

## Centre for Educational Research and Innovation



### ICT and Initial Teacher Training

23-24 February 2009

Venue:

OECD, Conference Centre, CC16  
2, Rue André Pascal  
Paris 75016

The meeting started with a short welcome by *Francesc Pedró, OECD/CERI* followed by a brief presentation of the 19 participants who attended the meeting on the study *ICT in initial teacher training* in order to:

- reach a consensus on the methods and planning;
- discuss and revise procedures and research tools;
- clarify the role of national coordinators and researchers.

Directly after the opening *Francesc Pedró* gave a presentation of the overall methodology and the different tools that will be used. As in each of the following sessions of the meeting, the participants were invited to discuss and to pose clarifying questions.

*Caroline Rizza, Télécom*, presented her findings from a review of policy documents on the issue *ICT and initial teacher training* from the 30 OECD-countries and Chile, which have joined the study. Her main sources to find the policies for the study have been the OECD and UNESCO libraries and web sites, governments' official web sites, Eurybase, the country questionnaires (which were sent out to the delegations at the beginning of January, 2009) and key persons, of which, some were in the meeting. She classified the policies in three main categories: 1) relevant information is missing, 2) developing awareness to the stakes of ICT in initial teacher training, and 3) inclusion of ICT in initial teacher training at different levels. The last category included four sub-categories depending on the level of inclusion. Most countries belonged to the third category. Supplementary information is still to be provided from a few countries. Some additional information in this respect was given directly from the participants in the meeting.

The following speaker was *Veijo Meisalo, University of Helsinki*. His task was to discuss the suggestions for questionnaires. He identified a few weaknesses which were discussed. There was consensus on the necessity for flexibility concerning the different contexts. All questions are not relevant in all countries, and some questions have to be modified or localized for each country, even if the language in general is the same. It was consequently decided that a set of questionnaires be developed for each country in order to address the different contexts.

Tuesday morning started with a session by *Anne Todd Leftwich, Indiana University*, where discussed the sampling and selection of institutions and stakeholders. As in the meeting in October, one of the partici-

pants raised the issue on the delicate matter of how to select 'the best' institution. For those countries who find this difficult, a system of peer review was proposed: the government – or corresponding – describes a handful of possible institutions, and researchers within the project can suggest, and finally the OECD staff will take the decision about which institutions will be part of the case studies.

*Terry Haydn, University of East Anglia*, initiated a discussion on the instruments for the case study by distributing an article with the title *The pedagogy of the impressed: How teachers become victims of technological vision* (Andy Convery, 2009). The aim was to open our eyes to the technological rhetoric within education, to look closely at the empirical evidences, and not to claim more than what is possible to see.

The last discussant was *Mario Brun, University of La frontera*, who began by outlining different responsibilities. He stressed the coordination between the research teams and the corresponding government and also the two-sided responsibility of belonging to a national research team as well as an international. This discussion was also about how to keep in touch and to share information easily along the way.

*Francesc Pedró, OECD/CERI*, concluded the meeting with a list of decisions taken:

- The summary and the PowerPoint presentations of the meeting will be circulated (which can hereby be considered as finished).
- The two research reviews (English references and French references) and the policy report will also be circulated as soon as possible.
- A revised planning with dates and deadlines will need to be attended to by the end of February 2009.
- By the end of February 2009 there will also be revised questionnaires with a request to comment within one week.
- A rationale for raising the questionnaires to the institutions will be developed to help motivating institutions to take part in the survey.
- Guidelines for the web-analyses will be provided. This will include an example from the US study.
- More elaborated outlines for the reports, the national ones and the final one, will also be provided.

It was also emphasized in the meeting the need to balance flexibility for the national coordinators with the requirements of a common denominator as a basis for comparison.

We thank all participants for contributing to the fruitful outcome of the meeting.

*Ann-Britt Enochsson, OECD/CERI*