

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 429 984

SP 038 493

AUTHOR Zay, Danielle
TITLE Collaborative Research and Evaluation in French Teacher Education.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *College School Cooperation; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Teacher Researchers; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Collaborative Research; *France

ABSTRACT

This paper examines France's attempts, difficulties, and issues related to developing a new collaborative relationship between university-based researchers and school-based practitioners and a new evaluative policy that includes social partners. The first section of the paper introduces the theoretical background and methodology of the study. The second section discusses collaborative research and teacher education in France. The third section discusses participatory evaluation of teacher education in France. The paper highlights two main trends: 1) making trainers and teachers benefit from an actual research project, which is useful for the university and the schools; and 2) making all involved parties concerned with the analysis and evaluation of activities. A final section discusses the possible impact of the evaluation on training and education. (Contains 46 references.) (SM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Danielle Zay
 University of Charles de Gaulle Lille III - FRANCE
 Zay@univ-lille3.fr

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 Office of Educational Research and Improvement
 EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
 CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION IN FRENCH TEACHER EDUCATION

Paper presented at AERA Annual Meeting
(American Educational Research Association)
Montreal, April 1999

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
 DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
 BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Zay

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
 INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

The extension of schooling and an increase of problems for young people (school failure, integrating into society and living in urban contexts) have made teachers' tasks more difficult. The educative policies have looked for solutions in two ways : by universitizing teacher education, in order to raise teachers' qualifications, and by opening up the school to the community-at-large, in order to make it the focus for a broader educational community which would be in step with the evolution of society.

These two approaches often seem difficult to coordinate in a coherent manner.

Nevertheless, in a period of uncertainty and crisis in those values which have formed the foundation of society and education, teachers, like their students, cannot content themselves with time-proven recipes. They need the means to confront new and unexpected situations, which is to say they must be able "to learn to learn" rather than to just acquire knowledge once and for all. In this sense, applying research processes right from the beginning of their training constitutes a preparation for the future to which the universitizing of teacher education could contribute, since the nature of the university is to elaborate knowledge through research. The problem is that the university research mission should not only serve the general culture, but should also be applied to resolving the actual concrete difficulties encountered by teachers.

The present tendency on the part of public authorities is to encourage institutions of higher education to improve their collaboration with schools. In the United States, as in the United Kingdom, funds are made available for this type of action. In Quebec, the latest reform in teacher education, in 1993, has a similar orientation. The generalization of the IUFM (Instituts Universitaires de Formation des Maîtres/Teacher Education Institute) in France in 1991 was accompanied by the development of research policy encouraging the setting up of teams and work projects between researchers and teachers in order to better understand the problems of the latter in the practice of their profession (Demailly & Zay, 1993, 1994, 1997).

Numerous researchers, especially in the United States, have turned their interests to setting up "*professional development schools*" (Holmes Group, 1990) or "*school-university partnerships*" (Sirotnik & Goodlad, eds., 1988; Goodlad, 1994; Osguthorpe & al., 1995; Zay, 1995). The titles of the three meetings of the AERA (American Educational Research Association) held between 1995-1997 were focused on these questions (Zay, 1996, 1997 a). The Quebec researchers also rallied round to treat the same issues following the reform in teacher education (AQUFOM, 1995). Each of these

found a solid theoretical base in Schön's concept of "*reflective practice*" (1983, 1987, 1991; Zay, 1998, 1999 a).

The paper will introduce a synthesis of French attempts, difficulties, points of tension and issues to develop a new collaborative work between researchers and practitioners and a new evaluative policy including social partners, since the 1989 Education Guiding Law which created teacher training institutes under the name of IUFM (Instituts Universitaires de Formation des Maîtres : University Institutes of Teacher Education).

1 - First, we shall briefly introduce the theoretical background and methodology;

Then we shall focus on two main trends of the shifts in institutional conditions :

2 - to make trainers and teachers to benefit an actual research and make it useful for the training and schools;

3 - to make all parties concerned by the analyses and evaluations of activities.

1 - THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

They were elaborated through three research reports :

- the first one was funded by the Ministerial DRED (Direction de la Recherche et des Études Doctorales : Research and Doctoral Studies Administration) on the research policy of the IUFM's during their first two years in existence (Demailly L. & Zay D., dir., 1993);

- the second one was funded by the SIGMA Pilot Project of the European Commission on the French System of Teacher Education (Zay D. & Bourdoncle R., 1996). This report was brought up to date and completed by a new part about the evaluation of the IUFM by the CNE (Comité national d'évaluation : National Committee of Evaluation) to be presented in the European Pilot Project Seminar about the Evaluation of the Quality in Higher Education, 09/3-5/1998 (Zay D., 1999 b).

- The third one is funded by the TNTEE (Thematic Network on Teacher Education in Europe) Subnetwork F on the theme : "*Developing a «reflective practice» for the teaching profession and teacher education through partnerships between researchers and practitioners*". It allows to compare new French trends to those emerging in other countries (Zay D., dir., 1999 c).

The theoretical background of the research joins international and French studies about partnerships and reflective practice. The methodology derived from textual analysis, inquiry and case studies.

The question

What frame(s) of theoretical reference may support a collaborative research including researchers and practitioners ?

was at the centre of my work in view of participatory research (1994 a and b). It has been synthesized in two recent texts (1997 a and b).

The philosophy of Jürgen Habermas (1987), the "*notions*" of "*intercomprehension*", the goal a society aims to establish among its members, and "*rationality*", the set of criteria which provides a social group with the means to resolve a problem through discussions based on the widest consensus possible, offer a conceptual framework for analysis in participatory research.

The "*theory*" is not conceived as a formal model for an a priori application. It is an on-going elaboration of representations starting from the "*real*", which is to say the most familiar, the most usual manner for practitioners to represent their training and research activities in context, and moving towards the reconstruction of meaning via the confrontation of experiences and the reinterpretation of data ? (Zay, 1994 a and b)

Methodological choices in this type of research derive from the nature and position of the object. Those objects which are in the process of being set up cannot be properly apprehended by methods appropriate to established and structured objects. Even more than representations, processes must be observed. The production steps must be examined before they lead to established relations, programmes and materials (Demailly & Zay, 1993, 1994, 1997).

Case studies and monographs are the key-notes of these studies. In the book edited by Sirotnik & Goodlad in 1988, Kenneth A. Sirotnik assigned a chapter to the theme : " The meaning and conduct of inquiry in School-University Partnerships ", in which he described the processes to be followed and emphasized collaborations between researchers and practitioners.

Nevertheless, the strong involvement of observers also seems to call up processes at a distance and of objectification. These may be the composition of the research team, mixing field actors and other outside observers, cross-case analyses, monographs following common guidelines and using a standardized grid to collect data or comparative analysis of issues generated by qualitative approaches and national statistics. (Zay, 1994 a et b; Demailly & Zay, 1993, 1994, 1997).

The requirements and ways of theorisation of that kind of participatory research were laid down by several researchers .

" Contemporary research defined as collaborative rather than co-operative, where teachers and researchers are engaged as partners in theory-building (see Cole, 1989; Cole & Knowles, 1993), might need to be reconceptualized to define an explicit link between research and action. Researchers of teaching would then follow a participatory approach (Hall, 1979; Maguire, 1987) defined by Maguire as :

a method of social *investigation* (emphasized in the original) of problems involving participation of oppressed and ordinary people in problem solving and posing... an *educational* process for the researcher and participants, who analyze the structural causes of named problems through collective discussion and interaction... a way for researchers and oppressed people to join in solidarity to take collective action. (p. 29)

Perhaps principles of participatory research need to guide the next generation of research on teacher thinking." (Cole, 1997, p. 23).

Dealing with the issue, the TNTEE-Subnetwork F research team members agree to develop models of constructivist approaches, action research and participatory research and research devices based upon qualitative methodologies (Zay, 1999 c, d, e, f).

We shall now describe the results of our research work about France.¹

2 - COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH AND TEACHER EDUCATION IN FRANCE

"What are the institutional conditions able to support collaborative research devices for training?" : this is the main question of our research funded by the Ministerial Direction for Research and Doctoral Studies DRED (Direction de la Recherche et des Études Doctorales), research on the nascent research policy of the IUFMs (Instituts Universitaires de Formation des Maîtres), university institutes of teacher education, during their first two years of existence, 1990-92 (Demailly & Zay, 1993, 1994, 1997; Zay, 1997 b).

1- The results of the TNTEE Subnetwork F research about comparative studies in European and North American countries, the United States and Canada, are the theme of another symposium in the AERA meeting 1999 : *Collaborative Reflection : Partnerships for Improving Learning and Teaching*.

Their status and mission defined the IUFMs as institutional cross-roads and institutional networks. Indeed they had both to establish a contract with universities and to be responsible for professional teacher training.

They tried to set up collaborative networks between academics, teacher educators at the IUFMs and teachers who receive student-teachers at school. They made teachers and students who attended in-service and pre-service training participate in these collaborative networks using three kinds of incentive, help and guidance procedures : information, methodological help, material and financial help. First, we shall introduce these incentive procedures. Then, we shall present their issues.

2-1 - The incentives, help and guidance procedures

- Information

circulates through surveys, periodical texts, IUFM bulletins, personal letters sent to teacher educators at IUFMs and to teachers who receive student teachers at schools, specialized publications such as journals containing summaries of seminars.

They act as an incentive by showing the existence and diversity of research actions in the field of education, not only locally, but also in France and abroad. The idea is to encourage the staff to participate, in various degrees, by attending a symposium or a seminar or even giving a paper.

The "days of study" make it possible, thanks to a lighter structure than that of a symposium, to bring the participants together, with a twofold perspective :

- a variety of subjects, which is important for professors who are specializing in a single subject at the university, and
- different categories of specialists which shows that research is not reserved solely for university professors.

- Methodological help

is offered to people who wish to engage in research, through systems destined to render explicit the modes of conception, organization and assessment of research.

The structural systems are thematic work groups or workshops, on the professional dissertation, for instance.

The exchange systems mainly cover the organization of seminars, as well as of symposiums and summer sessions which act as certain seminars, in spite of their occasional nature. They make it possible to familiarize participants with research themes and methods and with the specific form of a symposium paper. They may attract an audience which would not necessarily attend a purely university-type symposium.

Some seminars are directly linked to the IUFMs training needs, like the "seminars on didactic reflection" while the "seminars on methodology" are clearly destined to provide research training. Some of the former may be compared to the workshops between mathematics teachers and researchers described by William E. Bickwel and Rosemary A. Hattrup (1995) through the collaboration of the AFT (American Federation of Teachers) and LRDC (Learning Research and Development Center) of the University of Pittsburgh.

Some of the latter, like the "DEA seminars" ("DEA", Diplôme d'Études Approfondies : In Depth Studies Diploma, the preparatory year for a doctorate) are organized with universities which are the only institutions entitled to deliver that diploma. They have a twofold objective :

- giving training in methodology through contact with researchers who are asked to expatiate on their problematic and their personal approach;

- inciting the trainers who attend these seminars to enrol in qualifying research leading to university titles.

We must emphasize the role of the call for proposals in the creation of collaborative research networks drawing together established researchers, teacher educators and practitioners. These calls for proposals also constitute an original means of methodological training, not only by assuming that the existence of a team is necessary, but also, because they include possible approaches to dealing with the proposal themes and a plan of presentation for the research file which makes necessary answers to questions having to do with methodology, hypothesis, planning, internal functioning of the team, a bibliography on the chosen topic and support. They constitute in themselves tools for an initiation to the requirements and rhetoric of scientific research.

- Material help

To promote research, providing support is essential. It is dealt with in almost all monographs, either by mentioning its existence, or regretting its absence. Some researchers mention the reluctance of teachers to participate in collaborative research projects simply because teachers are not allotted time to participate. In this respect, support represents a lever which may appear indispensable to a research policy based upon collaborative team work, as a kind of compensation for the difference of status between teachers and researchers.

It includes four principal forms : extra hours, reductions in teaching load, various financial support for participating in symposiums, attending doctoral courses, or attending seminars concerning the IUFM (travelling expenses), support other than financial, such as the help for publication and for documentation.

The guidance and support systems are consistent with three main objectives :

- stimulating personal motivation,
- creating and maintaining formal or informal cooperation networks,
- socializing people to the constraints and requirements of scientific research by providing formally defined transition moments and places between research and professional reflection.

2-2 - The issues of incentives, help and guidance procedures

The analysis of the issues of these incentives, help and guidance procedures aiming to support practitioners to use research in teaching practices is complementary to the analysis of the competencies for and through partnerships, we have made before.

First, we have noticed a proliferation of horizontal regional networks, often "in the field", which strongly modify research in education, in three ways :

- the channels to formulate demand, the emergence of what may legitimately be set up as a research project,
- the symbolic relations between potential producers of research,
- the processes : the people concerned admit that networking modifies the ways teacher educators determine the demands and constraints of their job, the field of knowledge that can be made available for that work. It also influences the ways they see themselves, their work and their skills, their specific role in the training institution, their own ability to organize themselves and their future.

Then, we have noticed **institutionnal effects and how they touch people**

An initial quantitative effect is the increase in the number of theses and doctorates (DEA) prepared by the teacher educators, who have remained as secondary teachers while becoming integrated into the new IUFM structures.

At the end of our surveys some IUFM teams also noticed effects for the users that are the students associated with workshops and seminars.

Inside the new structures created by IUFMs, researchers, teacher educators and teachers could may establish relationships with two side effects. Researchers who participate immediately see the practical applications of their research. Practitioners influence the choice of subject matter and ways of conducting research projects in their classroom.

The monographs point out two main effects :

- the make-up of collaborative and interdisciplinary teams, breaking with the academic research tradition;

- a shift of research contents in the proposals from IUFMs toward problems more in harmony with those encountered by the teachers in their classrooms : didactics, teaching and training methods, and instructional technology.

Teachers and teacher educators can familiarize themselves with scientific research criteria required for the selection of projects supported by the IUFM and realize that they are not trivial nor unjustified. Participating in a university research team project they can embrace research criteria for analyzing concrete situations they must face and thus better answer student teachers' questions in the classroom. Indeed, these questions are often about the connections between the experiential contributions during training periods and a reflection and generalizing these in their professional dissertation.

These new trends comply with teachers and trainers requests.

The analysis of the history of the regional "Missions", the MAFPENs (Missions académiques régionales de formation) in charge of the inservice teacher training for secondary education, reveals that the problems linked to the prevailing model of training have led teachers to look for other models than those proposed by teacher educators. There emerges a social claim for a different sort of training which implies an innovative and research-oriented approach. The teachers concerned are voluntary teachers who have already attended many training courses and who reflect on their teaching. They are already "in research" as regards their own practice and wish to "do some research" and compare their respective techniques.

Thus, training-research groups were born in all MAFPENs. They expressed a heuristic desire on the part of teachers for a kind of socio-professional research aiming at the production of formalized knowledge, of tools for analysing existing practices to improve the old ones or build new ones. By taking a stand which kept intuitive and routine practices at a distance, these teacher-researchers developed the skill to adapt themselves to shifting teaching contexts in a period of school crisis. This skill of facing unforeseen events is perceived as more and more necessary. It cannot be learnt from model lessons. This training by means of research falls in with the necessity to build a new teacher professionalism. It uses a project approach and logic, with co-training teams consisting of trainers-researchers implicated in inquiries or with university researchers as "resource-persons". (Altet, 1994, pp. 238-241).

The testimony we have collected from teachers during IUFM "days of study" or symposiums about research corroborate the fact that the new Institutes have met the same needs as the MAFPENs. But they develop their action in ways the MAFPENs could not, because the latter are not higher education institutions linked to a university by any formal agreement. Research services at IUFM have systematized the MAFPEN initiatives. They have set up more important structures and means, and, above all, they have focused on an objective that the MAFPEN could not have : that is to articulate praxeological research, orientated toward the improvement of action, in accordance with the requirements defining scientific research.

However, the obstacles that can be observed, in the functioning conditions of the IUFM's as much as in the behaviour of their staff or users incite us to consider these three gains of the research policies as fragile : namely, new partnerships, new modes of training to research, new subjects of research. The idea of collaborative applied research,

involving university researchers and practitioners, indeed runs counter to established monopolies among the different authorities involved in research, training and administrative formalization.

Nevertheless, after the refusal of the responsible minister in 1993 to accept that *"the IUFM could be regarded as possible locations for conducting research"* and after having had to steer through troubled waters following this decision, the situation has now improved for the IUFM. Any IUFM wishing to develop a research policy has been able to do so, and even while the creation of stable research units in the IUFM as in universities has remained an exception, the activities which were begun soon after the establishing of the IUFM have been continued, as was also reflected in the evaluation reports on three IUFM (Caen, Grenoble, Lyon) which were published by the CNE (Comité National d'Evaluation des établissements publics à caractère scientifique, culturel et professionnel, the National Committee for the Evaluation of public institutions of a scientific, cultural and professional nature) in 1996.

After the new trends of the teacher education in France, we shall now describe them for the assessment of the IUFMs policies.

3 - PARTICIPATORY EVALUATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN FRANCE

Since their creation, the IUFM have been the object of reports by the General Inspection, as well as by numerous other institutions in a context of intense polemics (cf. Zay, 1997 b).

The basis of this part of our paper is our last report for the TNTEE (Zay, 1999 b) and the previous one (Zay & Bourdoncle, 1996).

The CNE (Comité National d'Evaluation des établissements publics à caractère scientifique, culturel et professionnel), the National Committee for Evaluation of public institutions of a scientific, cultural and professional nature, created by a law on January 26, 1984, which granted autonomy to universities, was solicited in 1994 by the Conference of Directors of IUFM. After consulting with the Conference and other parties concerned, it was decided in 1995 to evaluate the IUFM, as it was believed that the Committee had sufficiently more perspective than when the request was first made by the Ministry of National Education in 1991 at the creation of the first three institutions.

The approach adopted by the Committee is original in the sense that it chose to first evaluate the establishments (as done with universities and schools) and, only then, to conduct a general reflexion on the IUFM, and more widely on teacher education in France, based on these studies.

In the first experimental phase, it elaborated a methodology in conjunction with concerned partners and proceeded to evaluate the three IUFM whose heads were in agreement. These institutions presented a diversity of situations. The Committee considered it premature to draw conclusions from these first three evaluations. But it did perfect a methodology which then led to a new series of evaluations, the last of which is in process.

3-1 - The characteristics of the CNE evaluation approach

The CNE is an independant administrative body which reports directly to the President of the Republic and is thus independant from the Ministry of Higher Education. It is made up of seventeen members appointed by the President of the Republic for a four year term, not to be renewed. Eleven of them come from the academic and scientific communities upon recommendation by the presidents of the sections of the CNU (Conseil National des Universités), the National Council of Universities, as well as by

members of the Conseil d'État, the State Council. It has a Secretary General. It works with the experts of its own choosing.

The evaluation, as practised by the CNE, is characterized by the following :

- Establishments are evaluated in fields corresponding to public service missions for higher education : pre-service and in-service education, research, development (integrating each institution regionally, nationally and internationally); it also examines the "government" of the establishment, its policies and management;

- The evaluation is both qualitative and quantitative. Although it uses statistical data as the basis of its analyses and comparisons in a national context, the CNE considers that the evaluation of higher education is above all qualitative. It does not believe it possible to resort to a performance index and takes into account the context, specific situations, the evolution, and objectives specific to the institutions being evaluated.

- The evaluation reports provide an appreciation of the way establishments define their projects and fulfill their mission. They serve to inform the general public, users and partners of the establishment, including the State, and through the recommendations made, constitute a strategic instrument for conducting and improving institutional policy.

- The evaluation is a concerted effort. During the experimental phase which lasted two years (1995-1996), the CNE prepared a method in conjunction with the Bureau of the Directors' Conference and made an evaluation of three institutes.

As for universities, it was decided that the evaluation would include an internal phase with the establishment itself preparing an evaluation file, and an external phase with expert appraisal and a report to be made public. The usual approach applied to universities was set in motion.

For the first sample, the CNE selected three IUFM which presented a wide variety of situations (size of the establishment, number of affiliated universities, internal organization, palette of training programmes). These were the IUFM at Caen, at Lyon and at Grenoble.

The IUFM at Grenoble was one of the three pilot IUFM, created in 1990, a year before the other institutes. The IUFM at Caen volunteered to participate in the first evaluations. As for the IUFM at Lyon, it was quite naturally a part of the evaluation programme set up for the establishments of higher education in Lyon by the Committee in 1995 within the framework of its evaluation of the Lyon academy.

For all three, the internal evaluation began immediately after the development of the first institutional project. Indeed, at their conception it was decided that a harmonization would be progressively sought with the procedure of university planning. In the first phase, the Ministry requested that institutes prepare their planned projects according to a predetermined model before submitting them to a committee of experts. These institutional projects cover a period of four years (1995-1999) and include a training programme.

To the extent that developing the institutional plan had mobilized for a period of several months, not only the heads and authorities of the IUFM, but to a large extent the teaching staff, in order to redefine the training programme, it did not seem reasonable to immediately ask for the whole institution to commit itself to a new task. This is why the internal evaluation was conducted by a small number of persons : the director, the board of directors, a few administrative and teaching heads. The establishments had a tendency to confuse the development of the institutional plan with the evaluation; the internal evaluation files sometimes copied the project plan chapters without analysing what existed already.

The external evaluation followed the same procedure as for universities. The missions of appraisal were conducted during the spring of 1996. The commissions tried to compensate for the lack of references by visiting the IUFM in both the Lyon and Grenoble areas, and then basing their work on these experiences to appraise the IUFM in the Caen area. The two groups of experts were made up of six or seven persons

appointed by the president of the CNE according to the usual criteria : evaluation by peers, with a dual opening, internationally and professionally.

The Commission members and experts met with the main heads of establishments (the director and team, administrative heads, teaching heads), teaching staff and personnel, students and trainees. They also interviewed the principal partners of the IUFM in each region: the rector, the university presidents, members of the inspecting bodies, representatives of local communities.

The evaluation reports were prepared on the basis of the confidential reports from experts and the internal evaluation files. As is the Commission's habit, before making the final report which formulates conclusions and recommendations, each institute was invited to react to the planned report. Thus, up to the end, the evaluation procedure consists in numerous "comings and goings" between the CNE and the establishments. The evaluation reports were made public in February 1997, with the director's response as a postface.

3-2 - The methodological framework

Even if the Commission refused to draw any conclusions from the first three evaluations, as any generalizations seemed premature and contrary to the adopted approach, it did, however, evaluate the method at the end of that first experience, in conjunction with the Conference Bureau and the directors of the three IUFM evaluated. These evaluations brought to light two difficulties: that of the institutes in clearly detailing their goals and presenting their training project, and that of the experts in analyzing the project plan and judging its implementation in the various centers and branches, in partnerships with universities and in the field. It was clearly necessary to refocus the evaluation on the professional objectives of the IUFM and, therefore, to give more attention to the training plan and its implementation. This aspect had been partially obscured by the questions of governing and management.

Moreover, the Commission insisted on presenting its work to the various authorities of the Central Administration, ranging from the General Inspection of Schools to institutional advisors, to obtain their views and observations.

The methodological framework for future evaluations was thus laid down, always with a view to a concerted approach with the Directors' Conference. This was set forth in Bulletin n° 23 of the CNE (1997), *Références pour l'évaluation des IUFM (References for Evaluating the IUFMs)*. This document begins by presenting the IUFM, their mission and the conditions for their functioning (sets of rules, national contexts and specific contexts, intrinsic partnerships with universities and in the field, plans for a training programme, the institutional planned project), as it would seem, even today, that the IUFM are institutions which are not well known within their own academic community. In addition, in order to clearly define ways for evaluation, it was necessary to recall to mind the limits surrounding the IUFM in defining their objectives: on the one hand, they must answer to the State who is the employer and fixes the policy for training teachers in France, and on the other hand, each institute is in a unique situation, derived from the academic and regional context, where it must manage its activities in partnership with related universities and organizations in the field (particularly inspection bodies and teaching establishments).

On this basis, the document on methodology presents the general headings for evaluation, both internal and external :

I - Institute Activities

Pre-service and in-service education, research, other activities.

II - The Actors

Students and trainees; teachers, associate trainers and supervisors; administrative and technical personnel.

III - The Workings of the Institute

Internal organization, government, management, means for supervising the training.

A Guide for Internal Evaluation (Guide pour l'évaluation interne des IUFM, 1997) was put together from the first questionnaire and from these *References*. For all these programmes, the Committee is presently striving to provide support for the establishments as they set up a veritable internal evaluation system. Such an undertaking supposes that the institutions do not just provide information, but that they bring an appraisal of their work and activities, clearly setting apart their strengths, weaknesses and goals. It also supposes that the internal evaluation is not conducted just by the heads of the institutions, but that both teaching and non-teaching staffs participate widely, along with students and trainees.

3-3 - Pursuing the programme

Two new series of evaluations have been launched to be completed respectively in the spring and at the end of 1998. The first concerns five IUFM from the districts of Amiens, Dijon, Lille, Reims and Rouen, in connection with other programmes the Committee has (evaluation of the new universities of Lille in 1996; in the case of Amiens, Rouen and Reims, the second evaluation of the universities of the Greater Parisian area).

The second series also involves five IUFM, from the districts of Paris, Creteil, Versailles, Orleans-Tours and Besancon, along with the ENFA of Toulouse (Ecole Nationale de Formation Agronomique) whose central mission is the professional training of all teachers in the public technical agricultural sector. For this school, the evaluation will be conducted in connection with the Department of Teaching and Research of the Ministry of Agriculture.

In pursuing the evaluations of the IUFM, the Committee will take into account two factors : its programme for returning to the universities and the calendar for the IUFM's contract, without seeking to copy one calendar from another.

At the European level, other work is in progress. The CNE has been participating since 1991 in a European pilot project for evaluating the quality of higher education. The method is based on the principles common to four systems of evaluation in use in Europe when the project began (Denmark, France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom):

- autonomy and independance in evaluation methods and procedures, avoiding influence from political sources as well as from establishments of higher education;
- internal evaluations;
- external evaluations by peers (groups of experts) and visits to the site;
- public reports.

But specific aspects of the French method also appear, especially the importance attributed to research and institutional analysis.

2-4 - POSSIBLE IMPACT OF THE EVALUATION ON TRAINING AND EDUCATION

The evaluation process set up by the CNE meets some of the initiatives of the "rectorats", the educational regional authorities, in evaluating schools in France. They might generate reflection on the nature and role of evaluation in the field of education and training, along with strategies encouraging awareness among the actors in the educational system at all levels, teachers, heads, researchers, users and partners, around a conception of the qualitative side of evaluation which has been developed in all the French initiatives and reflects the international trends in thinking.

These tendencies elaborate analyses and evaluations of actions which are based on a participation of all the parties concerned. These concepts also underlie some of the assessments of academic and training institutions launched by regional authorities in France, for example the rectorat of Bordeaux. Their goal is to turn the evaluation process, often perceived by the actors as disparagement for their results, into a restitution of value, a "plus-value" (an increase in value, in profit) and a "plus-valeur" (an increase in worth, quality, merit), leading to a renewal in the process of communication among social categories and a more strict mastery of collective actions (Lecoïnte, 1997; Lecoïnte & Rebinguet, 1990, 1994; Lacrosaz, Lecoïnte & Rebinguet, 1996 a).

The CNE's insistence on a qualitative evaluation based on local realities and on the aims of those who make the system operate, on an approach through participation leading to the actors themselves taking on the process of evaluation along with their social partners and users, could set in motion a dynamic change running through the whole educational system, from the governing bodies in higher education to those bodies which supervise the future citizens who will build the society of tomorrow. The problematic tying together of theory and practice, of linking the process of educating trainers with that of educating youth, would begin with the prospective aims of a permanent evaluation, and not stem from a control after the fact of results which were not thought out from the beginning and, being unexpected, seem to be "a perverse effect".

The French tendencies in teacher education and its evaluation joins the North American trends we quoted when beginning this paper, in the United States - "schools for professional development" (Holmes Group, 1990) or "school-university partnerships" (Sirotnik & Goodlad, eds., 1988; Goodlad, 1994; Osguthorpe & al., 1995; Zay, 1995), "The Reflective Turn" (Schön, 1991, 1996; Zay, 1998, 1999 a, in print) - and in Canada (AQUFOM, 1995).

REFERENCES

- ALTET, M. (1994). *La formation professionnelle des enseignants*. Analyse des pratiques et situations pédagogiques. Paris: PUF.
- AQUFOM, Association québécoise universitaire en formation des maîtres (1995). *L'université et le milieu scolaire : partenaires en formation des maîtres*. Actes du troisième colloque tenu à l'Université McGill, 19-20 novembre 1993. Montréal : Université McGill.
- BICKEL, W. E. & HATTRUP, R. A. (1995). "Teachers and researchers in collaboration : reflections on the process". *American Educational Research Journal*, 32 (1), 35-62.
- CNE (Comité national d'évaluation des établissements publics à caractère scientifique, culturel et professionnel) (1996). *L'Institut Universitaire de formation des maîtres de l'Académie de Caen*. Rapport d'évaluation. Novembre 1996. Available on web site : <http://www-cne.mesr.fr>.
- CNE (Comité national d'évaluation des établissements publics à caractère scientifique, culturel et professionnel) (1996). *L'Institut Universitaire de formation des maîtres de l'Académie de Grenoble*. Rapport d'évaluation. Novembre 1996. Available on web site : <http://www-cne.mesr.fr>.
- CNE (Comité national d'évaluation des établissements publics à caractère scientifique, culturel et professionnel) (1996). *L'Institut Universitaire de formation des maîtres de l'Académie de Lyon*. Rapport d'évaluation. Novembre 1996. Available on web site : <http://www-cne.mesr.fr>.
- CNE (Comité national d'évaluation des établissements publics à caractère scientifique, culturel et professionnel) (1997). *Guide pour l'évaluation interne des IUFM* (février 1997). Available on web site : <http://www-cne.mesr.fr>.
- CNE (Comité national d'évaluation des établissements publics à caractère scientifique, culturel et professionnel) (1997). "Références pour l'évaluation des IUFM", *Bulletin N° 23* - février 1997. Available on web site : <http://www-cne.mesr.fr>.
- COLE A. L. (1989). "Researcher and teacher : partners in theory building". *Journal of education for Teaching*, 15, pp. 225-237.

- COLE A. L. (1997). "Impediments to reflective practice : toward a new agenda for research on teaching." *Teachers and Teaching : theory and practice*, vol. 3, number 1, march 1997, pp. 7-27.
- COLE A. L. & KNOWLES J. G. (1993). "Teacher development partnership research : a focus on methods and issues". *American Educational Research Journal*, 30, pp. 473-495.
- DEMAILLY L., ZAY D. (dir.) (1993). *L'émergence des politiques de recherche dans les IUFM*. Étude de la mise en place d'unités organisationnelles chargées de la recherche au sein des IUFM (septembre 1990-décembre 1992). CLERSE-LASTRÉE URA 345 (Lille I), IFEF (Paris VIII), DRED / IFRESI-CNRS / IUFM Nord-Pas de Calais.
- DEMAILLY L. & ZAY D. (1994). " Gestion de la recherche et formation de formateurs et d'enseignants. À quelles conditions institutionnelles la recherche peut-elle être un outil de formation pour un groupe professionnel? ". *Recherche et Formation*, n° 17, pp. 47-64.
- DEMAILLY L. & ZAY D. (1997). "Politiques et organisations dans la recherche-développement : le cas des Instituts Universitaires de Formation des Maîtres". *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, n° 121, pp. 79-97.
- GOODLAD J. I. (1994). *Educational Renewal*. Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco : Jossey - Bass Publishers.
- HABERMAS J. (1987) - *Théorie de l'agir communicationnel*, traduction J-M. FERRY et J-L. SCHLEGEL, Paris, Fayard, 2 tomes, 1ère éd. 1981.
- HALL B. (1979). "Participatory research : breaking the academic monopoly", in NIEMI J. (ed.) *Viewpoints on adult education*. Dekalb, IL : Northern Illinois University, pp. 43-69.
- HAMMERSLEY M. (1993). "On the teacher as researcher". *Educational Action Research Journal*, 1, pp. 425-445.
- HANDAL G. & LAUVAS P. (1987). *Promoting reflective teaching : supervision in action*. Milton Keynes : The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- HOLMES GROUP (1990). *Tomorrow's schools. Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing: Holmes Group Inc.
- LACROSSE M-C., LECOINTE & REBINGUET M. (1996). "L'évaluation de la politique d'ouverture d'un établissement." In ZAY D. dir. *Enseignants et partenaires de l'école*. Démarches et instruments pour travailler ensemble." Préface d'André de PERETTI. Bruxelles : De Boeck, pp. 165-179. 1ère éd. 1994.
- LECOINTE (1997). *Les enjeux de l'évaluation*. Paris : L'Harmattan.
- LECOINTE M. & REBINGUET M. (1990). *L'audit de l'établissement scolaire*. Paris : Les Éditions d'Organisation.
- LECOINTE M. & REBINGUET M. (1994). *Éthique et pratique de l'audit*. Le cas des audits de formation. Lyon : Chronique Sociale.
- MAGUIRE P. (1987). *Doing participatory research : a feminist approach*. Amhurst, MA : University of Massachusetts.
- OSGUTHORPE, R. T., HARRIS, R. C., FOX HARRIS, M., & BLACK, S. (eds.) (1995). *Partner Schools. Centers for Educational Renewal*. Foreword by John I. Goodlad. San Francisco : Jossey - Bass Publishers.
- SCHÖN, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New-York: Basic Books.
- SCHÖN D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner : toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco : Jossey Bass. National Institute of Education.
- SCHÖN D. A., dir. (1991). *The Reflective Turn.. Case Studies in and on Educational Practice*. New York : Teachers College Press.
- SCHÖN D. A., dir. (1996). *Le tournant réflexif*. Pratiques éducatives et études de cas. Trad. Jacques Heyneman & Dolorès Gagnon. Montréal : Les Éditions Logiques.
- SIROTNIK K. A., GOODLAD J. I. (eds.) (1988). *School-University partnerships in action. Concepts, cases and concerns*, Teachers College, Columbia University, New-York and London, 1988.
- SIROTNIK K. A. (1988). "The meaning and conduct of inquiry in School-University Partnerships". SIROTNIK K. A., GOODLAD J. I. (eds.), op. cit., pp. 169-190.
- ZAY D. (dir.) (1994 a). *La formation des enseignants au partenariat*. Une réponse à la demande sociale ? Paris : PUF.

ZAY D. (1994 b). " Y a-t-il des critères spécifiques de recherche sur un objet de demande sociale ? L'exemple du partenariat ". *L'Année de la Recherche en Sciences de l'Éducation*, n° 1. PUF, pp. 117-134.

ZAY D. (1995). "Goodlad (John I.). - Educational Renewal. Better teachers, better schools. - San Francisco : Jossey - Bass Publishers". *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, n° 111, pp. 118-120.

ZAY D. (1996). "L'évolution de la recherche en éducation à l'AERA (American educational research association)", Table Ronde "Nouveaux objets, nouvelles tendances dans la recherche en éducation et formation", *Deuxième Congrès international d'actualité de la recherche en éducation et formation* organisé par l'AECSE, Paris X-Nanterre, 1-2 et 3 juillet 1996.

ZAY D. (1997 a). "Le partenariat en éducation et en formation : émergence d'une notion transnationale ou d'un nouveau paradigme ?". In " Le partenariat : définitions, enjeux, pratiques ", *Éducation Permanente*, n° 131, coordonné par KADDOURI M. & ZAY D., 1997-2, pp. 13-28.

ZAY D. (1997 b). " How to Make Research Useful for Schools ? The Emergence of Researchers-Practitioners Partnerships through Teacher Education Reform in France ". Communication in " Relating Research and Practice in Teacher Education. International Perspectives" (Division K-Symposium). AERA, *Annual Meeting Program 1997*, March 24-28, Chicago, p.83, ERIC tracking number TMO26574.

ZAY D. (1998). "Schön D. A., dir. (1996). Le tournant réflexif. Pratiques éducatives et études de cas. (The Reflective Turn. Case studies In and On Educational Practice) (Trad. fr. J. Heyneman et D. Gagnon). Montréal : Les Éditions Logiques". *Recherche et Formation*, n° 27, pp.165-167.

ZAY D. (1999 a, in print). " Pratique réflexive". In *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de l'éducation et de la formation*". Paris : Nathan, 2ème édition.

ZAY D. (1999 b). "The French system of Teacher Education and its Evaluation. Changes between 1995-98". In T. SANDER, dir., *Teacher Education in Europe*, a complementary report to SANDER T., BUCHBERGER F., GREAVES A. E., KALLOS D., eds. *Teacher Education in Europe. Évaluation and perspectives*, National Reports prepared for a European Evaluation conference under the SIGMA Pilot Project, of the European Commission, held at the Universität Osnabrück, Germany, June 23 and 24, 1995, Osnabrück, 1996, to be published.

ZAY D., dir. (1999 c). Developing a "Reflective Practice" for the Teaching Profession and Teacher Education through Partnerships between Researchers and Practitioners/Développer une "pratique réflexive" du métier d'enseignant et de la formation par des partenariats entre chercheurs et praticiens. TNTEE-Subnetwork F Report to be published by the TNTEE.

ZAY D. (1999 d, in print). "Thinking the Interactive Interplay between Reflection-Practice-Partnerships. Questions and Points of Tension", in "Conceptualizing Reflective Practice through Partnerships. European Perspectives", an issue co-ordinated by D. Zay. *Curriculum Studies*.

ZAY D. (1999 e, to come). "Penser le jeu interactif entre réflexion-pratique-partenariat. Questions et points de tension", in "Pratique réflexive et partenariat. Théories et perspectives européennes", numéro coordonné par D. Zay. *Spirale*.

ZAY D. (1999 f). "Historical and Theoretical Backgrounds, Methodology/ Problématique, historique et méthodologie" and "Conceptualizing Reflective Practice through Partnerships/ Conceptualiser la pratique réflexive en partenariat", chapters 1 and 2 in Zay D., dir. (1999 c), see above.

ZAY D. & BOURDONCLE R. (1996). "The French System of Teacher Education". In SANDER T., BUCHBERGER F., GREAVES A. E., KALLOS D., eds., *Teacher Education in Europe. Évaluation and perspectives*, National Reports prepared for a European Evaluation conference under the SIGMA Pilot Project, of the European Commission, held at the Universität Osnabrück, Germany, June 23 and 24, 1995, Osnabrück, 1996, pp. 127-162.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

AERA
1999

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <u>Collaborative Research and Evaluation in French Teacher Education</u>	
Author(s): <u>Danielle ZAY</u>	
Corporate Source: <u>Université Charles de Gaulle Lille 3</u> <u>France</u>	Publication Date: <u>1999 April</u>

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <u>Sample</u> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
--

1

Level 1



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <u>Sample</u> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A



Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <u>Sample</u> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B



Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign
here,→
please

Signature: <u>D. Zay</u>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <u>Professor Danielle ZAY</u>
Organization/Address: <u>Université Charles de Gaulle Lille 3</u> <u>Domaine universitaire du "Pont de Bois"</u> <u>59653 Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex France</u>	Telephone: <u>(33) 01 42 27 68 98</u> E-Mail Address: <u>zay@univ-lille3.fr</u> FAX: <u>idem</u> Date: <u>April 21, 1999</u>



(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility

1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080

Toll Free: 800-799-3742

FAX: 301-953-0263

e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>



(Rev. 9/97)

PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.