That the Ministère de l'éducation nationale et de l'Enseignement supérieur has decided to treat its employees (us) with the means and methods of human resourcing (Direction of employees replaced by the Direction of Human Resources; and this is not only a name change, as we are starting to feel daily...), can never entail that the teachers should be forced – for one second – to treat and think of their students within the same frames.

For this reason, we, teachers, signatories of this call, solemnly pledge to:

**1° stop washing out the words from this pedagogy by banishing them from our vocabulary: the word “competence” and the word “resource” meant this way.**

If, for whatever reason, we are still forced (through legal means linked to our status as government workers, temporary workers, contractual workers, etc.) to use these words, then we will do so only by putting them at a distance, through the use of inverted commas for example, or by following them with the disclaimer, in speech or in writing: “...as the rectorates’ pedagogues say”;

or “as they say in human resources”; or whatever disclaimer will inspire us in the moment.

**2° oppose, wherever it is possible and through all the means at our disposal, the progression of the competence approach – and symbolically, never to miss an opportunity to say (in front of the students, in front of the students’ parents, in front of our hierarchy, in front of our colleagues, in front of the elected bodies, in front of our unions, etc.), explaining its reasons, our hostility to the concept of “competence”.**

(And this while claiming for us, if necessary, this common call, titled in the most general manner possible “The teachers’ call for active opposition to a competence-based approach in schools”, so that the local oppositions do not seem isolated, but rather, can come together in a general movement of rejection spreading in the whole country, and in all levels of schooling.)

School teaches, as it always did, knowledges and know-hows. The word “competence” is useless. We will work better without it. (In no way do we mean that schooling should stay as it is; it can and it must change; but the path of the “competence”, happily framing itself as an emancipating change for the students, is in reality the path towards an education of biopolitical and neo-liberal control.)

(And this is not to say either that it would not be necessary and possible to create, as our colleagues in elementary and primary schools do daily, through the means of alternative pedagogies, for example, better ways to help our students, and put forward, when it is absolutely necessary to assess them, more adequate and inclusive ways to do it than the numbered grade. But such efforts do not at all imply the necessity of turning to the “competence”, as education sciences would have us believe for the past 20 years; they do not even imply using this word, which is not ours. In this case, let us use the word “know-how”; and let us approach this problem like a pedagogical problem, i.e., like a problem in relation to teaching – and teaching only.)

\*

The future belongs not to the competence but to teaching. We will showcase resistance, but also patience. We know that the pedagogy of competence will be gone as the new gadget of education sciences (after the situation families, the objective pedagogy, etc.), but also and mainly as a neoliberal means to ap-

prehend personhood (and so, as a society-destructive instance) when we, in the schools, the middle schools, the high schools, the universities, will continue teaching the Pythagoras theorem, the sexual reproduction of plants, 1859, Pantagruel, Toussaint-Louverture, the rules of verb conjugation, the present perfect, Hegel, the arpeggio, 1792, the curve of the universe, Rimbaud, the joy of long jumping, or of hopping over hurdles.

Because all learning, all teaching is joyous. (And the Competence is an institution of sadness and of the “expected”.)

In Rennes,  
January 2024

PS. We, signatories, express our solidarity to all our colleagues who have been committed to this cause for years now, and who directly, or indirectly (but more and more harshly) are subjected to the backlash from the academy and the rector’s representatives. (Strikingly brutal actions from some rectorates and DESDEN, directed at some colleagues, have been witnessed).

N. B.

– All teachers, whether still active or retired, can sign this call.

– Signing this call can be done in two ways:

1° either through the means of the numeric platform “change.org”: <https://www.change.org/contre-l-entree-de-l-approche-par-compétences-dans-les-écoles-appel>. In this case, the signatory remains anonymous.

2° or by communicating one’s name and institution (for example: one’s teaching place, union, non-profit, etc.) to this address: [comite.action.competence.rennes@gmail.com](mailto:comite.action.competence.rennes@gmail.com). In this case, your name is shared in the list of signatories.

– The call’s text in pdf format, for printing and sharing, can be downloaded at this address: <https://www.pontcerq.fr/appel-des-enseignantes-et-des-enseignants-a-lutter-contre-lentree-de-l-approche-par-compétences-dans-les-écoles-de-la-maternelle-a-luniversite-appel-de-villejean/>.



**List of the first signatories (15 April 2024) :** Ninon Grangé, Cannelle Gignoux, Alain Brossat, Alexander Neumann, Plínio Prado, Marie-Dominique Garnier, Michèle Cohen-Halimi (Paris 8), Gérard Raullet (Paris 4), Marcelle Stroobants, Isabelle Stengers (ULB), Anselm Jappe (Rome), Frédéric Lordon (CNRS), Florent Perrier, Olivier Sarrouy, Emmanuel Parent, Christian Le Moëgne, Christophe David, Jil Daniel, Marius Muller, Clément Rouillier, Romain Huët (Rennes 2), Pierre Bergounioux (écrivain), Catherine Malabou (Université de Californie, Irvine), Michaël Crevoisier, Étienne Ménard, Daniel Lebaud, Aurélie Deny (Université de Franche-Comté), Guillaume Burnod (Lycée français, Berlin), Jacques-Olivier Bégot (Rennes 1), Sylvie Monchatre (Lyon 2), Chantal Jaquet, Aurore Koechlin, Franck Fischbach (Paris 1), Serge Martin (Paris 3), Alain Naze, Sandra Lucbert, Christian Prigent (écrivains), Alain Jugnon (Cahiers Artaud), Sonia Dayan-Herzbrun (Paris-Diderot), Manuel Tostain, Patrick Vassort (Université de Caen-Normandie), Jean-Pierre Terrail (Université de Versailles-St-Quentin), Olivier Neveux (ENS, Lyon), Christophe Camus, Anne Bondon, Pierre-Antoine Chabriac (École Nationale Supérieure d'Architecture de Bretagne), Leïla Frouillou, Pascal Sévérac (Université Paris-Nanterre), Nico Hirtt (Aped, Bruxelles), Miguel Benasayag (Paris), Matthieu Renault (Université Toulouse - Jean Jaurès), Joana Desplat-Roger, Bernard Aspe (Collège International de Philosophie), Philippe Nabonnand (Université de Lorraine), Marc Guillaumie (Limoges), Stefano Marchesoni (Lycée italien, Paris), Marc Berdet (Université Fédérale de Rio de Janeiro), Déborah Brosteaux (Université Libre de Bruxelles / Paris Lumières), Anne Roche (Université d'Aix-Marseille), Claudia Girola (IHSS, Université Paris Cité), Stéphane Haber (Paris-Nanterre), Renaud Garcia (Appel de Beauchastel contre l'école numérique), Perrine Wilhelm (Paris 8 / Lycée M. Berthelot, Pantin), Vincent Chanson (chercheur rattaché SOPHIAPOL, Paris-Nanterre), Thibault Barrier (Paris 1), Vincent Gibelin (Snuipp-FSU), Pauline Hachette (IUT de Sceaux), Arthur Lannuzel (UTBM, Belfort-Montbéliard), François Jarrige (Dijon, Université de Bourgogne), Gérard Hamon (SNES-FSU), Clément Cordier, Laurent Zwaenepoel, Morgan Marc, Yann Lupec (SUD éducation 35), Gabriel Mahéo (Rennes), Hervé Ferrière (Université de Bretagne Occidentale), Jean-Paul Engelibert, Jean-Michel Gouvard (Université de Bordeaux-Montaigne), Christiane Vollaire (CNAM/EHESS), Jean-Luc Gautero (Université de Nice), Sämi Ludwig (Université de Haute-Alsace), Lionel Jacquot (Université de Lorraine), Jean-Michel Devésá, Philippe Colin, Florent Gabaude (Université de Limoges), Françoise Salvan-Renucci (Université Côte d'Azur), Samuel Chaîneau, Raphaël Perrod (SNES 25), Frédéric Metz (Pontcerq), Marie Cuillerai, Eric Marty (Université Paris-Cité), Marc Chatellier (Université de Nantes), Francis Cohen (écrivain), Jérôme Lèbre (Louis-le-Grand), Letitia Mouze (Université Toulouse Jean Jaurès), Thomas Bouchet (Lausanne), Peter Andersen (Université de Strasbourg), Héléne Tordjman (Paris 13), Pauline Juvenez (Université de Nantes), Frederico Lyra de Carvalho (UPJV/USP), Hervé Le Meur (CNRS / Université de Picardie), Nathalie Quintane (écrivain), Florent Lahache (École supérieure des Beaux Arts de Bordeaux), Jorge Nóvoa, Soleni Biscouto Fressato (Université Fédérale de Bahia, Brésil), Geneviève Azam (Université de Toulouse Jean Jaurès), Michèle Gally (Université d'Aix-Marseille CIELAM), Thibault Catel (Université de Limoges), Philippe Roy (Besançon), Philippe Boursier (Rennes), Caroline Panis, Michel Savaric, Stefan Neuwirth, Laurent

Perreau, Claire Mallet, Pauline Chevalier, Séverin Guignard, Mina Aït'Mbark, Corinne Raynal-Astier (Université de Franche-Comté), Farid Ammar Khodja (INSPE/ Université de Franche-Comté), Cécile Tannier (CNRS/Université de Franche-Comté), Chloé Lavalette (Rennes 2), Véronique Labrot, Julien Fuchs, Hervé Guyon (Université de Brest), Laurent Jeanpierre, David Lapoujade (Paris 1), Davide Gallo Lassere (University of London), Isabelle Bruno (Université de Lille), Léo Charles (Rennes 2), Catherine Coquio (Université Paris-Cité), « Agrupación Pedagógica Siglo XXI » (Asamblea Técnica de Enseñanza Media de Uruguay), Maria Teresa Ricci (Université de Tours), Christophe Hanna (écrivain), Sébastien Charbonnier (Université de Lille), Walter Ferrer (Universidad de la República, Maldonado, Uruguay), Claudia Rodríguez (Universidad de la República, Montevideo, Uruguay), Luca Paltrinieri (Université de Rennes 1), Bertrand Ogilvie (Paris 8), Frédéric Neyrat (Université de Madison-Wisconsin), François Dosse (Université Paris 12), Marc Goldschmit, Florence Naugrette (Sorbonne Université), Thomas Lamarche (Université Paris Cité), Patrick Vauday (Université Paris 8), Philippe Minard (Université Paris 8 / EHESS), Céline Hervet (Université d'Amiens / Collège international de philosophie), Corinne Rondeau (Université de Nîmes), Paul Dirx (Université de Lille), Christine Baron (Université de Poitiers), Mario Denti (Université Rennes 2), Yannick Séité (Université de Tours), Hubert Heckmann (Université de Rouen), Benjamin Saccomanno (Toulouse 2), Alexis Nuselovici (Aix-Marseille Université), Cecilia D'Ercole (EHESS), Pascal Montlahuc (Université Paris Cité), Catherine Milkovitch-Rioux (Université Clermont-Auvergne), Ludmila Charles (Université de Tours), Olivier Bochet (Université Rennes 1), Stewen Corvez, Étienne Delprat, Ali Ait Abdelmalek (Université Rennes 2), Jean-Baptiste Bonnard (Université de Caen), Antonin Wisser (Gymnase de Beaulieu, Lausanne), Jérôme Meizoz (Université de Lausanne), Alan Hervé (Sciences Po Rennes), Lucas Kervegan (Sorbonne Université), Mireille Bruyère (Université de Toulouse Jean Jaurès), Gérard Bras (Université Populaire des Hauts-de-Seine), Katia Schwerzmann (Ruhr-Universität Bochum), Jochen Krautz (GBW / Bergische Universität Wuppertal), Andreas Gruschka (Goethe-Universität, Francfort), Éric Thouvenel (Université de Nanterre), Julie Sermon (Lyon 2), Diane Watteau (EAS, Université Paris 1), Aurélie Ledoux (Université Paris Nanterre), Christoph Türcke (Hochschule für Grafik und Buchkunst Leipzig), Judith Bernard (lycée, 93), Pierre Dardot (Université Paris-Nanterre), Nicolas Da Silva (Sorbonne Paris-Nord), Raoul Vaneigem (écrivain), Philippe Huneman (CNRS / Université Paris 1 Sorbonne), Daniel Serceau (Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne), Christian Laval (Université Paris-Nanterre), Marguerite Vappereau (Université Bordeaux-Montaigne), Alexis Cukier (Université de Poitiers), Laure Murat (Université de Californie, Los Angeles), Katia Genel (Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne), Cécile Canut (Université Paris Cité), Karine Pinel (Université Montpellier III Paul Valéry), Sylvie Rollet (Université de Poitiers), Sylvie Lindeperg (Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne), François Cusset (Université de Paris-Nanterre), Marie Martin (Université de Poitiers), Ann Smock (Université de Berkeley), Mickaël Lavaine (Université de Brest), David Faroult (École Nationale Supérieure Louis-Lumière), Xavier Lambert (Université de Toulouse Jean Jaurès), Élie Guéraud (Université Clermont-Auvergne), Andreas Gelhard (GWZ, Université de Leipzig), Olivia de Graef (Paris), Karin Fischer (Université d'Orléans), Emmanuel Quenson (Université d'Evry-Paris Saclay), Christophe Granger (Université



Paris-Saclay), Jean-Louis Siroux (Université libre de Bruxelles), Benoît Leroux, Arnaud Francois, Harmony Dewez (Université de Poitiers), Florent Gaudez (Université Grenoble-Alpes), Alain Refalo (professeur des écoles, Haute-Garonne, initiateur du mouvement des enseignants-désobéisseurs du 1<sup>er</sup> degré, 2008-2012), Fanny Madeline (Université Paris 1), Maria Kakogianni (écrivaine), Pieter Lagrou, Sylvain Delcomminette (Université libre de Bruxelles), Antoine Janvier (Université de Liège), Guillaume Dye (Université libre de Bruxelles), SUD Éducation 28 (Eure-et-Loir), SUD Éducation 41 (Loir-et-Cher), SUD Éducation 94 (Val-de-Marne), Vincent de Coorebyter, Francine Bolle, Chloé Deligne, Pierre Brasseur (Université Libre de Bruxelles), Wenceslas Lizé (Université de Poitiers), Norbert R. Vetter (Redaktion GBW, Allemagne), Laurent Ott (La Rage du social), David Jamar (Université de Mons), Bettina Horsch (École nationale supérieure d'architecture de Nantes), Sauver les lettres (sauv.net), Richard Abauzit (CNRBE, Solidaires 34).

**Traduction : Aloys Serrano.**  
**Imprimé à Rennes – mai 2024.**  
**Éditions Pontcerq**  
**61, avenue Aristide Briand, 35 000 Rennes**  
**pontcerq@gmail.com / [www.pontcerq.fr](http://www.pontcerq.fr).**