MindMerge   News

This contains more important information-please read!

Consortium takes off!

By now, nearly all partners have signed their MoUs and logged on to EPSS

If you have had a reminder about the Memorandum of Understanding or EPSS, please take action now. The process needs to be completed by June 8th. Please contact Hilde Roysland if there is anything you need to be resolved.

Possible new acronym for consideration:

Michel Grangeat proposes BoosterR as

Broadcasting
of
operative
science
teacher
education
research
Results

What do you think?

Deliverables - an awesome list!

I don't like the word 'deliverables' but that is what we have to provide from the project. Based on the materials provided by partners, we already have a list comprising 74 identifiable deliverables, a mixture of reports, video material, workshops, training modules, web resources and conferences.

There are several contributions still to come - if you are in the process of writing something, I will need it by Friday evening in order to get it into the draft proposal.

The deliverables list

I am trying out another new acronym: Production of Deliverables (**PoDs**). PoDs are essentially work packages but are very tightly linked to deliverables. The reviewers will expect to see the connections between work, deliverable and impact being made very clearly in the proposal. Furthermore, each PoD must have a coherent role in the overall project. At the moment the list is not very coherent, which is to be expected at this stage.

Attached to this mailing you will find a list of work packages (or PoDs - see below). This list is incomplete, sketchy and provisional - I am very happy to receive corrections, additions or deletions. It has been produced on the basis of material contributed by partners. You will see that some of the thematic WPs have more PoDs than others, and there may be some PoDs which should be moved to other thematic areas. You may not even recognise your contribution. I apologise, but we needed this list quickly.

Also, the PoDs so far do not explicitly indicate how they will be linked between partners. This is one purpose of the thematic WPs, which will be the 'spaces' where connections between PoDs will be realised. However, it is also up to partners to identify areas of mutual interest with other partners and to make explicit connections within and between PoDs.

There is an opportunity here for imaginative exchanges of people between PoDs, institutions, national contexts and thematic WPs. We can encourage the mobility of researchers (it's not a research project, but...) teacher educators and teachers, in order to build the pan-European dimension of the project.

Finally, the list has been annotated with lower and upper estimates of person-months required to produce the deliverable, and a single estimate of professorial or other senior staff time for management and supervision of the PoD. These are entirely provisional at this stage and there will have to be some quick calculations made at partner level

Grenoble meeting - agenda

We now have a list of who is coming to Grenoble, which is at the end of the newsletter.

As regards the agenda, we have the following suggestions (numbers in brackets refer to papers which will be circulated prior to the meeting or copied for participants):

0900-0910 Welcome and practical arrangements - Michel Grangeat & IUFM colleagues

0910-0930 Brief personal introductions including area of interest - all participants. we will also provide introductions to absent partners (Paper1)

0930-0935 General introduction and welcome to the project - Geir Karlsen, NTNU (Paper 2)

0935-0945 Outline of progress so far and what remains to be done - Peter Gray (Paper 3)

0945 - 0955 Administrative requirements - Hilde Roysland, NTNU (Paper 4)

0955-1005 Financial and budget issues - Per Andresen, NTNU (Paper 5)

1005-1015 Questions not covered already, short break

1015 - 1100 Presentation of Draft Proposal section B (the first 20 pages) - Peter Gray (Paper 6) This will be an interactive session where we will be able to alter the draft as we proceed.

1100-1115 Coffee break

1115 - 1200 Discussion in three groups:

Group one - terminology

Group two - emerging themes

Group three - achieving impact

1200-1230 Plenary discussion

1230-1300 Introduction to Work package section - Peter Gray (Paper 7)

1300-1400 Lunch, courtesy of IUFM

Work Package Drafts- outline and discussion led by WP leaders (or project leader if not decided)

1400-1430 WP1 - management structures and arrangements - GK

1430-1450 WP2 - Doris Jorde, University of Oslo

1450-1510 WP3 - Matthias Stadler, IPN

1510-1530 -WP4 - Michel Grangeat, UPMF

1530-1545 Coffee break

1545-1605 WP5 - Teacher education - TBA

1605-1625 - WP6 - Scientific Literacy - Bob Evans

1625-1645 - WP7 - Argumentation - Maria Pilar Jiminez Aleixandre/Margareta Enghag

1645-1700 Indicators - Tina Seidel (slides)

1700-1715 Media - Peter Gray

1715-1800 Final discussion and summing up - GK

This will be a long day but by the end of it we should have agreement on the overall form and content of the proposal.

In the evening Michel has arranged dinner at Chez Margo in Grenoble, we will leave the Hotel around 1930 and walk there.

On Tuesday we have a room booked at the University where anyone who does not have a flight in the morning or anything better to do, can finish off the proposal, or consult with us about specific issues.

We will arrange transport back to Geneva airport as necessary.

the Work Packages - overview

WP1 deals with the overall management, coordination and success of the project.

WP2 will gather evidence about policy in relation to innovative practices in science education and their impact on teacher education

WP3 will extend the learning from the SINUS and Sinus-transfer projects into the field of European teacher education

WP4 brings together current research in several partner countries which looks at the role of teacher collaboration and teachers' collective work in bringing innovative methods to bear on problems in science education, including problems of diversity.This will include the role of micro-collectives in mentoring new teachers

WP5 addresses teacher education practice in relation to science education, from initial teacher education to lifelong learning for teachers and teacher educators. It will be particularly concerned with actions to overcome the problems faced by new teachers in adopting innovative methods.

WP6 will connect current thinking in the field of scientific literacy to current thinking in the areas of teacher competence development. It will also include consideration of cross-disciplinary methods such as the use of drama, narrative and competition, and the roles of technology and enterprise education in promoting scientific literacy.

WP7 pursues questions of argumentation and dialogic teaching within the overall context of improving science education through teacher education. Since argumentation and discourse are central to the kinds of constructivist classrooms in which genuine inquiry-based science can be pursued, science teachers need to be equipped with the conceptual tools and practical skills to facilitate dialogic teaching. This work package will also include work on disciplinary differences in relation to constructions and conceptions of science in the classroom.

WP8 complements the other WPs by developing and coordinating a variety of instruments, indicators and methods by which the success of the project actions can be measured. This is essential for the scientific quality of the project, but we also intend that the instruments and indicators will be intrinsically useful to science teachers and teacher educators in formative assessment of practice.

Finally, **WP9** will focus on the development of deliverables from all the work packages, with the task of ensuring production quality and extensive dissemination. In the case of deliverables which take the form of events, the objective will be to use technology to capture learning outcomes. In the case of training packages, we will aim to produce re-usable models and materials which can be delivered directly to teachers or used to train teacher educators. The work of WP9 will also involve media collaborations in order to improve young people's image of science education as required by the Call.

The Grenoble meeting: June 16th

Although we plan to circulate a draft proposal before the meeting, it is your project and we are expecting to change many aspects of the document as a result of your input. It will also provide an opportunity to establish relationships within and across the work packages, based on mutual discussion of the issues involved and expertise required.

As the deadlines have been very tight for the project, we fully understand if you are unable to come to the Grenoble meeting. Given the size of the project and the fantastic quality of the people involved it would be surprising if everyone was able to attend. We will make every effort to keep people informed and consulted. It will be necessary for the smooth running of the project to accept that meetings have to go ahead and take

action with less than the full complement of partners.

IF you aren't coming…
We would still like to have your virtual presence at the meeting, so if you can send a brief introduction to yourself, your institution and your contribution to the project, with a digital photograph, we will at least be able to read something and have a wall display of all the partners.

Travel to Grenoble
We now have everyone's travel details except for those colleagues from France making their own way to the meeting. You will be met at Geneva either by Peter or by another colleague. We will make ourselves visible at the arrivals gate. In emergency contact Peter's mobile 00 33 (0) 684 88 07 97, or his Landline 00 33 (0) 476 09 86 11.

Similar arrangements will apply in reverse on Tuesday to take you back to Geneva (with a different driver)

www.hotel-gallia.com

 Directions to the hotel and meeting venue will be circulated once we have confirmed your attendance.

We regret that there is currently no funding for hotels and travel costs. Hilde Roysland will be able to issue an official invitation if your institution requires one.

Contact	email
Geir Karlsen - project leader & WP1	Geir.karlsen@plu.ntnu.no
Peter Gray - project coordinator	graypb@gmail.com

Contact	email
Hilde Røysland - project administrator	hilde.roysland@svt.ntnu.no
Leader WP2	doris.jorde@ils.uio.no
Leader WP3	prenzel@ipn.uni-kiel.de
Leader WP4 & coordinator for Grenoble	michel.grangeat@upmf-grenoble.fr
Leaders WP 5/6/7	To be arranged
Leader WP8	Tina.Seidel@uni-jena.de

We look forward to a productive partnership and an enjoyable collaboration!

Participants Confirmed for Grenoble

Name	From
Geir Karlsen	Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim
Hilde Roysland	as above
Per Andresen	As above
Margareta Enghag	Mälardalen University, Vasteras, Sweden
Matthias Stadler	IPN, Kiel, Germany
Dalius Dapkus	Vilnius Pedagogical University, Lithuania
Nijole Ciuciulkiene	Kaunas Technological University, Lithuania
Doris Jorde	University of Oslo, Norway
Michel Grangeat	Université Pierre Mendes-France, Grenoble

Name	From
Gerard Sénsevy	IUFM/CREAD/ Université de Haute-Bretagne, France
Andrée Tiberghien	Université Lyon-2, France
Jim McNally	University of Stirling, Scotland, UK
Allan Blake	as above
Colin Smith	University of Stirling, Scotland, UK
Maria Pilar Jiminez Aleixandre	University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain
Bob Evans	University of Copenhagen
Iva Stuchlikova	University of Southern Bohemia, Czech Republic
Jan Petr	As above
Liselott Forsman	Abo Akademi University, Finland
Peter Gray	Co-ordinator

Thinking allowed

Work Packages - Supply vs Demand

Currently we have around 70-80 possible deliverables, all of which are relevant to the project in some way. Most of them are based on existing projects, for good reasons. However, if we were to start from a clean sheet, what would be the ideal deliverables and how would they achieve their impact on the two problems stated in the Call?

Let's start at the beginning: what do we know, what are we assuming and what tools do we have?

What we know

We know that science education in Europe is not homogeneous, from (e.g.) Eurydice reports. We know that recruitment into some University science courses is falling as a proportion of overall student numbers. We know from the ROSE project that attitudes towards some aspects of science are less positive in the developed European countries than elsewhere.

What we assume

We assume that science teaching and learning in Europe is of variable quality, because of the PISA results and because of other research which shows that teacher quality is an important variable. Therefore, we also assume that improving the quality of teaching and learning will improve pupil attitudes towards science. And we assume that improving pupil attitudes will also improve recruitment to science (or MST) courses and careers.

What if our assumptions are wrong?

The combination of Mind the Gap and this project will certainly be able to reach strongly-supported conclusions as to whether IBST/E and other innovative methods (MIMES) are effective in improving pupil attitudes and achievements in science. Essentially the answer can be positive - yes they do - or negative - no they don't. It is unscientific to anticpate the answer although on the basis of what we know already it is likely to be Yes.

If it is No, on the other hand, then there will be some explanation as to why MIMES are ineffective. This could point to:

• Socio-economic factors outside school - students have different priorities

• Problems with implementation of MIMES, e.g. teachers inadequately prepared

• Use of MIMES creates different criteria for measurement or assessment of results, e.g. need for formative assessment of investigative activity

We can't do much about the first explanation, but we can show results on the second and third, whether or not the verdict on IBST/E is positive.

What tools do we have?

We should consider the deliverables as tools rather than shelf decoration, although we will try to make them attractive for that purpose too. So from that point of view, reports are less likely to be useful than workshops or conferences, which are in turn less useful than training courses or modules. On the other hand, reports can be turned into 'boundary objects' and used to create debate and activity, as indeed the Rocard report has done. So your ideas for implementation should include launch activities for reports and where possible, cupling of written reports with video evidence.

The same applies to web-based ideas - there will have to be extensive activity around any web resource in order to make it work. Who will moderate discussions? Where will the site be used?

One area of information gathering which will be vital in the first stages, and connected to WP2, will be to find out who is buying external training products, and where do these products come from. Are teacher education institutions using outside trainers, or is it local education authorities who are the main customers?

Also, there are no references to parents in any of the material I have seen so far (apologies if I've missed something). We need to take them into account as a special interest group, along with teachers and students of course. Some PoDs needed in this area.

Final thought - this is a huge project in terms of science education research, and supposedly vital to the future of Europe, and yet the budget = half Jose Mourinho's annual salary at Inter Milan.??????

See you in Grenoble, thanks for all your support so far, and apologies for any and all errors.

Peter