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ABSTRACT

The study describes the design, implementation and evaluation based principally on participants' perceptions, of a Teacher Retraining Program for French Immersion implemented at Simon Fraser University in September, 1985. The program included elements of effective in-service in the context of professional change, language acquisition processes, as well as the means to provide the participants with the knowledge and skills to effectively teach a French Immersion program. It was created, at the request of the Modern Languages Branch, British Columbia Ministry of Education, to respond to the growing need for pedagogically qualified and linguistically competent teachers of French immersion in British Columbia. The program consists of four phases: a) one semester of language training, curriculum, instruction and cultural workshops, and opportunities to observe and work in immersion classrooms; b) one semester of academic coursework oriented toward immersion pedagogy and curriculum; c) an intensive six-week practicum; and, d) six weeks living and studying in a francophone environment.

The purpose of this evaluation study of the Teacher Retraining Program for French Immersion is to provide a combination of descriptive and responsive information in order to offer experiential knowledge to those interested in
understanding the effects of the program on its participants. The intent was that this understanding would lead to a refining of the program where necessary and will deal with the implications of retraining in general. Much of the descriptive information was gathered by the writer during attendance at weekly seminar sessions. The seminar provides a forum for participants to air their concerns, to discuss their successes, and to reflect upon their experiences of the previous week. The responsive information was gathered at various times throughout the program through questionnaires and interviews with participants, instructors, program organizers, school district personnel, and the director of the Modern Languages Branch of the Ministry of Education. The data gathered have been compiled to provide a complete picture of the program with an emphasis on the participants and the change process to which they have committed themselves.

Growth in language development, knowledge and practice of immersion methodology, and participant self-confidence occurred. It was concluded that the chosen elements of effective in-service upon which the program is based have strongly contributed to this growth.
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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

Background Information

This study describes the design, implementation and evaluation (based largely on participants' perceptions) of a Teacher Retraining Program for French Immersion implemented at Simon Fraser University in September, 1985. In a climate of financial restraint over the past four years, and in many cases declining enrolment, school districts in B.C. have suffered cutbacks resulting in, cost saving measures such as, teaching staff reductions. French immersion programs however have experienced a tremendous growth (approximately 25% each year), necessitating the hiring of qualified French immersion teachers from outside of the district, if not from outside of the province. This practice, although not the cause of staff layoffs, was frequently perceived as threatening to teachers in the English programs (Mills, 1985).

Early French immersion involves total instruction in French in the early primary grades, between fifty and sixty percent instruction in French during the intermediate (4-7) grades, tapering down to approximately forty percent to twenty-five percent instruction in French in the secondary (8-12) grades. Late French immersion begins in grade six with one hundred percent instruction in French, while in grade seven, students receive between sixty to eighty percent instruction in French. The percentage of French instruction for late immersion students in the secondary grades is parallel to that of
early immersion students. In the mid-seventies in British Columbia, French immersion was offered in only three school districts to approximately 1,000 students. By the mid-eighties, twenty-seven school districts offered French immersion to approximately 12,400 students, (Shapson, 1985).

In an attempt to ease political friction and to assist School Districts in their hiring, the Modern Languages Branch, of the British Columbia Ministry of Education, requested proposals from the three major post-secondary institutions in the province for programs aiming to retrain teachers presently teaching in the English program. The University of Victoria (Department of French Language and Literature) and Simon Fraser University (Faculty of Education) subsequently submitted proposals and received approval for funding from the Modern Languages Branch.

The Modern Languages Branch undertook the task of linguistically screening candidates for the two programs. Development of the screening process was undertaken in consultation with the two institutions as well as with representatives from the French Education Department at the University of British Columbia. The process consisted of three phases; a self-evaluation, a written test, and an oral interview. Winnowing occurred after each phase. In September of 1985, each program registered twelve participants.

This study focuses on the retraining program offered at Simon Fraser University. Although questionnaires and interviews were administered to participants of the UVIC program, much more observation time was spent at the SFU site, creating a richer and thus
more informative bank of qualitative data.

The purpose of this evaluation study of the Teacher Retraining Program (TRP) for French Immersion was also to provide descriptive and responsive information in order to offer experiential knowledge to those interested in the effects of the program on its participants. It was hoped that this understanding would lead to a refining of the program towards offering the best possible means of retraining teachers for French immersion. This study also hopes to test the TRP in relation to recent theories of effective in-service, French immersion methodology and language acquisition.

The responsive and descriptive information was gathered throughout the duration of the TRP through questionnaires, interviews, classroom observations, and attendance at meetings with participants, instructors, program organizers, school district personnel, and the director of the funding agency.

Program Description

The TRP involves full-time study for one year, while the clients are practicing teachers on leave from their school districts. The design of the SFU Teacher Retraining Program for French Immersion was based on recent findings on the process of educational change. Many factors must be present in order for successful change and implementation to occur. Teacher commitment (Palmer, 1978; Joyce, 1981; Bush, 1971), teacher input (Hall & Loucks, 1979), teacher interaction (Fullan, 1982), teachers' sense of efficacy (Ashton, 1984; Dembo & Gibson, 1984), a supportive
environment (Fullan, 1982), and on-going evaluation and feedback (Joyce, Hersch & McKibbon, 1983) are necessary elements in a teacher retraining/in-service program. The SFU model was designed with these factors in mind. The program was also based on Joyce and Showers' (1984) work on the process of collegial coaching.

Recent trends in French immersion education research emphasize a communicative approach whereby students speak French for functional reasons (Allen, 1985; Tardif, 1985). Although some formal language study is needed (Calvé, 1985; Nemni, 1985), to truly acquire the language, students must use it, and to use it, they must have a reason for using it (Krashen et al., 1984). The SFU program was designed following this premise. While some language coursework was offered, the bulk of the participants' language development occurred 'on the job' -- in the French immersion classrooms during observation and practica phases, or during courses on curriculum, cultural studies, and French immersion methodology generally and in specific subject areas.

**Statement of the Problem**

The TRP is unique in that it is a retraining program for practicing teachers. Many pre-service immersion teaching programs have been implemented in various Canadian universities, however they are designed for students who are striving to become qualified teachers. Several in-service immersion teaching programs exist as well. In-service programs are aimed at practicing teachers but are distinctive from a retraining process because they serve to refresh or
upgrade teachers who are already teaching a particular curriculum or program. In-service programs usually take the form of coursework or workshops offered outside of the normal teaching schedule, either after school, on weekends or during the summer. Rarely are they offered in conjunction with active support in the classroom (Fullan, 1982).

A retraining program is aimed at practicing teachers wishing to change direction within their education career. Based on the writer's review of the literature, one should define retraining as an intense, full-time process, undertaken during regular teaching hours. It is combined with teaching experiences in the classroom and provides direct, on-the-job support in a protective environment (Joyce & Showers, 1984). This element allows the retrainee to learn by applying new knowledge, trying out newly acquired skills, and making mistakes if necessary, in a non-evaluative situation.

Although many universities across the country offer pre-service and in-service immersion teaching courses and programs (Wilton, Obadia, Roy, Saunders, & Tafler, 1984), the TRP at Simon Fraser University (SFU) is also unique since the program participants have not yet become masters of the language in which they hope to be teaching. Most immersion teacher training programs will accept only those students who can demonstrate a native-like fluency in the language. Through the screening process, the TRP participants have all been judged as being fair to good speakers and writers of French with the realization that much study and practice lay ahead for them to acquire a natural fluency in the language.
The major objectives of the TRP were to provide an immersion setting in which the participants will study and use the language in practical, functional situations and to provide learning situations in which the participants would internalize current methods specific to French immersion teaching. The first objective would help them develop their oral and written fluency to a level acceptable to school districts looking for good linguistic models in their immersion classrooms. The second objective would help them to develop skills in teaching French immersion which involves the constant marrying of content knowledge and language skill development. The TRP is unique then, in that it is most like a real life immersion situation in which teachers (the TRP instructors) are using curricula as a vehicle for language acquisition on the part of the students (TRP participants). It is also unique in that the participants are already qualified, practicing teachers, and it was intended that these teachers be 'sponsored' by their school districts and recommended as probable candidates for immersion teaching positions in the following year. It must be mentioned here that this latter criteria is one determined by the SFU program and that due to a variety of factors the criteria of official sponsorship by a school district could not be realized in year one. Further details of the participant group and the TRP will be provided in chapter three.

The organization and emphases of this study have been determined by the writer in collaboration with program organizers who expressed interest in discovering not only whether the objectives of the TRP are being met, but also in the effects of this
change process on the participants. The research questions which therefore provide the focus for the formative evaluation (Stufflebeam, 1983) of the TRP program at SFU are:

1. What changes in attitude, concerns, and motivation do the participants experience as they progress through the program? Almost all the participants have taken great risks (financial, professional and personal) in undertaking this year long commitment to professional change. It is therefore incumbent upon the writer, in accordance with program organizers, to examine the development of the above aspects of the participants.

2. Are the objectives of the program realistic? Do they correspond with the needs of the participants, and if so, are they met? Does the program help the participants develop confidence to face a new professional situation? If not, is the program flexible enough to change direction in accordance with the perceived needs of the participants?

3. Will the participants become skillful enough in immersion teaching and knowledgeable of French immersion issues to meet hiring standards of school districts?

4. Will the participants' linguistic skills improve sufficiently to meet hiring standards of school districts?
This study attempted to answer these questions yet the writer remained open to addressing other issues as they arose throughout the study. It was not the intent of this study to systematically and objectively determine the worth of the TRP by rendering a judgement "based on the accumulated evidence about how it compared with similar objects in meeting the needs of consumers..." but rather to "... collect and report data and judgements to assist the development of an object" (Stufflebeam, 1983, p. 123).

This study, in describing the program and presenting its outcomes, will attempt to show whether a retraining program based on principals of educational change, language acquisition and French immersion methodology, can effectively help teachers in their endeavor to become French immersion teachers by meeting the hiring standards of school districts in British Columbia.
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The first section of this chapter provides a description of recent findings in the research on in-service. The reality of teaching as described by educational writers will then be examined, followed by a summary of problems of traditional models of in-service education. Reported elements of effective in-service will be discussed and a description of what various researchers consider to be ideal in-service models will ensue. The review will be completed by a brief discussion on motivation factors for teachers to participate in professional growth activities.

The second section of this chapter looks at a design for a teacher retraining program for French immersion based on Michael Fullan's (1982) suggested elements for effective in-service, recent theories on language acquisition, and contemporary trends in French immersion teacher education.

Theories of Educational Change

Through Teacher In-service

The Reality of Teaching

It is said that today's society is an extremely diverse one with few commonalities providing a focus for educators (Dillon Peterson, 1981). This coupled with the tremendous breadth of expectations for teachers has resulted in a 'survival' attitude on the part of teachers which is reflected in the design of many existing in-service models.
Teachers are under pressure not only to teach the basics better but to ensure the personal, social, and physical needs of students are more than adequately met. They are given these responsibilities and encouraged to participate in professional growth programs yet they are given few if any decision-making powers. Lack of time and direct upper administration support, decreasing budgets, and political tension contribute to low levels of growth and participation. "The spring of each school year is better symbolized by dismissal letters and budget acts than it is by opportunities for new collaborative planning around improvement" (McLauchlin and Marsh, 1979, p.91).

Teachers have become accustomed to teaching in isolation largely because most local systems do not promote processes which encourage a collegial spirit. This results in a brewing cynicism, little opportunity for clinical work and experimentation, and pressure to teach in a traditional fashion.

Trying alternatives is a risky business. For one thing, when teachers explore a new teaching strategy, their performance suffers in that they are less comfortable with the new than with the old... other teachers and community members are suspicious of awkwardness in performance. However, initial awkwardness is a condition of the acquisition of a new teaching approach. A social climate that encourages risk taking and provides a protective haven in which to experiment with teaching is essential in order to combat the pressures that strip the profession of lively alternatives in favour of the normative model. (Joyce, 1981, p. 123)
Of the teachers that do participate in in-service programs, many of them see it as a "convenient way to pile up units, which will move a teacher horizontally across the pay schedule" (Allen, 1971, p. 109), while relatively few perceive it as a means of improving their classroom performance and contributing to their professional development.

Problems with Traditional Approaches to In-service

Schiffer (1979) explains that the mediocre results of in-service programs are, in part, due to extremes in planning foci. Either they are biased toward fulfilling organizational goals, overlooking values of the school and the needs of teachers, or they don't deal with organizational change at all while concentrating solely on personal change.

Fullan (1982) states that the in-service model of the late seventies and eighties likely consists of one-shot workshops or a series of workshops given by an 'expert' in the field of a current educational development. Provision for individualization consists of offering choices among the available workshops or, in the case of a special request, approval by a professional development committee with teacher and board office representation. There is a lack of planning for the entire process of change and therefore resources are not available for consistent and valuable follow up to ensure transfer of techniques and skills.

Frequently, teachers are exposed in a workshop to sequence theory, practice theory, or whatever, and then naively expected
to apply this theory magically and correctly in their practice ... Too frequently teachers are not observed or coached after in-service; consequently, they never translate the new learning into their teaching, or it appears in a form that is not as productive as it could be. (Hunter, 1985, p. 60)

Hunter goes on to describe one of the major problems of today's in-service programs as a patchwork effect created by lack of coordination and planning, resulting in the teachers seeing "no relationship between the patches" (p. 60).

Fullan (1982) concurs with Hunter and warns that "solutions directed at any one factor in isolation will have minimal impact" (p. 9). He stresses that the major reasons why many in-service programs do not succeed are, a) they are ad-hoc and fragmented, and b) they ignore the "realities of everyday work of teachers and administrators" (p. 9).

In 1980, at a symposium held at Simon Fraser University, Fullan described the British Columbia in-service experience as suffering from this "one-shot workshop syndrome" (p. 24). More often than not, the topics are decided upon by someone other than the recipients, there is no follow up, evaluations are minimal, and the process does not deal with the social system of the school. In the writer's experience, it has been observed that local administrators are very good at espousing the latest research on, and effectiveness of, school-based in-service and careful planning, but in close analysis it is not wholly acted upon. They fall into the pattern of condoning
"instant solutions to long term problems" (Dillon-Peterson, 1981, p. 5) which take the form of "crash training courses in new teaching techniques, cursory introduction of new 'teacher proof' curriculum materials, ... in-service days with little or no follow up, college type courses or large group presentation by an outside consultant" (p. 15).

Despite research indicating the effectiveness of long term planning, problem solving approaches using homogeneous teacher grouping, sessions based on teacher needs, and provision of time, most in-service programs consist of expert/lecture presentations, and no on the job support via coaching practices in order to ensure maximum transfer and application of skill and knowledge. "What we have done to ourselves is create a staff development ecology in which we very rarely put together the elements we know we learn from" (Joyce, 1980, p. 31).

In districts where a consultative support staff is provided, most often the consultants are appointed because they are experts in their curricular field, not because they have demonstrated effective consulting skills. Fullan (1982) considers effective consulting skills to include the ability to plan, organize, and facilitate groups of teachers with varying abilities, concerns, and levels of interest. Job descriptions for consultants are open-ended enough so they eventually find that they're carrying overlapping responsibilities which in turn makes it difficult for them to gain credibility and trust from their colleagues. For example, a consultant who is hired mainly as a facilitator and a curriculum advisor in a supportive nature, may also find himself being asked by district administrators to evaluate. He
will soon find classroom doors closing if he is perceived as one who makes judgements about teachers' actions in the classroom. Also, more often than not, they are part of a district which does not have a coordinated process in place for professional development and curriculum implementation yet they are continuously expected to effect change (Fullan, 1982).

All of this has left us with a scene where those who are the most powerful implementers of change (the teachers), are not being serviced nor utilized effectively. The teacher's right and responsibility to see that his professional aspirations are fulfilled, and integrity and sophistication are respected, have been overlooked by education decision makers. To remedy this problem, Rubin (1978) calls for "an effective machinery that will generate professional growth among teachers as a necessary precondition to rational change and better schools" (p. 32).

Elements of Effective In-service Programs

The demand during the sixties and seventies for more knowledge on the science of the change process was very clear (Carlsen, 1965; Pellegrin, 1965; Cane, 1973; James, 1973; Watkins, 1973; Rubin, 1978). Fullan (1982), in his book 'The Meaning of Educational Change" responded by analysing the change process carefully and setting forth steps for action for those involved in the planning, implementation and continuation of educational change.

In 1971, Rubin stated that educational change results from shifts in educational policies which reflect changing social values, financial limitation, and population shifts. Fullan takes this further
by adding that we can take it for granted "that there will always be pressure for educational change in pluralistic and/or externally influenced societies" (p. 13). The purposes of those exerting the pressure are usually well intended in that they are seen as an improvement to the system. These 'improvements' are of course relative and must be interpreted by those in charge of making educational decisions for the benefit of students and society. In order for these people to make sound decisions, they must consider the available process as well as the content, since, if the innovation cannot be implemented properly it will likely have little effect. As Fullan stated "...the practitioner interested in planning and bringing about change requires a theory of changing" (p. 96), and "... a theory of changing should be judged only in terms of whether it is successfully implemented" (p. 98).

Fullan suggests three dimensions to consider collectively when planning an innovation; beliefs, teaching practices, and resources. What people do and think are crucial considerations. Simply put, "Educational change is technically simple and socially complex" (p. 54). As Leithwood, Holmes, & Montgomery (1979) concur, "Attempting to bring about change is, in essence, an attempt to influence individuals or groups to decide to do something different" (p. 70).

Fullan also points out that all those affected by the change will experience concerns regarding practices, beliefs, goals, and implementation. It is very important for a mechanism to be in place to facilitate dealing with these concerns and to give meaning to the change.
The first step in pursuing an innovation is its adoption which is the process leading to and including the decision to proceed. This phase entails ensuring, a) the advocacy of all those concerned, b) resources, including time, will be available to help teachers implement the change, and c) a solid plan for implementation and evaluation. The second step, implementation, is the experience of putting the innovation into practice and helping the teachers understand the change, for it is at this stage when real change is at stake. A demonstrable change in practice is called for, and to ensure success, several factors must be considered. The innovation must be perceived to be needed by those undergoing the change, its objectives must be clear, its scope must be kept fairly simple, and its quality and practicality must be of high caliber. This is often the stage where modifications are made to suit individual situations, however Hoyle (1973) warns us to be cautious of

...knocking off the corners to get it through the doors of the school ie: completely transforming the innovation in order to bring it in line with prevailing beliefs and procedures and thereby robbing it of its innovative character. (p. 93)

Continuation is the final stage where, after a complete evaluation of the innovation's effectiveness, it is either dropped or continued.

It takes a fortunate combination of the right factors- a critical mass to support and guide the process of resocialization which respects the maintenance needs of individuals and groups and
at the same time facilitates, stimulates, prods people to change through a process of incremental and detrimental fits and starts on the way to institutionalizing or discontinuing the change in question. (Fullan, 1982, p. 72)

Fullan suggests the key is the resocialization factor involved in bringing about the change. It doesn't really matter who initiates the change, but how it is carried out is crucial. Combining knowledge about the nature of the change process, an understanding of the phases of change, and the ability to remaining flexible throughout, will help to ensure the success of many educational innovations.

In describing the Rand Change Agent Study, McLaughlin and Marsh (1979) also outline the factors necessary for successful innovations to occur. First there must exist an institutional motivation tied to a broad-based, collaborative approach to change. Active commitment must be evident from all levels of the system. Secondly, there must be a planned strategy for the implementation of the project. Staff training activities and staff support activities must accompany clear objectives for the project. Thirdly, institutional leadership must be prevalent whereby administrators provide continuity where staff changeovers occur. The attitude of the administrator has a direct bearing on the perceived legitimacy of the project. Finally, teachers' sense of efficacy is extremely important to the success of the innovation. This can be affected by the approach used in the planning and adoption stages. If the teachers have a feeling of ownership, if the change has meaning and relevance for
them, then the chances of positive results are great.

The key to effective in-service education is a process oriented approach. The education system should have an integrated framework to support the exchange of ideas, the enhancement of enthusiasm, and the promotion of problem-solving capabilities (Dillon-Peterson, 1981). This aspect of organizational development is a process based on research and broad-based participation, the goals of which are to "...effectively solve problems, initiate needed changes, and provide support for their members" (Roark & Davis, 1981, p. 37).

Within the framework of the various models of in-service, almost invariably time is emphasized as a crucial factor of the process of implementing a change or encouraging continuous professional development. In general, in-service is now undertaken on weekends or after school when receptiveness is at a low ebb. If teachers are to be supported in their quest for instructional improvement and continuing growth, then time will have to be provided and/or responsibilities will have to be lightened.

Other important elements of the teacher in-service education process, as outlined below, constitute a general consensus on the part of contemporary educational researchers and writers. An effective in-service program will incorporate a collaborative, broad-based participation in its design. Teachers, principals, and administrators will all have input as to its format and content (Fullan, 1982; Joyce, Hersch, and McGibbon, 1983).

In-service education should be designed to improve groups of teachers working on a common problem. The most likely identifiable
groups would be a school staff or department who collectively
determine a problem meriting attention and decide on the steps to
implement in order to solve the problem. This collective
determination promotes commitment by all parties and is more likely
to succeed. An actively supportive administration which openly sets
the in-service process as a priority and which offers specific
implementation support will make all the difference to the in-service
education program. No matter how sincere verbal encouragement may
be, a general support is not enough. The support must be explicit and
reflected through action.

The successful teacher in-service education process will be a
continuous and self renewing one so that teachers may benefit from it
throughout their career. This is not to say that all teachers will
constantly be seeking change and growth through the system, but they
will go through stages whereby they will be heavily involved in the
process of change and stages when they will not be involved in the
process set up for in-service education. There will also be times
when a teacher will be giving to the process much more than he is
taking from it. The important element is that the process be
constantly intact and supported.

The accommodation of individual differences in teachers should
be incorporated into the process as well. Teachers learn in different
ways and on different levels (Allen, 1971; Corno & Clark, 1978; Bents
& Howey, 1981). In order for all to benefit from the process, they
should be able to profit from activities geared to their style of
learning.
Any model or process for teacher in-service education should be based on sound research, as it is this solid starting point which gives direction and clarification to goals and objectives. The 'why' and 'where' are as important as, and serve as a basis for the 'what' and 'how'. An understanding of the problem is essential if goals are to be clear and accepted by those participating.

**Ideal in-service models**

As mentioned earlier, the elements of effective in-service outlined above are generally espoused by educational researchers. Some specific models however are of interest to illustrate the different ways in which these elements can be combined.

Joyce (1980) outlines components of training which are necessary for successful implementation or transfer of learning. Presentation, modeling, practice, and feedback, in combination, are very effective. He emphasizes however, a fifth element, coaching for application, which is essential for some teachers. In 1981, he described the coaching element as, a) providing companionship to combat the isolation so prevalent in teaching, b) giving objective technical feedback, c) analyzing application to determine appropriate use, d) providing ideas on how to adapt the students to change, and e) offering a personal facilitation process which helps to keep up self confidence during a vulnerable time of trial and error.

Hall and Louck's (1979) Concerns-Based-Adoption-Model (CBAM) emphasizes meeting the individual needs of teachers who encounter a wide variety of issues and problems. It is a process which meets and
Teacher Retraining Program

deals with the concerns and provides alternative approaches in accommodating all teachers' needs regardless of their level of concern or ability.

The Aptitude-Treatment-Interaction (ATI) model (Corno & Clark, 1978) also strives toward the individualization of teacher in-service education by identifying groups of teachers with similar learning styles and subsequently designing professional development programs which compliment their specific learning style.

Day (1981) writes of a classroom-based in-service model, the basis of which is Interactive Theory of Change. A client-centered, facilitative but confrontational approach is used to create a cognitive dissonance in the teacher forcing him to clarify his beliefs and adjust his practices accordingly. The facilitative skills of the helper are of capital importance since the model is based on a trusting professional relationship. The use of trained facilitators in professional growth is also discussed by Lipitt and Fox (1971).

The Clinical Supervision model, developed in the sixties, also uses direct confrontation with the teacher in order to help him understand the direct consequences of his instructional actions (Fischler, 1971). The combined use of planned conferences, classroom observation, and feedback conference, is a means of promoting 'the professional development of teachers, with an emphasis on improving teachers' classroom performance' (Atcheson & Gall, 1980, p. 1).

Wood, Thompson, & Russell (1981) outline the stages of an effective in-service education model. The readiness stage involves, a) ensuring a healthy school climate exists through clear and open
communication, b) collectively determining needs, c) obtaining support, d) outlining expectations, and e) forming a long term plan. The planning stage is used to set out a specific process for implementation and is followed by the training stage where intense orientation activities are provided. The implementation stage is the carrying out of the plan but should be undertaken with a commitment to follow up assistance by district leaders and resource personnel. The final stage, maintenance, ensures continuous monitoring and adjustment of the innovation.

On paper, there seems to be no reason why these models of effective in-service should not be successful. Many of the writers follow up their descriptions with accounts of successful innovations based on their model. Many of the innovations however have occurred in an experimental setting where intervention has produced the ideal conditions for their implementation. The real world of education does not always comply with these conditions and instead provides barriers to them. For example, in the school district of Surrey (≠36) British Columbia, a well established program of week long courses for teachers in collegial/clinical supervision was severely curtailed due to job action by teachers related to contract issues.

Regardless of the theoretical basis for each of the models mentioned above, their appears a common thread in their application - that of allowing teachers to work in their own educational setting on a one to one basis with a facilitator or coach. Whether it be a fellow teacher, district consultant, school principal, or a course instructor, it appears that the direct support of someone who the teacher trusts
is crucial to the success of any attempt at change.

Motivation Factors

In addressing the problem of motivation for teachers to participate in an on-going, growth oriented in-service education program, educational writers offer a variety of suggestions. Britton (1973) comes out strongly against financial compensation used as a reward, and suggests that since students are compelled to attend school, teacher attendance at in-service activities should be compulsory as well. He does however qualify his statement by saying "Such a compulsion implies a compulsion on the part of local education authorities to make necessary provisions" (p. 26). Fischer (1971) also feels that in-service should not be accompanied by financial increments or bonuses. He adds that promotion or raises should be based strictly on performance as evaluated by colleagues trained as observers.

So what is a good motivator? Rubin (1980), Bush (1971), and Palmer (1978) agree that a high level of intrinsic motivation is necessary to commit to an on-going program of professional development. "There is a proportion of incentive and motivation to be had in the simple human desire to be good at what we do" (Rubin, p. 82). In order to maximize this motivation, in-service education programs must be relevant to teachers' needs (Bush, 1971) and be clearly perceived as beneficial to participants. A well planned, concise process of development and renewal will help to increase teachers' self esteem and motivation once they perceive that they are
being taken seriously. An effective teacher in-service education program should incorporate a process to provide access for continuous professional growth for motivated teachers who see themselves as controlling their own development, with a process to deal with curriculum changes deemed necessary by the Ministries of Education or local School Boards. There should also be a support infrastructure aimed at helping teachers deal with the demands on them. The in-service process should be an integral part of the educational system if it is to carry any merit at all.

A Framework for the Design of a Teacher Retraining Program
For French Immersion

In-service

Research directly related to a full-time teacher retraining program was not found since such a program has not been reported in the available literature. The writer has therefore relied on research derived from studies on teacher in-service programs in developing a framework for a teacher retraining program for French immersion.

In-service programs for teachers have been in existence for many years. Very few however have resulted in long-lasting changes in instructional practice (Dillon-Peterson, 1981), yet educators still believe that professional development through in-service should continue to be a focus (McLeod, 1985). In his work on educational change, Fullan (1982, p. 263) summarizes the literature on in-service
by outlining seven reasons why in-service seems to fail. These seven caveats will be used to form the conceptual basis for an effective in-service/retraining program.

(1) **One-shot workshops are widespread but ineffective**

In order to effect lasting change, time is needed to ensure an understanding of the changes occurring, to integrate acquired knowledge, to come to terms with concerns and fears arising from the risk-taking involved in the change process, and to practice, analyze and adjust new skills. To aim for positive changes in classroom practice, it must be understood that change is a process which takes time and is achieved in stages (Hall & Loucks, 1978). Teachers involved in innovation will experience changes in concerns as they progress through the various stages of change. Planning for a long term in-service program allows them the time necessary to reflect (Wideen, Carlman, & Strachan, 1986) on the process and on their teaching.

Coping with change is stressful and puts the teacher in a vulnerable situation where they may well feel awkward and insecure in their new practice. Fullan (1982) stresses the necessity for time to allow the teacher to better cope with the change and to effect new strategies and understanding. Innovations should also be planned to include an implementation phase which involves continued in-service as a support structure for the teacher (Fullan, 1982; Hunter, 1985).

Given the knowledge that we now have on effective change, it is apparent that the one-shot workshop model is not going to produce
long lasting change in teaching practices. If in-service is to be effective, it may well include a few workshops but only if they are part of a larger scale program for change. A teacher retraining program for French immersion should take place over an extended period of time to ensure participants' understanding of the process of change in the context of French immersion, to enable them to practice new strategies in a safe environment, to allow them to cope with concerns as they arise, and to let them reflect on their new experiences.

(2) Topics are frequently selected by people other than those for whom the in-service is intended

Professional development activities are most effectively undertaken when the topics have been selected by the participants. They are even more powerful when the participants have had a direct hand in their design and implementation (McLeod, 1985). Change takes on an extremely personal dimension (Hall & Loucks, 1979), the recognition of which is of crucial importance in designing in-service programs.

Fullan (1982) identifies four aspects of the nature of change which have been found to affect in-service efforts. (a) Need--teacher identified priorities for change; (b) clarity--the identification of the essential features of the innovation; (c) complexity--the recognition by participants in the innovation of the difficulty and extent of the change they will be undertaking; and (d) quality and practicality of the program--the availability of quality materials to help the
participants implement the innovation. All of the above characteristics of change require participant involvement through the identification and understanding of them.

(3) Follow-up support for ideas and practices introduced in in-service programs occurs in only a very small minority of cases.

During the course of a normal school day, teachers have little opportunity to discuss teaching problems or to spend time in each others classrooms. Traditionally, teachers work in isolation, and share few of their instructional problems with colleagues. If long-term in-service programs are to be effective, they must include plans for a support structure upon which the participant can rely when attempting to implement changes in their classroom.

Fullan (1982) talks about the need for in-service work during the implementation phase of change "...to provide the ongoing, interactive, cumulative learning necessary to develop new conceptions, skills, and behavior" (p. 66). He states that although teachers say that they learn best from each other, they also indicate that they can learn from helpers from outside of the school, if the help is "practical and concrete" (p. 66). McLauchlin and Marsh (1978) also support direct outside help when involving skill-specific training.

If a process for change through a model of retraining is to succeed, it must incorporate a network of support for the participants at all stages of the process. In their study of Problem-Focused Coursework as a Model for In-Service Education:
Case Studies of Teacher Initiated Change, Wideen et al. (1986) found that support was essential to teachers undertaking an instructional change process. The type of support varied, however it was noted that almost all the teachers who had effected significant change in their teaching practice had had access to some form of support.

A retraining program for teachers should strive to provide a supportive environment in all its phases. It should provide a facilitator who will trouble-shoot for the participants when necessary and who will open the doors to various support mechanisms available to teachers of French immersion. A process of clinical feedback should be available to participants during the practical phases of the change process, and access to quality materials to assist them in the development of their own learning.

Follow-up evaluation occurs infrequently

In all learning situations, at some point the learner needs to know how he is doing relative to his objectives. Often he is too close to the situation to objectively assess his progress and must rely on someone else to provide feedback. The feedback need not be of an evaluative nature, but simply an objective reporting of what the learner did. This allows the learner to 'see' his words and actions, to reflect upon them in the context of his objectives, and to adjust his practice if he deems it necessary.

Joyce and Showers (1984) promote the use of collegial coaching to circumvent the notion that once learned, a skill can be applied in the classroom with no consideration of its longterm use.
The non-evaluative feedback in coaching "...stresses the appropriateness of specific strategies to certain goals" (p. 84). Coaching is a continuing problem-solving process engaged in by the two parties who establish the criteria for observation and the methods of recording. Following the observation, the learner can discuss the data with the coach and set directions for the following observation session.

Fullan (1982) suggests that the more teachers are able to analyze and review their own teaching practices, the better equipped they will be to effect the changes that they have identified as needing. He also cites several studies (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976; Fullan, 1981b; House, 1074; Little, 1981; Loucks & Melle, 1980; Stallings, 1980) which indicate that teachers interacting with other teachers or district specialists, find this process very helpful.

A teacher retraining program should include a coaching element, not only to provide objective feedback to the participants but also to assist them in developing skills in analyzing their own practices.

(5) In-service programs rarely address the individual needs and concerns

Earlier in this chapter, the importance of offering programs based on teacher identified needs was discussed. Joyce (1981), Day (1981), McLaughlin & Marsh (1979), Fullan (1982), Hall & Loucks (1979), McPherson (1980), and many other contemporary educational researchers stress the importance of teacher involvement when
determining the content and process of innovations. When specific, relative needs are identified by the participants of change, a sense of ownership develops which lends itself to a greater degree of success.

These same researchers charge that any in-service program must be sensitive to and able to diagnose participants' changing concerns as they proceed through the stages of change. The Concerns-Based Adoption Model of Hall & Loucks (1979), as evident in its title, focuses on the diagnosis of group and individual needs and concerns during the adoption phase of an innovation. Fullan (1982) and Joyce & Showers (1984) stress sensitivity to teacher's needs during the implementation phase. In her Client-Centered Model for teacher in-service, Day (1984) states that the teacher's concerns should be considered at all stages of the innovation.

If the goal of in-service is to effect positive change in the instructional practices of teachers, their individual needs and ever changing concerns must be considered and addressed. A teacher retraining program can deal with this element by providing a forum for participants to express their concerns on a regular basis and the necessary flexibility to respond to them.

(6) The majority of programs involve teachers from many different schools and/or school districts, but there is no recognition of the differential impact of positive and negative factors within the systems to which they must return.

The degree to which school districts promote and support professional development programs varies from total understanding,
commitment, and support to no recognition whatsoever. The teacher who may initially be motivated to effect change in his instructional practices may find his efforts thwarted in a system where a supportive process is not in place. Fullan (1982) states that...

...the successful ones had central office administrators who enjoyed or were able to gain the support of the board, and who had very clear views and sets of ideas and skill which determined how they confronted and managed change; in the management of change they provided the support and training to increase the willingness and capacity of principals and teachers to deal with change. (p. 177)

A teacher retraining program should encourage participants to gain experience in and knowledge of the policies and practices pertinent to professional development and other support structures for French immersion in the school district in which they will be teaching. This will enable the participants to tap into existing support mechanisms and established professional networks upon their return to teaching. If the participants discover that such support mechanisms do not exist in their district, then the program should assist the participant to develop external networks and access to external resources.

(7) There is a profound lack of any conceptual basis in the planning and implementation of in-service programs that would ensure their effectiveness.

For in-service programs to successfully assist teachers in
their endeavors to effect change in their instructional practices, a thorough understanding of what change involves is essential. Without that understanding, proper planning cannot occur, training strategies will have no direct purpose, and implementation will most likely be abandoned. Distinct from and accompanying an understanding of change must be a conceptual understanding of how to influence change (Fullan, 1982). "...rationally planned strategies are not that rational when it comes to dealing with people and the problem of meaning" (p. 7).

A teacher retraining program should be based on a thorough understanding of the change process and of the social complexities involved when attempting to effect change. This knowledge should also be understood by the participants to avoid unexpected misunderstandings regarding the change process in the context of the program.

Following the guidelines for effective in-service, a summary of the elements necessary in planning and implementing an effective retraining program would include:

a) time for participants to absorb knowledge, to gain an understanding of the innovation they are undertaking, and to address concerns as they arise in the implementation phase.

b) participant involvement in determining its content and to promote ownership of the process of retraining.

c) opportunities for practice in the classroom of new skills, combined with a supportive environment and the promotion of collegial interaction.
d) a supportive context for learning, understanding, and application which includes a process of facilitative feedback to promote analysis and reflection between stages of application.

e) an integrated process whereby participant's changing needs can be highlighted and addressed.

f) a process whereby participants will become skilled at developing their own networks of support within and outside of their schools and school districts, to reach out and tap existing resource centres and professional organizations.

g) a program design which reflects an understanding of the process of change and program planning, development, and implementation. Implicit in this element is an understanding on the part of the participants of the complexities of the process or change they are undertaking.

Language Acquisition

In addition to being based on recent theories of change and effective in-service, a teacher retraining program must also consider the context in which it is operating--in this case, French Immersion. An understanding of language acquisition principals upon which French immersion instruction is based is essential if a retraining program is going to model them, and engender in its participants an understanding of them.

Edwards, Wesche, Dracheń, Clement, & Kruidenier (1984) discuss the need for a protective environment or a low risk situation
conducive to lessening anxieties and increasing self-confidence. This state of a low 'affective filter' increases the learners receptiveness to the second language. It is the creation of this safe environment within a context of subject matter learning upon which French immersion is based. It seems appropriate that a teacher retraining program for French immersion be based on the same premise firstly because it has been shown to increase language acquisition (Edwards et al., 1984; Krashen, 1983), and secondly because it would provide a good learning/teaching model for future teachers of French immersion (Tardif, 1984).

The theory on teaching a second language through subject matter forms the basis of French immersion programs in Canada. In discussing Krashen's (1983) "input hypothesis" Edwards et al. (1984) state that it

... claims that second-language acquisition results from comprehensible input provided in sufficient quantities within a real communication situation. It claims that we subconsciously acquire new linguistic structures by understanding messages that contain the structures, with the aid of extra-linguistic information from the context in which the messages are embedded. ...the input hypothesis would be supported by a finding that students, when exposed to a second language as the medium of instruction in 'the subject matter' (sic), make observable gains in second-language proficiency while learning 'the subject matter' (sic) (p. 268).
Tardif (1985) in her article "L'approche communicative: pratiques pédagogiques" discusses the difference between the concept of language learning through grammar study and language acquisition through communication.

...si je vois la langue comme étant un ensemble de structures grammaticales que l'on doit acquérir, mes pratiques pédagogiques seront différentes de l'enseignant qui voit la langue comme un outil de communication. Dans le premier cas, la langue est vue comme un stock de savoir à absorber - on mémorise des colonnes de vocabulaire, on complète plusieurs exercices faisant accorder le participe passé etc., on apprend les règles d'usage du subjonctif, des pronoms d'objets directs/indirects etc. Dans le deuxième cas on voit la langue comme une multitude de savoir-faire à acquérir: savoir demander une information, savoir saluer quelqu'un, savoir comprendre un discours, savoir transmettre un message. Selon cette conception, la grammaire devient non une fin en soi mais un instrument au service de la communication (p. 68).

Tardif sees the learner of grammar as one who is obliged to absorb linguistic rules in order to emit grammatically and phonetically correct stock phrases. The teacher's role here is to correct mistakes. In a communicative situation however, the learner takes on a more active role. He is given the opportunity to express himself without being restrained by a framework of linguistic structures. The structures are determined by the communicative
situation at hand and the needs of the learner. The teacher in this situation can tolerate some errors as long as they do not prevent the learner from effectively communicating.

Both Tardif (1985) and Calvé (1983) say that the most effective way to promote language acquisition through communication in immersion settings is through teacher training programs which emphasize this approach. A teacher retraining program designed to promote this model of language acquisition would strive to see that its participants will carry it into their own teaching/learning situations in the French immersion classroom.

**Course Content**

As discussed earlier, the success of an in-service program will more likely occur if participants have had a collaborative hand in determining its content (Fullan, 1982; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978; Joyce, 1981). In the case of a retraining program which involves total commitment and personal and professional sacrifices over a long period of time, participant involvement in the establishment of personal and group objectives is essential. The development of a sense of ownership on the part of the participant will greatly enhance the effectiveness of the program.

Some research has been done on the content and design of teacher training programs for French immersion. In 1984, the Canadian Association of French Immersion Teachers (CAIT) commissioned a National Study of French Immersion Teacher Training and Professional Development (Wilton, Obadia, Roy, Saunders, &
Tafler, 1984). The resulting report was based on questionnaires to hundreds of experienced French immersion teachers, French program coordinators, personnel of post-secondary institutes offering teacher training programs for French immersion, and Ministries of Education from each province. In brief, the perceived need for continued in-service training consisted of methodology of immersion, teaching of reading and French language.

In response to two of the recommendations outlined in this report calling for continued research on the training and retraining of French immersion teachers, a follow-up study, "La formation et le perfectionnement des professeurs en immersion: pour des critères nationaux" was commissioned by CAIT (Frisson-Rickson & Rebuffot, 1985). One of the outcomes of this report was a 'tableau synthèse' summarizing a national consensus on the components of an effective teacher training or retraining program for French immersion (see appendix A). These recommendations do not denote specific courses but rather components of an entire program dedicated to training or retraining French immersion teachers.

1. General education training
2. Acceptable linguistic competence levels upon completion of such a program
3. Language and cultural studies
4. Theories of second-language learning
5. Theories of second-language teaching
6. Didactics of French as a second language
7. Specific subject area knowledge
8. Practical teaching experiences (practica)

9. Methodology of French immersion teaching

These elements have, as indicated in the preamble of the report, been supported in whole or in part by other researchers who have delved into the issue of teacher training for French immersion (Rebuffot, 1980; Calvé, 1983; Tardif, 1984).

In her article 'La Formation des Enseignants' Tardif (1984) outlines seven elements which a French immersion teacher training program should include;

(a) the science of education--a general knowledge of the philosophies of education and more specifically within the context of French immersion which would entail the development of language skills and cultural sensitivity of students.

(b) mastery of oral and written French--to ensure that the students, for whom French is not the normal social language, are exposed to an excellent linguistic model.

(c) French Canadian culture--to ensure the students do not receive stereotypical images or false attitudes and values of French Canadians and to enable them to deliver these images in a vibrant, living context.

(d) the nature of language--a knowledge of the linguistic systems of French and English would enable the teacher to anticipate and to address areas of linguistic transfer and overgeneralisations to the target language.
(e) psychology of bilingualism and second language learning--the effects of second language learning on the learner.

(f) second language acquisition--the study of how a learner most effectively acquires a second language.

(g) teaching communicative competencies in a second language--to enable students to transmit ideas, attitudes, and feelings according to social norms, in a variety of situations.

A framework for the methodology used to gather and analyse data

In his discussion of staff and professional development as an evolutionary process, Stake (1985) puts forth the notion that in order for educators to best benefit from educational experiences in which they have not directly participated, they should be able to experience them vicariously by reading descriptions of them. Descriptions of experiences which allow the reader to truly understand the program or process under scrutiny will enable him to incorporate that experience into his own. Stake advocates

...the design of studies to carried out by trained researchers, carried out in such a way as to provide vicarious experience to the readers, done so that they easily combine new experience with old... the role of the program evaluator or educational researcher on these occasions is to assist practitioners in reaching new experiential understandings, which ... I have
called 'naturalistic generalization' (p. 4).

Stake contends that helping educators arrive at understanding via naturalistic generalization should be seen as a valid if not more effective route than providing formalistic generalizations through theory and empirical data. He also states that

The basic task for an evaluator is made barely tolerable by the fact that he or she ... merely needs to make a comprehensive statement of what the program is observed to be, with useful references to the satisfaction and dissatisfaction that appropriately selected people feel toward it (1985, p. 291).

The purpose of this evaluation study of the Teacher Retraining Program for French Immersion at Simon Fraser University is to provide a combination of descriptive and responsive information in order to offer experiential knowledge to those interested in understanding the effects of the program on its participants. It is hoped that this understanding will lead to a refining of the program if and when necessary.

In his article "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation", Stake (1967) proposes a model of program evaluation which allows for the recording of twelve different types of data which could feasibly be included (see appendix B). Since it is not the intent of this study to extoll the merits or weaknesses of the program to possible consumers, its focus will be to provide information in the descriptive matrix of Stake's model. The emphasis will be on looking
at the relationship between the antecedent conditions, transactions and outcomes as they directly affect the participants.

As noted in the preceding chapter, one aspect of the outcome data in which the writer is most interested is changes in attitude, concerns, motivation, and most importantly, confidence which participants experience. There is evidence that teachers' sense of efficacy, their beliefs in their ability to teach effectively, has a direct bearing on their success in teaching and efforts toward change (Ashton, 1984; Gibson & Dembo, 1985; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1979; Berman & McLaughlin, 1977; Brookover, Schweitzer, Schneider, Beady, Flood, & Wisenberker, 1978; Armor, Conroy-Osequere, Cox, King, McDonnell, Pascal, Pauly, & Zellman, 1976) In describing the Rand Change Agent Study, McLaughlin and Marsh (1979) outline the factors necessary for successful innovations to occur. In addition to need, support, and commitment, they state that the teachers' sense of efficacy is very important to the success of the innovation. The participants are being put in a high risk situation but this program hopes to reduce that feeling of exposure through a well planned, supportive, interactive change process.

Other aspects of the outcome data which the writer intends to record is the linguistic development of the participants as well as their knowledge and skill in French immersion teaching. Previous to the implementation of the TRP, some local French immersion educators expressed doubt as to whether 'fair-to-good' speakers of French can, within a twelve month program, become fluent enough to meet hiring standards of school districts. The success of the
participants' linguistic development, and their skill in and knowledge of French immersion methodology will be measured by the extent at which they are hired to teach French immersion.

The writer's choice in using qualitative as opposed to empirical data in this study is also reinforced by Miles and Huberman (1984) who state

Qualitative data are attractive. They are a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in local contexts. With qualitative data one can preserve chronological flow, assess local causality, and derive fruitful explanations. Then, too, qualitative data are more likely to lead to serendipitous findings and to new theoretical integrations; they help researchers go beyond initial preconceptions and frameworks. Finally, the findings from qualitative studies have a quality of 'undeniability' ... Words, especially when they are organized into incidents or stories, have a concrete, vivid, meaningful flavor that often proves far more convincing to a reader—another researcher, a policymaker, a practitioner—than pages of numbers. (p. 15)

The qualitative data format allows the evaluator to be more flexible in his quest for understanding the phenomenon at hand. He is not tied to a pre-determined set of questions but can change direction depending on what each step of data collection brings to light.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The Subjects

As outlined by the Ministry of Education, it was required that all participants meet the following criteria:

- they hold a permanent B.C. teaching certificate
- at the outset of the program, they demonstrate considerable proficiency in the French language
- they are prepared to give a full-time commitment to retraining for one year

In addition, the TRP at Simon Fraser University was designed for qualified and practicing teachers in B.C. working full or part time, who are sponsored by a school district in this province. Sponsorship could range from financial assistance or at the very least a recognition that upon completion of the TRP, the retrainee will be seriously considered for reassignment to an immersion teaching position within the district. The above criterion could not be strictly adhered to during this initial year of implementation of the Simon Fraser TRP for two reasons. Firstly, linguistic screening for retraining was opened to teachers who were unemployed or underemployed. This meant that many candidates were not tied to a particular school district and therefore did not receive assurance of employment upon completion of the TRP. Secondly, lead time was short since final approval for program funding occurred in the spring of 1985. This factor prevented the program organizers of the TRP at Simon Fraser University from working with districts to ensure that
their participants satisfied the 'sponsorship' criterion.

The Ministry initially received 98 applicants who submitted a self evaluation of their communicative ability in French. Of these, 60 were recommended to take the written portion of the screening process. The 36 applicants who achieved better than 50% on the written examination went on to take the oral exam. Of these, 24 applicants were accepted into the program having achieved 60% or better. The twelve participants of the SFU program were all British Columbia certified teachers with an average of 7.5 years of teaching experience. More descriptive information about the participants is provided in chapter four.

The Program

The twelve months of the TRP at Simon Fraser University were divided into four phases. The university operates on a semester system so the TRP was also designed on a semester basis. Within each semester however, the program was not limited to strictly conform to the Faculty of Education course structure.

1) Introduction to teaching French Immersion
   (September-December = 15 credits)

This semester was designed to introduce the participants to the French immersion setting. A strong emphasis was set on providing opportunities for language perfection in relation to the pedagogical work required for immersion teaching.

The first week of the program was an orientation session allowing the participants to become familiar with the program, the campus and the faculty facilities. This session was designed and led
by the program coordinator who organized activities which helped the participants to establish a working/collegial relationship with her and with each other. Time was also taken for the participants to work together to form a group consensus on their objectives for the first semester.

This orientation was followed by eight and one-half weeks of language training sessions and introductory workshops on curriculum, instruction, and culture. One day of each of these weeks was spent in French immersion classrooms around the Greater Vancouver area. Each participant was assigned to a practicing French immersion teacher (school associate) and was given opportunities to observe and to work with small groups of children. The role of the school associate was of a supportive nature to assist the participants in their transition into the immersion classroom. The program coordinator, along with another faculty member, took on the role of Faculty Associate. The Faculty Associates at SFU are trained in the process of clinical supervision (see appendix C) which was implemented during their regular visits to the participants in their classrooms.

The coursework was offered in half-day blocks and included "la grammaire", "la conversation", "la culture francophone", "les séminaires", "les groupes d'études", and "les ateliers". For a more detailed description of the first semester timetable and of each course, refer to appendices D and E.

A follow-up to the coursework sessions was provided in the form of a three-day mini-conference. Its purpose was also to provide
a change of pace for the participants who had just completed a challenging block of learning and studying, and who were about to embark upon an intensive three-week practicum in their assigned French immersion classrooms.

The practicum was followed by a final week on campus which served as a wind down to the fall semester and as an orientation to the spring semester. Seminars, discussions and study groups were held in a more relaxed fashion where participants were able to share their practica experiences and to evaluate the first semester. A process for goal setting and needs assessment for the second semester was also undertaken.

2) Coursework semester

(January - April = 14 credits)

The spring semester was designed following the expressed needs of the participants. The coursework was again offered in half-day blocks. It also involved instructors from the Department of Languages, Literature, and Linguistiques (DLLL) who gave courses of a more formal nature on French language study. The coursework included:

- EDUC 473-4 l'apprentissage et l'enseignement de la lecture
- EDUC 474-4 l'enseignement des sciences humaines
- EDUC 496-3 la phonétique corrective dans la salle de classe
- FREN 206-3 Intermediate French III
- FREN 301-3 advanced French - composition I

In addition, the students attended weekly seminar sessions and a series of curriculum workshops which covered such topics as
Appendix F offers detailed descriptions of each course and the timetable for the second semester. One day each week was left unscheduled to allow the participants to arrange visits to a variety of French immersion classrooms in the Greater Vancouver area.

3) Practicum (April-May)

To consolidate the first two semesters of learning, a six-week practicum was undertaken in immersion classrooms. A clinical supervision model was implemented for the duration of the practicum involving the school associate and faculty associate (program coordinator). A process of analysis of instruction and self evaluation was emphasized in this practicum during which the participants took on all teaching responsibilities in their classroom.

4) Québec Component (July-August)

The participants spent six weeks in Chicoutimi, Québec, living, studying, and practicing linguistic skills in a francophone environment. During the final week in Québec, the participants were evaluated on their communicative skills in French by two evaluators from B.C.

For those participants who succeed in the retraining program and who have jobs the following September, a follow-up component
"Implementation and Monitoring" will be offered to assist the participants in their new professional environment. The effects of this component of the TRP however are beyond the bounds of this thesis.

Instruments and Procedures

Although a time line for data gathering was established prior to the commencement of the study (see figure 3.1), the actual instruments, especially those involving responsive data, were finalized just prior to their administration. This allowed the writer to design the instruments based on issues that had arisen during previous phases of responsive and descriptive data gathering. Miles and Huberman (1984) suggest that in an exploratory study such as this, specific site considerations will be lost if one remains tied to an inflexible, pre-established set of instruments.

Phase One

The first task in this formative evaluation process was to gather what Stake (1967) refers to as antecedent information, "...any condition existing prior to teaching and learning which may relate to outcomes" (p. 12). Stake gives attitude, previous experience, interest, and willingness of students prior to taking a course or enrolling in a program as examples of antecedent information. A questionnaire (see appendix G) was distributed to participants for the purpose of discovering their expectations, concerns, and fears vis a vis the retraining program, and to find out what was their
| phase one | Sept. 9 | questionnaire (participants) discussions with program organizers |
| phase two | Sept.-Dec. transactional information | observations - weekly seminars discussions with program organizers attendance at evaluation sessions |
|          | Jan.-Feb. transactional information | interviews with program instructors, school district personnel, and the director of the funding agency informal meetings with the above, the coordinator, participants, and organizers |
|          | March transactional information | interviews with participants and program coordinator |
| phase three | August outcome information | questionnaire (participants) discussions with program organizers |
understanding of current topical issues in French immersion programming. This questionnaire was administered in the very early stages of the program, before their expectations and attitudes were altered by exposure to the program and before their knowledge of issues in French immersion deepened. It is this antecedent information (Stake 1967) which will help to establish a barometer on which to analyze changes in participant concerns, expectations and confidence as they go through the program.

**Phase Two**

This initial stage of responsive information gathering was followed by a participant observation phase of data gathering throughout the first semester. This was the first of several methods used to gather transactional information which Stake (1975) describes as the encounters of the participants with each other, their instructors, their students, program organizers, school district personnel - everyone with whom they had contact within the context of the program. Ideally, the writer would have been present throughout the entire program, in all the courses and in all the classrooms during practica. This was not possible and so the writer relied upon the interpretation of the major encounters by the participants and the program coordinator. The writer was able to attend the participants' weekly seminar sessions during the first semester where they discussed the events and experiences of the week, and issues of concern as they arose. The focus of the observations was on gathering supportive data pertinent to the information gathered in the first questionnaire, as well as on noting unexpected developments and
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concerns.

Transactional information was also gathered throughout the second semester during several unstructured contacts with the participants, meetings with program organizers, the program coordinator, as well as during interviews administered to each participant and the program coordinator (see appendices H & I). These interviews lasted a minimum of one-half hour each, and focused on the perceived changes in needs and concerns of the participants. Program personnel, Ministry officials and school district representatives (see appendix J) were also interviewed.

Phase Three

The final stage of data gathering occurred at the end of the Québec phase, after twelve months involvement in the TRP. Stake (1967) describes this outcome phase of data collection as focusing on "...the abilities, achievements, attitudes, and aspirations of students resulting from an educational experience" (p. 112). This phase took the form of a questionnaire (see appendix K) since it was not possible to gather all the participants together upon their return to B.C. All the participants had agreed prior to leaving for Québec, to complete the questionnaires and to send them to the writer in a pre-stamped and addressed envelope.

Data Analysis Procedures

Much of the data analysis procedures undertaken are consistent with those suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984) in their book
'Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods'

Immediately following each contact, the writer completed a contact summary sheet (see appendix L). This was often done without referral to the raw data just collected and served to capture the writer's initial impressions of the interview, meeting or discussion. Each sheet recorded the time and place of the contact, the people involved and the situation under which the contact occurred. Through this process, the writer was able to highlight the main themes or issues which became apparent throughout the contact and to set directions for the follow up contact.

The second step of analysis was to consolidate the responses gathered during interviews and in questionnaires or, in the case of descriptive data, to rewrite verbatim the notes taken. This served two purposes: a) to review the raw data at hand, and b) to create an easier referral system to the raw data.

The third step, coding, was the initial phase of data reduction which Miles and Huberman (1984) describe as the "... process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the "raw" data that appear in written-up field notes" (p. 21). Codes were established to reflect the research questions and themes into which the writer wished to delve and also brought to the fore any unexpected issues. The coding permitted the clarification and quantification of the data while retaining the richness of words as well as the retrieval, organization, and reduction of bulky data (Miles and Huberman, 1984).

The follow-up step to coding consisted of the establishment of
categories which involved the collapsing of some of the codes to create more meaningful and workable data. The categorizing allowed for easy transformation of data to various forms of visual representation such as tables, graphs, organizational charts and checklists. As Miles and Huberman (1984) state, visual representations of data are "...a spatial format that presents information systematically to the user ... You know what you display" (p. 79). The display of data, in combination with a narrative text can be very powerful when describing or explaining a phenomenon.

Depending on the issue under discussion, a variety of display formats were used in the analysis of the data gathered in this study. Tables were used in conjunction with descriptive text and quotes when presenting results from questionnaires and interviews. Although a checklist matrix does not emphasize data for individuals, it is very useful in sorting out conditions by role and time period, and will be used to stress the early-late differences of the dynamics in specific conditions.

At one point during the analysis, it became apparent that the role of the program coordinator was of significant importance to the program and to the participants. To assist in illustrating the complexity of this role, a context chart was created. This allowed for the mapping of "...the social context of individual actions, economically and reasonable accurately, without getting overwhelmed with detail" (Miles and Huberman, 1984).

This formative study of the TRP at Simon Fraser University can be described as exploratory, descriptive and informative. Its
limitation is of course that it cannot be used in generalizing to other similar situations since it is entirely site specific. However, an attempt was made to provide pertinent responsive data from the University of Victoria site, where applicable, to illustrate a contrast or a similarity in the context of available research literature on in-service and immersion language learning.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

Phase One: Antecedent Conditions

The antecedent information presented here looks initially at the professional and personal background of the participants. This is followed by a discussion of several issues which reflect participants' attitudes at the outset of the program. Finally, a summary of the participants' knowledge of contemporary French immersion issues is presented.

Background of participants

Upon entering the TRP all of the twelve participants were qualified to teach in British Columbia. One however, was qualified to teach only at the secondary level. Of the twelve participants who enrolled in the SFU TRP, only one (1) had a continuing, albeit part time position with a school district. This participant is also the only one who received financial sponsorship from a school district to undertake the program. Six (6) of the twelve participants had been working as substitute teachers immediately prior to enrolling in the TRP, while five (5) of them had not been teaching within the public school system during the school year 1984-85. As for sponsorship from a particular school district, nine (9) participants had received no support, financial or verbal. The major reason for these participants committing themselves to the TRP was to increase their marketability in finding a secure teaching position. Three (3) of the participants had some form of sponsorship from a school district. One (1) involved leave with partial pay while two (2) were of a less
Table 4.1
Professional Standing of Participants: September 1985 (n=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>0-3 yrs</th>
<th>4-7 yrs</th>
<th>11-25 yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Position*</th>
<th>Substitute</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District Sponsorship</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.C. Certified **</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The TRP appeared to offer hope for employment to many applicants who had been unemployed or underemployed during the early 1980's due to the state of financial restraint within the education system of the province of B.C.

**One of the twelve participants was qualified to teach only at the secondary level (grades 8-12).
tangible nature involving a verbal assurance that they would be seriously considered for an immersion teaching position upon successful completion of the TRP. Program organizers would have preferred to work with a more homogenous group in terms of professional standing however table 4.1 illustrates the reality of the variety in professional background of the participants for the first year of implementation of the retraining program.

The average teaching experience of the participants was 7.5 years, most of which were teaching in the regular English program. Three (3) of the participants had limited experience teaching French immersion but on a substitute teaching basis only and for brief periods of time. Eleven (11) had experience teaching French as a Second Language (Français de Base), however five (5) of those were on a substitute basis. Only one participant had no teaching experience in either French immersion or in French as a second language.

The personal situations of the participants (see table 4.2), varied as well. The median age of the participants was 37 years, eight (8) of them were married, and nine (9) had one or more dependents. Two of the four single participants had dependents.

The results of the screening tests (see table 4.3) indicate that the participants also varied in their ability to speak and write French. In the written test for which a cut off point of 50% had been established, the scores of the 12 candidates who were accepted at SFU ranged from 53% to 84% (mean score = 69%). The scores on the oral test, for which a cut off point of 50% had also been established, ranged from 53% to 94% (mean score = 75%).
### Table 4.2
**Personal data of participants: September 1985**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependents</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.3
**Results of linguistic screening:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>50-60%</th>
<th>61-70%</th>
<th>71-80%</th>
<th>81-90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The wide range in personal, professional, and linguistic backgrounds of the participants meant that the program was not dealing with a homogeneous group. The main unifying factor within the group however was a strong motivation and commitment to successfully complete the program.

**Highlighted Issues**

**Motivation.** At the outset of the TRP, the participants were highly motivated to successfully complete the program. Two reasons for undertaking this commitment were cited; (a) a need to improve language skills and (b) marketability (see table 4.4).

Prior to enrolling in this program, most (11) of the participants did not have a steady teaching job. Several were substitute teaching (not necessarily in French immersion) and a few were unemployed. Increased marketability and a desire to change ones' teaching assignment were the prime motivators of the participants. Most (10) of the participants felt the successful completion of this program would better qualify them for a teaching job or for a change in assignment.

As shown in table 4.5, half (6) indicated that they had been looking for a means of changing their focus within teaching to teach French immersion and that the design of the SFU program appeared to respond to that quest, while some (4) chose the SFU program over the UVIC program because of location. A few (2) said that the Ministry funding provided to cover all course related costs was a factor in their choice of methods to undertake that change.
### Table 4.4
Motivation Factors: September 1985
(n=15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Job Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* - Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)

### Table 4.5
Reasons for Choosing the SFU TRP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.6
Confidence: September 1985
(n=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Not Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To teach French immersion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To successfully complete the TRP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confidence. The participants generally would not have felt confident if they had been asked to teach in an immersion classroom at this time (see table 4.6). This is not an unexpected piece of information given the nature of the program to which the participants have committed themselves for a year. The major reason for this lack of confidence was a weakness in language skills. Almost all of the participants indicated they had much work to do to develop communication skills in French to the point where they would feel comfortable and in control of a French immersion teaching situation. Another reason for this lack of confidence appears to be a recognition that to teach in immersion one must acquire techniques and knowledge of methodology specific to French immersion. Many of the participants do not appear to have acquired this knowledge. They had no previous training in the teaching of French immersion although some had limited experience through substitute teaching.

Despite the expressed uneasiness about teaching French immersion at this point, all of the participants felt confident that they would successfully complete the TRP.

Language concerns. As illustrated in table 4.7, a fear which was strongly stated by several (8) participants was that of not improving their language skills enough to the point of being comfortable with or being accepted into teaching French immersion. For many, this year represents hope for their professional future, yet they fear that their language development may prove to be a stumbling block.

Concerns about finding a job. Another concern often (7) cited
reflects the reason why many of the participants enrolled in the TRP -- marketability. Despite the confidence expressed about successfully completing the program, many (7) of the participants stated that they were very concerned about finding a full time teaching position when the program was over.

Financial concerns. Financial concerns weighed heavily on some (4) of the participants' minds. These tended to be the ones who have dependents and/or no spouse to financially support them. Even though the participants did not have to pay tuition, several had given up a salary for the year and forecasted difficulties in meeting personal expenses.

Family concerns. For many (5), especially those who are wives and mothers, the organization of their time and priorities was expected to be a new and difficult pressure with which to deal throughout the program. They feared the difficulties inherent in juggling family responsibilities and study obligations. Although most of them had worked in the past, it appears that they expected full-time studies to be more demanding than full-time work.

During seminar discussions, it was apparent that, although almost all of the participants seemed to be open to and ready for change, for some, the transition to becoming a student again was not a comfortable one. One had to leave her family and was feeling stressed at the thought of being in a new environment without her personal support system. For some, it was viewed as a challenging change while for others it was viewed with apprehension.

Concerns about the practica. Many (5) participants were
### Table 4.7

**Concerns: September 1985**

(n=29)\(a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Practica</th>
<th>Financial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)

### Table 4.8

**Expectations: September 1985**

(n=28)\(a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Development</th>
<th>French Immersion Pedagogy</th>
<th>Curriculum/Resources Familiarity</th>
<th>Increased Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)
fearful of their impending practica experiences since they felt the first weeks of the program was too soon to be in the classroom. Some (3/5) felt that much more time on campus taking courses would be needed before they would feel prepared to face a practical situation. Others (2/5) expressed concern over the appropriateness of the grade level they had chosen for their first practicum.

**Expectations.** Almost all (11) of the participants expected that the TRP would provide them with opportunities to develop their fluency in French (see table 4.8). Most of the participants displayed a recognition of the differences between French immersion and regular English program instruction. They expected that this retraining program would also provide them with opportunities to learn and to practice techniques and skills involved specifically in the teaching of French immersion. Many expected to develop an ease and a confidence as they became more proficient in the language and more familiar with curricula and specific programs used in French immersion.

In summary, the main motivating factors for the participants undertaking the TRP were related to marketability and language development. Almost all of them indicated that they had little or no confidence to teach French immersion however they expected that the TRP would help them to overcome this lack of confidence by offering them the opportunity to improve their language skills, to become skilled in French immersion teaching practices, and to become familiar with curricula and resources specific to French immersion. The major concerns of participants were, a) their ability to improve their language skills to the point of being comfortable and in control.
of an immersion program, b) finding a job, c) being trained in pedagogy specific to immersion, d) finding the time necessary to successfully complete the program requirements, and e) for some, dealing with the financial difficulties of not receiving income for twelve months. It will be of interest to discover, through further study, whether their concerns change, are alleviated, or are increased as the program continues.

**Issues in French Immersion**

The participants appeared to be cognisant of current topical issues. When asked to outline arguments for and against the implementation of French immersion programs (table 4.9), many cited reasons often heard when parent groups lobby school boards to offer such a program. Reasons for its implementation were varied, however the argument most often stated (19) was dealing with the benefits to the child in learning to communicate in French. Specific examples were; better job opportunities, easier to learn while young, increases cultural awareness, enriches the child's knowledge of English, and generally enhances the child's education. Another argument often (5) offered was to support the bilingual nature of Canada. Other reasons such as parent demand, lack of success of f.s.l. programs in forming bilingual students, and no loss of English skills were stated.

Arguments against the implementation of French Immersion programs most often stated as used by resistant school boards (table 4.10) included staffing difficulties, cost, administrative difficulties, and political barriers.
### Table 4.9
Reasons for Implementing French Immersion (n=30)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial to bilingual child</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual country</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent demand</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English not affected</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.S.I. unsuccessful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)

### Table 4.10
Reasons for Not Implementing French Immersion (n=29)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing difficulties</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative difficulties</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political difficulties</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)
### Table 4.11
Criteria for hiring
(n=37)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>Teaching competence</th>
<th>F.I. methodology</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14(varia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)
When asked to state criteria for School Boards to look for in French immersion teachers (table 4.11), the participants overwhelmingly (12) stated language competence as a necessary quality. Ability in teaching generally (6) and knowledge of French immersion teaching techniques (5) were mentioned by several. Other qualities mentioned were, enthusiasm (2), cultural knowledge (2), openmindedness (2), dedication (1), commitment to a district (1), and knowledge of second language development in children (1).

Almost all (13/15) of the responses in describing immersion students were in terms of their parents who were said to be well educated professionals (5), supportive of their child's education (3), interested in language learning or bilingual themselves (4), and openminded (1). Only two participants directly described students and the adjectives used were, bright and likely to be bored with the regular program.

In giving reasons why parents choose French immersion for their children, a large number (10) suggested that parents realize the importance of learning a second language. Some explanations for this realization were, parents felt immersion would provide a better, more challenging education, help their children get more out of life, and open more occupational doors in the future. Some (3) participants felt that another motivator was a perceived status factor ie: "it's the in thing to do".

Most (10) participants felt immersion should be accessible to all students. A few (3) however added that enrolment in immersion should not be open to students known to have learning difficulties.
One participant stated that e.s.l. students should not be encouraged to enroll in immersion. The choice factor was mentioned by two participants so as to ensure French immersion is not forced upon any student.

When queried about their perceptions of public attitude toward immersion, the answers were varied. Many (5) stated they felt the public was generally in favour, a few (3) saw the issue as polarized, while two perceived the public to be generally against immersion. One felt that the public was not well enough informed on the subject of French immersion to have a valid opinion.

Many issues of concern regarding French immersion programming were brought forth in the responses to this questionnaire. Half of the group raised the issue of the displacement of regular program teachers as needing attention. Several wrote of the lack of trained and/or experienced personnel, of the maintenance of immersion through secondary, and of the lack of tolerance or flexibility on the part of regular program personnel. Funding, lack of quality resources, and transportation problems were stated as issues by a few. Other issues mentioned were split classes in immersion, poor implementation of the program, overly high expectations, remedial instruction for French immersion students, and expansion.

In conclusion, some conflict of opinion was noted, and several issues were left untouched. Further study strived to determine whether the group as a whole became more cohesive in their opinions, whether their understanding of the issues broadened and/or whether some issues were dropped and others raised.
Phase Two - Transactions

This section looks at the issues highlighted in the first phase of the evaluation to see how, if indeed, they changed over the course of the program. Following this, a discussion of newly developed issues will be presented.

Issues and Concerns

Motivation. Motivation appeared to remain high throughout the program. This is reflected in the continued high participation levels in all phases of the program of almost all of the participants as well as in their comments. Although a few of them had experienced discouragement at various phases of the TRP, they all reaffirmed their commitment to the program during each contact with the evaluator.

One of the participants had a particularly negative experience during her fall practicum partly due to circumstances beyond her control (her school associate was often absent), and partly due to a lack of preparedness and skill development on her part. Another experienced a certain level of boredom during the mini-lesson presentations of the fall semester.

In general however, it can be said that the majority of the participants viewed their experiences during the first and second semesters as worthwhile and relevant to their needs. Even the ones who had experienced some difficulties remained motivated and optimistic about the program.
Confidence

All (12) of the participants who had indicated in September that they were not at all confident at that time to teach French immersion became more confident as the program progressed (see table 4.12). The majority (10) of the participants felt that the main reasons for their increased confidence were language improvement and familiarity with French immersion through their classroom experiences and the methodology and curriculum courses. As the coordinator said "... the unknown has become the known", or as several participants concurred, "...we have been exposed to such a variety of practical teaching and learning experiences upon which we can draw and expand."

Language concerns. Language development, although less of a concern to the participants, remained as a worry to a few (3) (see table 4.13). They all recognized that they had made enormous strides in this area however, as one participant stated "... the more I improve, the more I become cognisant of what I am doing wrong and of the long way I have yet to go."

The participant's perception that they had improved linguistically was not noted by several until the latter stages of the second semester, even though observers could attest to their improvement on a weekly or monthly basis throughout the program. The coordinator, other faculty members and the writer saw the participants developing in their ease and fluidity with the language. The participants were able to participate more and more in abstract
### Table 4.12
confidence: Sept./March
(n=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sept. confident</th>
<th>not confident</th>
<th>March more confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to teach French immersion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to successfully complete the TRP</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.13
concerns: Sept./March

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Practica</th>
<th>Financial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=29)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=22)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_a-Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)_
and technical discussions without having to pause to search for words. Their vocabulary was also expanding at a noticeable rate.

Despite the awareness that they were improving their language skills, some of the participants at the end of the second semester were still concerned that they wouldn't be good enough by September.

**Concern about finding a job.** The concern of finding a job was less apparent from October through February than it was in September, and became more of a concern in March when the participants began to think about actually applying for a job. At that point, many started to feel the pressure of putting together résumés and letters of application while they were also trying to complete their course assignments. This, coupled with the financial stresses many of them were experiencing made March a very difficult month. Shortly after that however, one participant was hired for the following September which seemed to lessen the concern. The writer observed that many of the participants felt that "If X can get a job in immersion then I can too!" It appeared that the their spirits rose as more of their colleagues either were hired or felt they had 'a line on a job'. The program coordinator, during discussions with the writer, indicated that toward the end of spring however, when several participants had work for the fall, those who didn't were feeling quite discouraged and for them, this concern mounted steadily.

**Financial concerns.** The number of participants affected by financial difficulties increased somewhat as the year went on. By the end of March, more than half of them (7) were very concerned about their savings being depleted and not lasting until the end of
September when they hoped to receive a pay cheque. One participant felt that the fact that she had worked previous to the TRP and had acquired some savings was in fact a detriment since she was told to cash in and deplete her retirement fund before she could qualify for a bursary. She, and most of the other participants experiencing financial difficulties could not rely on spouses to support them.

**Family concerns.** As the program progressed, more and more participants felt the pressures of a heavy workload and family responsibilities. The majority of these participants had young children, and even with spouses able to take off some of the pressures at home, they felt overworked and guilty about not being able to participate in family activities. A few expressed particular concern about their stay in Québec when their children would be out of school and without parental supervision. One participant had decided to take her young child to Québec with her but had no idea how to go about arranging day care for him.

Almost all of the participants who expressed concern about time and family pressures felt that some of the course assignments, especially those given by the Department of Languages, Literature, and Linguistics, were excessively heavy and unrelated to classroom teaching. They felt that the essence of the coursework could have easily been captured in less weighty assignments. "More does not necessarily mean better." As an alternative, these participants suggested that the formal language courses taken in the second semester should have been spread over two semesters thus retaining them but in a less intense manner.
Concerns about the practica. The fear of working in immersion classrooms expressed by the participants in September, waned considerably once they had actually begun their practical experiences. At the end of the three week practicum component of the fall semester, one participant captured the feelings of most of the others when she said,

Initially, the thought of facing a group of immersion students was quite terrifying, but the one day each week that we spent in immersion classrooms really helped us to prepare, psychologically and practically, for this longer practicum when we took on much of the teaching responsibilities.

Another added...
The fear of being put into a class before really knowing which level I would prefer has obviously been lessened because the experience is behind us and all went well.

In the fall, program organizers were not yet sure that a spring practicum would be necessary, however, during an evaluation session when the participants were asked how they felt, they indicated very strongly that they wanted another practicum experience. This could be interpreted as a reaction to negative experiences in the first practicum however this was not the case. During one of the final seminars of the fall semester, almost all the participants indicated that this initial experience in a French immersion classroom had been
very much a period of trial and error during which they had just got a
taste for what teaching French immersion was all about. They wanted
a second opportunity to focus on specific aspects of their French
immersion teaching and to refine their skills.

**Expectations**

The participants generally felt that their expectations were
being met by the TRP. Although many (5) of them felt that they
needed more language development, they recognized that they only had
to do more of what they had been doing within the program since it
offered plenty of opportunities for study and practice. The same
appeared to apply to French immersion pedagogy ... as one participant
expressed herself near the end of the second semester

"...my major expectation which is being met is methodology,
from awareness to information to practice to perfection. I'm
working on the last phase right now."

Through coursework on campus, practice in the classroom, and
field trips to French resource centres, all of the participants felt
that their need to become familiar with French immersion curricula
and resources were being met. They also felt, as indicated earlier,
that the expectation of increased confidence to teach in a French
immersion classroom was steadily increasing.

**New Issues and Concerns**

**Coursework.** During the course of the program, two areas of
concern appeared to develop and were mentioned during the individual
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>new concerns</th>
<th>new issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coursework meeting</td>
<td>- program group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual needs</td>
<td>- design cohesiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a- Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)
interviews held in March (see table 4.14), and during less formal conversations with several of the participants. Although the participants seemed to appreciate and benefit from the courses dealing with specific curricular areas (i.e., reading and social studies), several felt that they would like to have similar courses in other subject areas such as physical education, mathematics, and art. They added that although they realized that only so much could be fit into the program, these subject areas demanded specific and more technical vocabulary which they felt they lacked.

**Individual Needs.** Another concern which arose for a few of the participants was that some individual needs were not being met. They were specifically referring to the elementary orientation of the program when in fact they considered themselves to be secondary teachers. Again the comments made here were qualified with the realization that it was not possible to respond to each of their needs, especially when the focus of the program, at the outset, was teaching at the elementary level.

Another, but less tangible concern which arose during discussions with the participants was recognized by those whose previous teaching experience had been teaching French as a Second Language (Français de Base). They had never taught any other subject in French or in English and realized that they had to develop skills in becoming good generalist teachers as well as immersion teachers. They felt however that this concern was being addressed through the professional experiences provided within the context of the TRP. This specific concern was also recognized by the program coordinator who
felt that for some of the participants, this realization was an unexpected but not unsurmountable challenge.

**Issue of group cohesiveness.** All of the activities undertaken by the participants, courses, discussions, presentations, even leisure activities, were carried out totally in French. Although this factor was very much desired and appreciated by the participants, many of them initially felt vulnerable in this new situation and expressed these feelings during the seminars held early in the first semester. They soon began to rely on each other once the initial barriers of getting to know each other were overcome. The participants developed a supportive network among themselves and were often in contact with one another on the phone at night or during impromptu study group meetings. The language of communication during these informal contacts was consistently French. Several of the participants said that by the end of the first semester, they were beginning to dream in French.

This supportive network became very important to many of the participants. It began mainly as a means for them to call upon each other for assistance in carrying out assignments however it soon developed into a professional and personal bonding process. Throughout the program, the coordinator emphasized a process of peer supervision and actually taught the participants how to criticize each other in a non-judgemental, unthreatening fashion. Many hours were spent participating in mini-lesson presentations or watching video tapes of each other's lessons. In both cases, the observee established what she wanted her peers to look for and to report back to her. For
example, before presenting a mini-lesson on tessellation, the
observee asked her peers to observe her language, her use of gestures,
the types or levels of questions she used, and the percentage of
teacher-talk as opposed to student-talk. Each point was taken on by
two or three observers who watched and recorded data. The data was
then reported back to the observee while the reporter practiced his
skills in non-judgemental feedback.

This process of learning and practicing the techniques of peer
supervision combined with the natural evolvement of bonding in a
context of motivation and vulnerability created a professional and
personal cohesion among the participants. Some of the participants'
comments which reflect this cohesion are:

- There is a good group atmosphere here. I have felt
  comfortable taking risks and making mistakes. This is due, I
  think, to the make up of the group - most of us have a very
  strong commitment - and to the openness of the staff.
- We have a really cohesive group which gives a lot of mutual
  support.
- The participants are very supportive of one another

**Issue of program design.** Many of the positive comments the
participants made during the March interview were related to the
design of the program (see table 4.15). Several of them had been in
contact informally with participants of the UVIC program and had
compared notes. The SFU participants were very appreciative of the
practical orientation of their program, especially the opportunities to
put into action much of the knowledge and many of the skills they had learned during courses on campus.

- The methodology courses are great - they're clear, practical assignments I will use in class.
- It models the latest research on effective immersion/second language teaching.
- The methodological base for teaching French immersion is crucial.
- It's orientation is of a practical nature, not too much theory.

The importance of a practical orientation of such a program was reiterated by all but one of the school district personnel who were familiar with the program and who had been contacted by the writer. They felt that the educational and pedagogical aspects of the retraining process were as important as the linguistic aspect.

All of the participants had, at some point, been students before beginning their careers and expressed genuine surprise at the professional respect they received from program organizers.

- We are treated like adults and respected as professionals in our own right.
- Our feedback is respected.
- We controlled how much we wanted to get involved in the teaching during our first practicum.

There were some negative feelings towards specific aspects of the program design which were expressed by the participants.
### Table 4.15
Positive aspects of the SFU TRP as perceived by the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Personnel</th>
<th>Gain in Self-confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(a) Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)*

### Table 4.16
Negative aspects of the SFU TRP as perceived by the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Interfaculty Communication</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(a) Because the nature of the questions were open ended, not all respondents had something to say about the program design when criticising the TRP (n=12)*
Several felt that there should have been more communication between the Faculty of Education and the D.L.L.L. since the courses offered by these departments differed significantly in terms of orientation and structure.

Some sensed that certain aspects of the program were hastily organized and therefore did not unfold as expected. For example, the free day each week in the second semester was established just prior to January yet on several occasions, that day was used by certain instructors for rescheduling classes which normally would take place on one of the other four week days.

Another aspect of the program design which some of the participants felt didn't meet expectations was the role of the sponsor teacher during the fall practicum. This point was raised in the final week of the Fall semester during a seminar which focused on analysing this semester. In a few cases, the sponsor teachers expected that the participants would speak fluent French and therefore heavily criticized that aspect of their performance, at times in front of the classroom students. During a semester evaluation session held in December, the group generally agreed that a more formalized attempt should have been made to inform the sponsor teachers as to the nature of the TRP and appropriate expectations of the participants.

Apart from the few instances cited above, the participants had few quarrels with the manner in which the TRP had been designed, organized and implemented. They all appeared to appreciate the practical orientation of the program, the integration of linguistic and
pedagogical emphases, and the respect they received as professionals.

**Issue of program personnel.** Inevitably, during many contacts with the participants on a one to one basis or as a group, comments were made about the quality of the personnel directly involved with the TRP.

-We get a lot of support from program organizers.
-(The coordinator and faculty associates) are good models and show respect and support.
-The teaching staff is terrific.

Most of the participants felt that the instructors and coaches who were either themselves teachers in schools or who spend a lot of time in classrooms, were the ones who had the most to offer them. Once again the practical nature of the program was highlighted. Specific courses and instructors were praised and/or criticized but these varied from one participant to the next. A number of participants however did comment that some of the instructors, being francophones, had no idea of the extent to which they had to work to complete what appeared to them (the instructors) to be a simple assignment.

**Issue of the program coordinator.** Although the position of the program coordinator was half time for most of the program (during practica phases, she worked full-time), she was the one with whom the participants had the most contact. The aspects of her role which directly touched the participants involved the leading of seminars,
coursework instruction, coaching during practica, organization of field trips, and late night 'counseling' phone calls. It is not surprising then that many of the participants often made comments on her role in the TRP. All of the comments were of a positive nature yet they reflect a perceived difference in her approach from the first to the second semester.

During the first semester, the participants saw her as a 'mother hen' figure, prodding, supporting, encouraging, organizing and facilitating in a warm and sympathetic manner. During the second semester, the participants felt a distance developing between them and the coordinator. Many perceived this change as her attempt to wean them from her to prepare them for the 'real world'.

The coordinator confirmed these perceptions by describing her decision to withdraw somewhat from the participants after the first semester. Firstly, she felt that she was getting too involved in the program. Only working part time with the program, she had other professional and personal responsibilities. Secondly, the nature of the second semester was quite different from the first in that it entailed a more structured coursework format. The coordinator tried to involve herself only in the courses for which she was an instructor. This change is illustrated by the action she took when approached by several participants complaining about the direction and the workload of one of their language courses. Rather than intervening to solve their problem for them, she encouraged them to discuss the problem as a group and to include the instructor in those discussions. They did, and eventually came to an agreement with the instructor about
how to modify the coursework.

The context chart (chart 4.1) illustrates the complexity of the program coordinator's job. This person took on a variety of roles with the participants and was the contact for each person or agency directly or indirectly involved with the TRP.

**Issue of the Québec phase.** Several (4) participants, as well as some program observers, the program coordinator, and some school district personnel felt that the Québec phase would be better placed at the beginning of the program rather than at the end. Their reason was that this would serve to give them a linguistic boost so that they wouldn't feel so vulnerable at the beginning. As one French consultant who had a brief contact with the participants stated:

They (the participants) can express themselves with no glaring grammatical errors, but there's a hesitancy ... they seem to lack confidence. To put them in a situation (i.e.: a French immersion classroom) where they are expected to be totally spontaneous is very dangerous. The communicative approach, so necessary in the immersion classroom, demands an open, spontaneous organization. If one is not totally confident linguistically, one tends to want to hold one's cards very close to the chest, not letting go of any control in the learning situation. This is not conducive to students taking control of their own learning. It becomes a 'Cours Magistral' instead of an integrated living/learning experience. The participants lack the authentic spontaneity and syntax which comes only from exposure to native
It was generally felt that time spent in a totally francophone environment prior to the commencement of coursework and practica would greatly enhance their linguistic confidence. Some participants even suggested that two sessions in Québec, one preceeding and one following the academic/practical phases, would have been ideal.

The transactional information presented indicates that the participants remained motivated throughout the duration of the TRP despite some difficult moments experienced by individuals. Their confidence to teach French immersion increased significantly from September to May, and most of their initial expectations were being met. Many concerns which they had at the beginning of the program (ie: language development, finding a job, practica) were lessened as the program progressed and helped them to deal with these concerns. Other concerns (financial, time for family) appeared to increase.

Some new concerns did arise as the participants continued the program. Offering more variety in subject area methodology coursework was suggested by several. The elementary orientation of the program was also mentioned but only by a few of the participants.

Some issues based on the participant's experiences and reflections throughout the program were also highlighted. The growth of a supportive, cohesive group was perceived as a very positive development by many of the participants who relied heavily on their colleagues for professional and emotional assistance. The program design was generally well appreciated by all of the participants even though they had some specific recommendations for change or
**Chart 4.1**
context chart

- **Funding Agent**
  - approves and provides funding

- **Faculty of Education**
  - studies and approves program

- **Program Director**
  - designs program
  - applies for funding
  - applies for Senate approval
  - administers program
  - evaluates program

- **D.L.L.L.**
  - designs language courses specific to participants' needs

- **Program Coordinator**
  - instructs participants
  - counsels participants
  - leads participants in seminars
  - organizes and coordinates all coursework
  - organizes and coordinates instructors and outside presenters
  - organizes and coordinates all extra-curricular activities
  - organizes and coordinates all practice
  - supervises practice

- **School Districts**
  - agree to participate

- **School Associates (12)**
  - coach participants
  - provide rich, supportive environment

- **Participants (12)**
  - study, practice, learn, grow

- **Presenters**
  - lead seminars/workshops

- **Instructors**
  - faculty of education
  - D.L.L.L.
  - teach courses 1-3/wk

- **Outside Agencies**
  - accept educational/social visits

* indicates initiator of interaction
--- indicates unofficial but nonetheless present interaction

*Department of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*
improvement. The strongest opinions expressed by the participants reflected a very positive interaction between the program personnel, especially the coordinator, and themselves. They all felt that the professionalism and respect demonstrated by all of the personnel was a very important factor in making the TRP a positive growth experience.

In contrast to the generally positive opinions expressed by the SFU TRP participants regarding program design and personnel, the UVIC TRP participants expressed serious concerns about these aspects of their program. Although the writer did not spend a lot of time with them, their feelings were expressed very strongly in the responsive information they provided on questionnaires and during interviews. Some examples of comments regarding the design of the program as experienced by the UVIC participants were...

- The program seems not to have built in a process for feedback...
  any suggestions for change have not been solicited by the organizers but rather initiated by disgruntled participants.
- Not enough contact with schools
- It’s an artificial environment, not related to the real world of teaching.
- There is little active involvement on our part in the learning process. We want to talk in the language, not about the language.
- Some non teachers have been accepted into our program and have vastly different needs.
- The program is designed to fit the existing infrastructure of
the French Department ... has not been designed with our needs in mind. A special program needs flexibility and special design attention.

- There is a lack of direction. Fundamental questions regarding retraining approach and inherent process have not been addressed. There seems to be no plan therefore the goals are not clear.

- One or two participants with extremely weak linguistic skills were let in so we have a tremendous range in communicative abilities. It makes it difficult for those of us who consistantly have to slow down to accommodate the weaker students.

- We need a "faculty associate" who can offer practical, relevant information and promote group cohesiveness.

- The director (coordinator) of the program should have more contact with us.

- The program is too loaded on the scholarly side. We need a living experience with some language study.

Most of the UVIC participants liked many of their instructors and found them enthusiastic within the context of their individual courses, but felt that little accommodation was made for them in the context of retraining. Some comments:

- Pressure is increasing as our pracicum approaches but we're getting little help to prepare for it.

- We listen 90% of the day.
- Our professors are scholars, not educators.
- The faculty doesn't respect us as professionals.

These comments contrasted sharply with those of the participants from the SFU TRP whose experiences and reflections are generally of a positive nature. As discussed in the final chapter of this study, a great deal of consideration was given to contemporary research in the areas of in-service, language acquisition, and French immersion methodology in the design of the SFU program. Comments given by the organizer of the UVIC program indicate that such research was not considered when that program was being designed. Although the goals of the two programs were the same, to retrain qualified B.C. teachers for French immersion, the steps taken to achieve that goal were very different, as is evident in the contrast in participants' reactions to their respective programs.
**Phase Three - Outcome Information**

This section will look at the participants' experiences during their six week practicum in April-May, and their stay in Chicoutimi, Québec. Following this, their reflections on the TRP as a whole will be discussed and their comments regarding contemporary issues in French immersion will be compared with their comments made at the beginning of the TRP on the same subject.

**Spring Practicum**

The participants generally had very positive experiences during their final practica and indicated that these experiences helped them to gain confidence in dealing with their own pending teaching assignments. As illustrated in table 4.17, one of the major factors in this positive reaction was the choice of school associates with whom the participants worked for these six weeks. Half of the participants specifically mentioned that their school associate was instrumental in creating a supportive, healthy working environment.

- my helping teacher was always positive and helped me with my grammar and pronunciation
- 'X' trusted me and left me to do what I wanted
- I had the great fortune to work with a positive encouraging and energetic school associate

Just as some school associates were perceived as being positive influences on the practicum experience, others were noted to have been less than ideal models.
-I do not feel that my sponsor teacher was a good example as far as discipline was concerned.

- she was overprotective about leaving me alone with the class.

- Teachers and students should be matched carefully. Also, by the spring, many good teachers have already had a student and are burned. Maybe some teachers need to be kept 'in reserve'.

Many (7) of the participants expressed appreciation for having another opportunity to practice their skills and to learn from experienced teachers.

- I was able to try all sorts of strategies (integration, centres etc...).

- I gained experience in a grade which I had not taught before, and also learned many ideas from an excellent teacher.

- I feel more prepared to teach in September, more confident.

As I took my practicum in my future school, I feel part of the staff, integrated into the routines and the school.

Of those (8) participants who had some suggestions for changes to the spring practicum (see table 4.18), four felt that the timing of the practicum could have been better.

- Have it earlier, perhaps the last 2 weeks of March and all of April. (Much of the course content was finishing off at the end of May).
### Table 4.17
**Positive Aspects of the Spring Practicum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement (School Associate)</th>
<th>Practical Experience</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Language Development Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a- Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)*

### Table 4.18
**Suggestions for Changes to the Spring Practicum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Placements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a- Because of open questions, this number is less than the number of respondents (n=12)*
- it might be better to have it end before the 24th of May as the elementary schools start to have 'wind-down' activities soon after the holiday weekend.

- it should be held in January. Until the final practicum is completed, school boards are reluctant to hire and this put our group at a real disadvantage vis a vis the PDP [pre-service] students.

The importance of careful placements was also mentioned by a few (3) of the participants, who considered themselves lucky to have had very good placements.

- place teachers in schools where a variety of grade levels can be observed - teachers chosen should be excellent models

- assure that all future students have good placements. I felt very lucky to have had an experienced, calm, competent maître-guide.

- for myself, there were no problems, but I chose the school and the teacher myself. Teachers and students should be matched carefully, personality conflicts can be a problem.

Of the twelve participants, all of whom completed the practicum, two did not succeed. One in particular failed because her language skills were still weak so they hindered her performance as an effective French Immersion teacher. Both of the participants who
did not pass the practicum went to Québec, since a) the one with weak language skills was told that her situation would be reviewed at the end of the Québec phase if her linguistic skills improved considerably and, b) the one whose language skills were fine but who was methodologically weak was told he may have an opportunity to be re-evaluated during another practicum in the future.

Québec phase

One participant had decided not to go to Québec since she found the prospect of being away from her spouse for six weeks too difficult. She was asked to withdraw from the TRP since she was not going to be able to complete all of the program requirements. All of the participants who went to Québec, had positive comments (see table 4.19) regarding their stay in Chicoutimi. Many (7) commented specifically on the program which was organized for them.

- a large selection of activities, batik to boating. Interesting weekend trips
- it was a well organized program, excellent idea to stay with a family in Chicoutimi
- very well organized, very well received and taken care of!
  Many worthwhile activities planned

Several (5) of the participants felt that Chicoutimi was a particularly good location for the purposes of this program, while some (4) mentioned that the opportunities (organized and spontaneous) for perfecting their communication skills were
abundant.

-Chicoutimi was a very 'French' milieu allowing us unlimited occasions to practice our French
-the community, the family, the school functioned totally in French, and provided the needed immersion
-very French atmosphere, very organized program
-absolutely helped my fluency, competence and confidence in speaking. I found the people warm, and welcoming.

Other, less often mentioned positive aspects of the Québec phase were living with a family and specific program staff.

When indicating suggestions for change to the Québec phase (see table 4.20), some (4) participants thought that there could have been more opportunity for them to socialize with local francophones. Some felt the program was a little too organized and left them little time to make their own informal contacts with the local population.
-needs a restructuring of the program to assure that we spend more time with the francophones in the area
-we needed more time to integrate with the French population, rather than being constantly together

Some (4) participants were not pleased with their lodging arrangements and suggested that more care be taken when finding families to take students in. In one situation, three anglophone students shared accommodation with a family that wanted to practice
### Table 4.19
Positive Aspects of the Québec Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Language Development</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (*n* = 11)

### Table 4.20
Suggestions for Change to the Québec Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact with Francophones</th>
<th>Host Family/ Lodgings</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (*n* = 11)
speaking English. It was also mentioned that at this stage in life (middle age), privacy is a very important factor and that some participants found sharing accommodation a very difficult adjustment.

-some more care needs to be taken in the placing of us, as mature students, in a family. We did not like sharing rooms for six weeks for example. Some people found their families noisy and many people had problems with the food-

-it would have been better if we had had only one anglophone for each family. Ours had three! My family included many English words when speaking French

A few (3) mentioned that six weeks was too long a time to be away from home, especially for those with family obligations. For some it took a lot of organization to be able to leave their home responsibilities for that long.

Of the eleven participants that went to Chicoutimi and completed the program there, nine successfully completed the linguistic evaluation implemented under the jurisdiction of the Modern Languages Branch, British Columbia Ministry of Education at the end of the program. Of the two who did not succeed, one had also failed her practicum so in fact three participants did not meet the standards of the TRP. One did not meet linguistic requirements, one did not meet pedagogical requirements, and one met neither set of requirements. Since one participant had withdrawn prior to the Québec phase, eight of the twelve participants who began the program
in September 1985 successfully completed it.

**Outcome Information**

As of September 9, 1986, of the eight participants who successfully completed all components of the TRP, seven had jobs teaching French immersion. The positions ranged from full time to half time and from grade one to grade six.

**Confidence.** One of the most striking issues which was highlighted during the gathering of outcome information was the uniformity of the confidence levels (see table 4.21) of the participants who were embarking on their new teaching careers. All but one expressed confidence in themselves towards teaching French immersion. The person who did not feel as confident as the others is the only one of the successful participants who, as of September 30, had not yet found a job. This is in contrast to the beginning of the program when only one of the participants indicated that they were confident to take on a French immersion teaching assignment (see table 4.6).

For those who, at the end of the TRP felt confident to teach French immersion, the major contributor to that confidence was the emphasis on French immersion pedagogy (table 4.22) which the program provided. Other influencing factors were their practica experiences, and the language development opportunities provided throughout the programme.
### Table 4.21
Level of Self Confidence toward Teaching FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Unconfident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.22**
Aspects of the TRP contributing to participants' confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immersion</th>
<th>Practica</th>
<th>Language Development</th>
<th>Other Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a- Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)

**Concerns**
Many of the concerns highlighted earlier in the program are no longer an issue since they have been dealt with or been forgotten by the participants now that the TRP is behind them. Some however remained throughout the final stages of the TRP, and in a few instances, continued after the program as well. Chart 4.2 tracks the presence of the participants' concerns as they progressed through the program.

**Language concerns.** Many (5) of the participants recognized that they would have to continue to work on developing their language skills and that the end of the TRP does not mean the end of their quest for improvement.

- I am still trying to improve my oral French. I am most fortunate to be in a school where the majority of the French teachers are francophones. I have learned a lot already
- need to work on vocabulary development, mine and the students'

**Financial concerns.** Of the participants who were experiencing financial difficulties earlier in the program, all but one had a job to go to in September. The participant who did not have a job and who had expressed concerns of a financial nature was, by the end of August, extremely concerned by her difficult financial situation.

- I appreciate the fact that the government paid my fees and books, but the year has meant financial disaster for me
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>concerns</th>
<th>september '85</th>
<th>march '86</th>
<th>august 86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>linguistic</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practica</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* high= 7-12 moderate=3-6 low=0-2 participants

Among those who have jobs, finances will continue to be of
concern to them as they pay off debts incurred over the past year. Even though only one of the participants directly expressed worries over finances on the final questionnaire, a few indicated during conversations that it would be several months before they would again be financially on their feet.

**Family concerns.** Family responsibilities which were problems for several of the participants continued to be so during the Québec phase. Special and sometimes difficult arrangements had to be made for childcare for the six weeks. Two of the participants brought their charges to Québec with them and arranged childcare there. Once the program was over however, this concern was alleviated.

**Concerns about the practica.** The practica which had been a concern to several of the participants during the first, and for some the second semesters, are now looked back upon as being very worthwhile and useful. It appears that the concerns were based on the unknown which of course were overcome. One concern noted however was the manner in which one of the students was notified of her failure during the second practicum. She reported that, she found out formally by letter while she was in Québec. According to the program coordinator, this participant's evaluation during the practicum was an ongoing process and that there were no surprises.

**Concern about finding a job.** Since seven of the eight successful participants who secured a teaching job for September in French immersion, this concern does not exist for them. For the one successful participant, who did not get a job, her concern is still very
much in the forefront.

**Issue of Program Design.** Almost all (11) of the participants felt that the TRP was designed to effectively prepare them to teach French immersion (see table 4.24). When asked to indicate what aspects of the TRP most helped them to develop their confidence (see table 4.22), half of the participants said that the emphasis of the TRP on French immersion pedagogy was a major factor in that development since they were repeatedly exposed to the reality of teaching French immersion in contrast to teaching the regular English program.

- all round awareness of the French immersion programs (eg.
  - methods used, types of programs etc...)
- the discussion and training in immersion methodology
- the emphasis on immersion pedagogy
- pedagogical work and planning

Two other aspects of the TRP given equal emphasis when responding to this question were the practica and the language development emphasis of the TRP.

- the spring practicum and the stage in Québec
- speaking French while at SFU all the time
- les stages pratiques dans les écoles

Throughout the program, during informal discussions and seminars, during interviews and on questionnaires, participants consistently suggested that when hiring French immersion teachers,
school districts should look for the following criteria: oral and written communication skills in French, immersion teaching experience, knowledge of French immersion methodology, and the ability to work collegially with other teachers. Table 4.23 illustrates how the participants thought the TRP helped them to develop in those areas.

Almost all of the participants felt that the TRP provided them with opportunities to develop their oral and written expression for the classroom and in general. One participant who felt less strong about this than the others added that she felt that more work directly from the textbooks used in French immersion would have been more useful to her in the development of language for the classroom.

In acquiring knowledge about French immersion methodology, all of the participants indicated that the TRP provided plenty of opportunities to develop in this area.

- this aspect of the program was extremely important
- well examined and given a lot of thought and discussion during this program
- a great emphasis was placed on this area

Almost all of the participants said that the TRP provided them with plenty of immersion teaching experiences, ranging from the mini-leçons of the first semester, to the six week practicum during the spring.
Table 4.23
How well the TRP helped participants to develop effective FI teaching qualities
n=12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral expression for the classroom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral expression in general</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written expression for the classroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written expression in general</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of FI methodology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI teaching experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work collegially with other teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There's nothing better that the real thing. I was in a situation
where I got to teach a lot and really be a part of the classroom
-the practica were very important to our success

When asked about the opportunities provided to help them work collegially with other teachers, many (8) responded that the TRP had created several situations where they had to work with other teachers.
-we were given lots of opportunity to work with the other teachers

A few (3) however felt that their skills in this area were already well developed and that they didn't see the TRP as being instrumental in further developing these skills.
-remained the same, as a substitute I learned to adapt to any staff situation over the years
-I work this way anyway

One participant felt that he still saw a need for himself to improve in this area.

Since many of the participants' comments given in March related to the design of the TRP, in August, they were asked directly whether they felt the design of the program was effective in helping them to prepare for French immersion teaching. The UVIC participants were also asked this question since their remarks in
March were generally in contrast to those given by the SFU participants. Table 4.24 illustrates the continued contrast in reflections on the design of the two programs. Almost all of the SFU participants felt that their TRP was very well designed for its purpose— to train teachers to teach French immersion.

- they set up a relaxed, encouraging environment 1st semester, intense work on language 2nd semester, practical application—practicum, and perfectionnement of language, Chicoutimi—sciences humaines, lecture, arts plastiques, and français methodology courses were very useful, practica gave us a chance to put theory into practice

Of the UVIC participants who responded to the final questionnaire (7/9), all of them felt that their TRP was not well designed in meeting its objective.

- strong on language development, weak on methods
- too much emphasis on traditional, academic course work

Issue of Program Staff. Many (7) of the SFU participants felt that the personnel who organized and/or taught in the program were very good. The remarks made at the end of the program regarding personnel do not differ from those made during the program after the first and second semesters.

- considering it was the first time, yes they were
Teacher Retraining Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.24</th>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Program Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program design</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU (n=12)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVIC (n=7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were they able to help to prepare you to teach French immersion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFU (n=12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVIC (n=7)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-X's attitude is very professional and very positive
did their best to meet our needs
excellent choice of competent teachers

A few remarks were accompanied by qualifiers relating to specific instructors but the overall consensus was generally very positive.

The comments of the UVIC participants' pertaining to the staff of their TRP were also consistent with remarks made in March, and continue to show a contrast from those made by the SFU participants.

- no one at UVIC was familiar with the French immersion programme
- The UVIC staff were not really committed to developing a program that would work effectively. They made no effort to change their orientation to teacher training methodology

Suggestions for change - All of the participants made suggestions as to how they felt the program should be modified in the future. They were asked to indicate their suggestions in order of importance, to which the writer accorded points depending on their placement (first, second, third, or fourth). Chart 4.3 presents those suggestions which received more than five points.

As is shown, the recommendation which is most strongly stated has to do with the language coursework which was offered during the first two semesters. Several participants reiterated what
chart 4.3
recommendations for changes to the TRP
in order of importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank of importance</th>
<th>first X4</th>
<th>second X3</th>
<th>third X2</th>
<th>fourth X1</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>language courses</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practica</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other subject areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entry requirements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Québec phase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[other suggestions mentioned but with five points or less are, French immersion pedagogy (more of it), more emphasis on reading, more emphasis on specific commercial programs, better organization, more contact with francophones throughout the program, and more time for preparation.]

they had indicated in March, that the grammar course offered by the
DLLL was needed but that it involved an inordinate amount of homework. They felt that the same course should be offered but spread over two semester.

- a basic grammar course all year, once a week, not with too much homework, but still all year

The phonetics course offered second semester was thought by many to be very useful but that they would also like to have received phonetics instruction during the first semester.

After having received what many participants considered to be excellent instruction during a grammar/language course in Chicoutimi, some participants felt that their SFU languages should be based on that model.

- change first term conversation and grammar course to an adult course taught in a communicative style
- in Québec our teacher utilized the Approche Communicative always and we worked in small groups to solve all kinds of problems. These discussions stimulated conversation, competence, and organization of ideas. Everyone really worked, this would be ideal for semester #1

Changes which received considerably less but still fairly substantial support dealt with the practica. Although it was the practica in their varying forms which received the most support when discussing positive aspects of the TRP, the participants still had a
few points to raise, most of which were organizational. A few participants would like to have had even more time in the classroom, while others felt that the timing of the spring practicum should be changed. Several mentioned the importance of carefully selecting appropriate school associates.

- spring practicum in March
- three month practicum, JAN - FEB
- two practica are good, but watch the teachers who are school associates. More grapevine about good teachers is necessary

Another change which participants would like to see has to do with their curriculum courses and workshops offered throughout the first and second semesters. Many felt that several curricula areas were completely ignored. They indicated that although reading and social studies were very important, science, physical education, and mathematics were also important because of the specialised vocabulary one needed to know in order to teach these subjects.

A few (2) participants indicated on the final questionnaire that they felt that the linguistic entry standards should be raised. This concern was reinforced by several (4) others during informal conversations in September. The constant worry of wondering whether or not they would improve their linguistic skills enough to be considered French immersion teachers wore heavily on most of them throughout the year. It was felt that if the initial entry standards were a bit stiffer, then future participants would not be so consumed
by this worry.

- the level of French must be high enough at the beginning to permit entry, otherwise we just have false illusions about ourselves

The Québec phase of the program was mentioned by several (5) as a focus for change however most of the comments related to the timing and the length of time. Of those concerned about the timing, most suggested that the Québec trip be done earlier and/or more than once during the program. Other suggestions for change to the Québec phase were offered earlier in this chapter.

**Issues in French Immersion**

The participants' knowledge of French immersion issues appears not to have changed significantly over the course of the program. Tables 4.25 through 4.31 indicate a general consistancy, with one or two exceptions, in students' perceptions of issues in French immersion education.

In giving reasons for the implementation of French immersion (table 4.25), little change was noted except for the few (4) who added federal funding as a positive factor. The arguments which participants felt would be used against the implementation of French immersion (table 4.26) also included federal funding but rather the lack of it and thus the perceived resulting increase in costs to school districts. Two participants also added that the argument of students'
## Table 4.25
Reasons for Implementing French Immersion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>beneficial to</th>
<th>bilingual</th>
<th>parent</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>f.s.l.</th>
<th>funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>not affected</td>
<td></td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**September '85**  
(n=30)a

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**August '86**  
(n=27)a

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a- Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)*
### Table 4.26
Reasons for Not Implementing French Immersion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Difficulties</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Administrative Difficulties</th>
<th>Political Affected</th>
<th>English Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>September '85</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August '86</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a- Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)*
### Table 4.27
Criteria for hiring French immersion teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language competence</th>
<th>Teaching competence</th>
<th>F.I. methodology</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>September '85</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=37)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14(varia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August '86</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=33)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a- Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)*
### Table 4.28
Description of Immersion Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents Professional</th>
<th>Parents Supportive</th>
<th>Parents Interested in Bilingualism</th>
<th>Parents Openminded</th>
<th>Students Bright</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>September '85</strong> (n=15)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August '86</strong> (n=13)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All kinds of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a-* Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)
English skills suffering would be used.

When citing criteria for the hiring of French immersion teachers (table 4.27), the same issues arose however slightly more participants felt that general teaching abilities and French immersion methodology skills were important to consider.

The descriptors of children enrolled in French immersion (table 4.28) did not change much except that no one used 'bright' as a general description. In fact, several thought that all types of students (slow/average/bright, variety of economic and ethnic backgrounds) were enrolling in French immersion.

They reasons given for why parents choose French immersion for their children (table 4.29) remained the same. Examples of benefits to children cited:

- parents wanting a broader educational experience for their children
- they feel they get a more quality education
- to provide them with better opportunities on the job market

That parents viewed French immersion for their children as a status symbol for themselves was stated by a few (3).

- From my experience, they see it as an elite group, this is also one more dimension in their efforts to allow their children to benefit from every opportunity
- social prestige
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Benefits</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September '85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August '86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a- Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)*
**Table 4.30**

Accessability of French immersion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Restrictions</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>September '85</strong> (n=12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August '86</strong> (n=12)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.31**

Public attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Polarized</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>September '85</strong> (n=12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>August '86</strong> (n=12)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.32
**Issues of Concern in French Immersion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Displacement</th>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Secondary Maintenance</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Administrative Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **September '85**  
(n=23)<sup>a</sup> | 6                    | 4       | 4                     | 3       | 3       | 3                       |
| **August '86**    
(n=22)<sup>a</sup>  | 1                    | 5       | 4                     | 5       | 4       | 3                       |

<sup>a</sup>- Because of multiple responses, this number is greater than the number of respondents (n=12)
In discussing the accessibility of French immersion (table 4.30), most of those who responded to this particular question (7/11) said yes with no reservations. The rest also said that ideally, yes all children should have access to French immersion education, but that the reality demanded that some sort of screening be undertaken to direct children with learning disabilities into the regular English program. Reasons given for this were:

- if a child has great problems with oral language and reading early on, I would reconsider, otherwise it is harder for this child, he has two problems, understanding the concept and the language
- yes, in general, however I'm not convinced that children with learning disabilities really get the attention they need
- unfortunately, the reality of the situation is the F1 teacher already carries a great load teaching this program, and may have difficulty dealing with a child with a learning or behaviour problem

When the participants were asked to state what they thought were issues of concern in French immersion, six of them, in September, cited displacement of teachers in the regular program as an issue. In August, only one felt that this was an issue to be dealt with. Two more felt that support, via teaching materials and consultative staff needed attention. Although four participants each time suggested that the maintenance of French immersion through the
secondary grades was an issue of concern in September were quite different from those given in August. Initially, most of the participants who mentioned this issue were concerned about the maintenance of the students' language skills as the amount of time of instruction in French diminished as they got closer to graduation. In August however, the concern was more over the availability of qualified subject specialists who are also competent in adapting their approaches to meet the language development needs of students.

The participants as a whole remained quite consistent in their understanding of issues in French immersion education from September to August. Some differences as noted above were evident, however there appear to have been no major shifts in attitude and perceptions regarding French immersion education from September 1985 to August 1986.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

Summary of Results

The Participants

Background - The participants of the Teacher Retraining Program '85-'86 at Simon Fraser University were all qualified to teach in British Columbia prior to entering the program. They had also all been through the linguistic screening process and were prepared to spend one full year training to become French immersion teachers. Their actual professional background varied however since some had only taught at the secondary level and some had, for the most part, been substitute teaching for some time before the TRP began, while a few had not been teaching immediately prior to taking the TRP. The SFU TRP was designed for practicing teachers with continuing contracts which would have ensured a direct link with a school district and the increased possibility of being hired to teach French immersion the following year. Only one participant who successfully completed the screening process undertaken by the Ministry of Education satisfied this requirement. She was able to take an educational leave which involved receiving partial salary from her school district. Two participants had received verbal assurance that they would be seriously considered for a French immersion teaching position upon successful completion of the TRP. The other participants had received no support, financial or verbal, from a school district.

The participants also varied in their linguistic ability as
indicated on their entry scores [written= 53%-84%, oral= 53%-94%].

Their ages ranged from 26 to 52, most were married, and most had one or more dependents.

The participants had all committed themselves to one full year of retraining which for almost all of them meant no salary. The group was highly motivated since they felt that the successful completion of this program would better qualify them for a teaching job which meant a steady income, or for a change in assignment. They saw it as an investment for which much hard work would be necessary before they would realize a return.

**Issues** - Throughout the program, the writer tracked several issues as they affected the participants. The issues were determined by the participants themselves as they expressed them at various stages of the program.

The confidence levels of the participants contrasted sharply from the beginning to the end of the TRP. Almost all of the participants were confident from the beginning that they would successfully complete the program however, in September 1985, almost none felt confident to teach French immersion. The reasons most often given for this lack of confidence were weak language skills, and the realization that they knew little about French immersion pedagogy. By August 1986, all but one participant expressed confidence to teach immersion. The aspects of the program which the participants said most contributed to that confidence were the many opportunities to study and practice their communication skills and to learn and practice teaching methods specific to French
In the early stages of the TRP, almost all of the participants expressed concern over being able to improve their communication skills enough to satisfy the hiring standards of school districts. Even though program observers and instructors could see a continuous progression, the participants felt throughout the first and most of the second semesters that they were still making too many mistakes and were not fluid enough in their speech. This frustration appeared to diminish somewhat by the end of the second semester. In August, when the Québec phase was completed, although most of them realized that they would have to continually be working on the development of their language skills, very few participants felt worried about their skills not being good enough to teach immersion.

Even though the Ministry of Education paid for all fees and books, financial worries affected some of the participants early in the program, especially those with dependents and/or no supporting spouse. By the middle of the program, this concern was raised by several more participants who were seeing their savings depleted and having difficulties acquiring loans. This worry added much pressure in an already stressful situation of trying to find a job, completing courses at the end of the second semester, and preparing for the six week practicum. In August, many of the participants were looking forward to their first paycheque and the possibility of becoming financially solvent again.

For some of the participants, especially those with young dependents, the concern of dealing with family responsibilities and
demanding studies was very difficult. By March, even more expressed this concern as they found they had to withdraw from many personal interest activities. Even those without dependents were finding that the amount of time they spent with the program affected their private lives. A few were very worried about how they were going to ensure care for their children while they were in Québec for six weeks. By the end of the TRP, this concern was no longer in the forefront since it had been confronted and dealt with by each individual.

The concern of finding a job was very high in the early stages of the program, lessening consistently as the confidence levels of the participants increased and, one by one, they began to get immersion teaching positions.

At the beginning of the program, the participants were feeling very anxious about their impending practica. Many felt that they weren't ready, especially linguistically. The practica began in late September when they spent one day each week in a French immersion classroom. By the end of their three week practicum in November, very few participants saw the practica as a concern. One concern however which arose as a result of their initial practical experience was that the school associates were not well enough informed as to the nature of the TRP and had difficulty in knowing to what point they should criticize, help, or leave the participants alone.

All but one of the participants felt that their expectations and needs were met by the TRP. Although some said they needed more language development, they also said that the TRP had provided as
much of that as was possible during the twelve month period. They also stated that their expectation that the TRP would provide them with opportunities to learn about and to practice techniques specific to French immersion teaching were met.

The participants formed a cohesive group as most of them developed a very strong professional and personal support network. They all began the TRP in a state of risk-taking and vulnerability yet they were all highly motivated. They were put into situations where they had to trust and rely on one another for personal support and professional feedback. The contacts they formed with each other during the TRP may very well continue as a strong professional network throughout their teaching careers.

The Program

Design - The design of the SFU TRP was very much lauded by its participants for its practical nature, its responsiveness to their needs, and its flexibility to address concerns as they arose. They appreciated the combination of language development opportunities and pedagogical emphasis. This is in contrast to the attitude of the UVIC participants, who felt that their TRP was very rigid in an attempt to fit the program into the existing structure of the Department of French Language and Literature. They felt that their program was of an academic rather than an educational nature and lacked an understanding of what French immersion is and how to effectively teach it. The UVIC participants also felt that there was great disparity in the linguistic and professional backgrounds of those accepted into their program and therefore the needs were
extremely varied.

The SFU participants, even though they generally felt very positive towards their experience, had some suggestions for change to future TRPs held at SFU...

- the distribution of the formal language courses should be more evenly distributed over the two 'on campus' semesters rather than concentrated in the second semester
- the spring practicum should be held earlier in the school year before the year begins to 'wind down' and the school associates become tired and 'overused'. They also felt that the school associates should be made aware of the nature of the TRP so as to help them to focus on the most effective ways in which they can assist the participants.
- coverage of more subject areas during the workshops and courses instead of concentrating on two (social studies and reading).
- entry standards to the TRP should be raised so as to ensure less stress on the participants as a result of weak linguistic skills, as well as a higher success rate
- the Québec phase be done earlier and/or more than once during the TRP. The time spent in Québec should be less structured to allow them to mingle more with the francophone community rather than spending their time with other anglophones trying to perfect their French

Personnel - During each phase of data collection, participants’ comments highlighted the quality of the people involved in
coordinating or instructing in the SFU TRP. They felt that the people with whom they worked directly were very professional and knowledgeable about French immersion education. They were treated openly and with respect as professionals with valid experiences to share and to build upon.

Again, in contrast to comments made by the SFU participants, the UVIC participants stated that, although the personnel of their program were very nice people, they were scholarly oriented rather than educationally oriented. This created difficulties in that the teaching staff at UVIC could not offer a program modeled on the strategies used to implement an effective French immersion program in a communicative environment.

**Outcomes**

Of the twelve participants who began the SFU TRP, eight of them successfully completed the program (one left the program before the Québec phase, one failed the linguistic test, one failed the methodology component, one failed both the linguistic test and the methodology component). Of the eight, seven have found jobs teaching French immersion.

Of the twelve participants who began the UVIC TRP, two were not qualified teachers and therefore were not considered in this study. A third participant left the program in March. Of the nine 'teacher-participants' from the UVIC program who went to Québec, three passed the language exit exam. Of these three, only one responded to the final questionnaire and indicated that she has a job teaching French immersion, so it is not known to the writer whether
the other two have found jobs teaching French immersion.

**Issues in French immersion**

Many issues of concern regarding French immersion were highlighted by the participants however little change was noted from the beginning to the end of the TRP. The depth of knowledge of the group as a whole appeared to change very little. Most of the issues raised are consistent with the findings of educators and researchers of immersion programs (Carey, 1984; Day & Shapson, 1983; Jones, 1984; Harley, 1985; Lewis, 1986). Points of view of some participants which are inconsistent with recent findings are, negative or polarized public attitude (Shapson, 1985), and that of immersion not being accessible to low ability students (Jones, 1984).

One of the issues raised but not addressed directly by research available to the writer is that of problems experienced by school districts where French immersion teachers are being hired, indirectly causing the displacement of regular program teachers. It is the experience of the writer, during discussions with District Coordinators of French Programs (BCFCA Fall Conference, November 1985), that this is an issue of concern to many school districts in the province of British Columbia. It was pointed out however that this issue is compounded by the restraint policies implemented in this province during the early nineteen eighties. Under normal circumstances, the phenomenon of regular program teacher displacement would be of minor concern since attrition and mobility of teachers encouraged during healthy economic times would allow for the hiring of French immersion teachers without affecting regular
program staffing. This point was raised to emphasize that teacher displacement is occurring not as a result of French immersion program implementation, but as a direct consequence of funding cutbacks in the general education system.

There are issues in French immersion as indicated by educators and educational researchers which were not mentioned at all by the participants. Harley (1985) writes specifically about the need for appropriate library materials in immersion schools and offers guidelines for immersion educators as to their selection. Carey (1984) mentions the need for a variety of intensive cultural experiences necessary to improve (immersion) students' attitudes toward francophone culture. When discussing specific staffing needs, Jones (1984) indicates a need for qualified immersion teachers who are trained in specialized subject areas for secondary. Lewis (1986) suggests that educators take a close look at the quality of instruction and the variety of course offerings in secondary immersion. Jones also calls for a wider choice of quality materials, especially to cater to the 'gifted' immersion students. Shapson (1985) discusses the need for the development of post-secondary choices in bilingual education to respond to the growing number of students who may wish to continue their studies in French.

In general little change was noted in participants' knowledge of French immersion issues, perhaps because, from the beginning of the program, apart from a few exceptions mentioned above, their opinions differed very little from those views held by researchers and educators of French immersion.
A Framework for the Design of the SFU TRP

a) In-service

One of the purposes of this study is to test the SFU TRP against recent theories of effective in-service, French immersion methodology and language acquisition. This section looks at the design of this program as it relates to contemporary educational research.

As mentioned in chapter one, the Teacher Retraining Program (TRP) at Simon Fraser University is unique in that there are no reports of similar programs being implemented in Canada. The research on in-service programs for teachers to date deals with school-based or school district initiated programs. Even though the TRP removes the teacher from his normal teaching milieu, i.e.: out of their school, program organizers have relied on much of the effective in-service literature in designing their program.

Chapter two provided a possible theoretical framework for a Teacher Retraining Program for French Immersion based generally on research done in the field of in-service, and specifically on seven points outlined by Fullan (1982) as to why in-service programs fail. Each point will be taken up again and inversely related to the design of the Teacher Retraining Program at Simon Fraser University. This will be followed by a brief discussion on how organizers of the TRP also considered research done in the areas of language acquisition in a French immersion setting, and content of teacher training programs for French immersion.
(1) **One-shot workshops are widespread but ineffective**

The TRP was designed based on the knowledge that change in teaching practice takes time. Time is needed to ensure an understanding of the changes occurring, to integrate acquired knowledge, to come to terms with concerns and fears arising from the risk taking involved in the change process, and to practice, analyze and adjust new skills. Within the context of the TRP short presentations were offered, but always within a broader, relevant context. For example, during a three day mini-conference organized for the participants at the end of the first semester, a workshop on children's literature was presented by an outside 'expert' in the field. The participants however had already had some exposure to children's literature in one of their fall courses, they were about to embark on a three-week intensive practicum where they could begin to apply their newly acquired knowledge, and one of their spring courses was to be solely on the teaching of reading in immersion.

The TRP is a twelve month program with a follow up component. It is based on the notion that learning, understanding, observation, practice, and feedback are most effectively assimilated when surrounded by a supportive framework which allows time for reflection, integration, and application of knowledge.

(2) **Topics are frequently selected by people other than those for whom the in-service is intended**

The participants of the TRP chose this program and underwent
a rigorous screening process before being accepted. Certainly the course content of the first semester was in place when the participants arrived but it was based on the results of the ACPI/CAIT National Study of French Immersion Teacher Training and Professional Development (Wilton et al., 1984). This report synthesized the results of questionnaires to hundreds of French immersion teachers across Canada who indicated the kinds of courses they felt should be included in a French immersion teacher preparation program. The design of the second semester and the inclusion of a second long term practicum relied heavily on feedback from the participants who, based on their in class experiences of the first semester, had strong feelings about what they needed.

(3) **Follow-up support for ideas and practices introduced in in-service programs occurs in only a very small minority of cases**

The participants of the TRP at Simon Fraser University had ample opportunity to practice new ideas in the classroom. During the first two semesters, one day a week was set aside for participants to spend in a French immersion classroom to observe and to practice new skills under the guidance of their school associate (classroom teacher) and their faculty associate who visited them in their classrooms at regularly scheduled intervals. This process was also in place during their two long term practica. For those participants who successfully complete the SFU TRP and are hired to teach French immersion in the fall of 1986, a follow-up support structure involving continued visits from an in-service associate will be
implemented.

(4) **Follow-up evaluation occurs infrequently**

Inherent in the support structure mentioned above, was a system of feedback and evaluation. During the first semester, participants were trained in and consistently practiced systematic observation skills based on the clinical supervision model already in place within the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University. The program coordinator who initiated this process had two years training and experience in clinical supervision. Her focus was to teach the participants to observe, analyze, and provide feedback to each other in an atmosphere of mutual respect and constructive criticism. The participants also became skilled in self evaluation. This model of ongoing evaluation will be continued during the follow-up phase in the fall of 1986.

(5) **In-service rarely addresses the individual needs and concerns**

To address this issue, the TRP allowed for several program evaluation sessions where the participants aired their concerns and had input into program changes. For example, at the end of the first semester, the participants were given the opportunity to indicate their wishes as to the content and design of the second semester. At their request, courses on Phonétique et Diction, Designs for Learning -Social Studies, Apprentissage de la lecture, and Grammaire et Composition were offered. They also requested, and got, one unscheduled day each week to allow them to arrange visits to a
variety of French immersion classrooms around the Lower Mainland. In addition, the weekly seminar, led by the program coordinator, provided the participants with a forum to air and discuss concerns which had arisen throughout the week.

(6) The majority of programs involve teachers from many different schools and/or school districts, but there is no recognition of the differential impact of positive and negative factors within the systems to which they must return.

Many of the participants arranged to do their practicums in the school district in which they hope to be teaching French immersion in the fall of 1986. This allowed them to experience the 'positive and negative factors within the systems to which they must return'. For example, they were able to discover their district's support infrastructure (or lack of it) for French immersion programs and teachers, and to address issues of concern in partnership with their faculty and school associates. They were also able to begin the difficult process of developing their own support network among new colleagues in their district.

The in-service practicum (EDUC-407) to be implemented in the fall of 1986 will not only offer the participants a research-based follow-up to the methodology, theory, and curriculum courses taken during the first two phases of the program, but also allow the participants to address issues of concern specific to their own school district. The role of the in-service associate during this phase will be to work with each individual in their new environment, to assist
them in taking advantage of positive factors within their district and to help them deal effectively with the negative factors, as well as to help them implement appropriate curricular and effective instructional strategies.

(7) There is a profound lack of any conceptual basis in the planning and implementation of in-service programs that would ensure their effectiveness.

The premise of this thesis is that the TRP at Simon Fraser University is in fact designed following a conceptual basis in the planning and implementing of effective in-service programs. Program organizers seriously considered and drew upon research in the areas of program design for teacher in-service involving change in teaching practices, French immersion methodology, and language acquisition. The program was also able to draw on the well established models for effective in-service already being implemented in the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser University.

Program organizers at SFU have attempted to design the TRP in such a way as to avoid the many pitfalls of in-service programs as outlined by Fullan. Consideration was given to each of the points mentioned above in the hopes of providing an effective means of preparing teachers for a major change in their careers. In addition to the aforementioned caveats, Fullan discusses characteristics of in-service which must be present for change to succeed. The two which apply to the TRP are:

- professional development must focus on a need
-teachers must have the opportunity to interact with each other, share ideas, and help one another, and must have some external assistance (p. 264).

The TRP program focused on a need which was initially perceived by the director of the Modern Languages Branch at the Ministry of Education and was corroborated by school district personnel. The participants were enrolled in the program strictly on a voluntary basis, indicating a sense of a need for change on their part.

Opportunity for interaction with each other and with teachers already teaching in French immersion was abundant and encouraged. The role of the program coordinator ensured that these opportunities were sustained through her organization of the seminars, meetings between the participants and pre-service immersion teachers, coursework offered by practicing French immersion teachers, and many informal 'rencontres' of the group on their own and with participants of the TRP at the University of Victoria. In addition the coordinator not only provided them with external support, but also assisted them in developing their own networks of external support.

b) Language Acquisition

In addition to being based on recent theories of change and effective in-service, the TRP was also designed with contemporary notions of language acquisition in mind. Edwards, Wesche, Krashen, Clément, & Krudenier (1984) write of the need for protective situations created to lessen the anxieties of second language
students and subsequently to increase their receptiveness and progress. Efforts were made to help the participants during a time of vulnerability through the practice of mini-lessons within the group, providing plenty of opportunities to observe French immersion teaching, and allowing the participants to control the extent to which they wished to become involved in actually teaching during their weekly visits to classrooms.

Krashen (1983) talks about providing real communication situations such as learning a subject matter in French so that the second language becomes the vehicle for acquiring knowledge. This creates a need on the part of the student to understand and communicate in French and therefore a motivation.

To illustrate this point within the context of the TRP, it is worthwhile looking at a specific activity which occurred at the beginning of the program. The writer was present during several of the activities during the orientation week in early September 1985. The participants were engaged in creating their personal journals through a bookmaking activity. Although they could all communicate fairly well in French in a general sense and could understand most of what was said to them, it was apparent that they lacked the specific linguistic tools necessary for this particular arts and craft activity. Through informal discussions with several of the participants while they were doing the activity, many of them expressed frustration at not having a vocabulary list distributed to them so they could memorize the words they would need to lead a similar activity in a classroom. The program coordinator, who was the activity leader,
explained to them that she felt the words would be better learned if
they were learned while performing a particular function - in this
case, making the journals. As linguistic needs arose, she addressed
them by encouraging the participants to describe the object or
process they wished to communicate. She also encouraged the
participants to rely on each other thus creating the beginnings of a
mutual support network within the group. If the participants felt the
need to write words and phrases down for later study, they were free
to do so. Some did, while others seemed to grasp the meaning and
appropriate usage without written reinforcement. The activity was
done entirely in French and acquisition of new linguistic elements
was based on functional need. The environment was low risk in that
everyone was a) in the same situation, b) encouraged to communicate
even if it meant making mistakes, and c) not being evaluated. The
coordinator also used it to help establish her role as facilitator as
opposed to 'answer-giver'.

Formal language courses were offered within the context of the
TRP, but only as a support to the entire communicative structure.
This format is based on Tardif's (1986) and Calvé's (1983)
discussions on the creation of functional, relative learning situations
within which to practice and acquire communicative skills. In such a
design, language courses as such would play a supportive role, only.

c) Course Content

Although the participants had a great deal of input into the
course content of the second semester, the first semester courses
were already in place when the program began in early September, 1985. Program organizers relied heavily on recent research into teacher training programs for French immersion teachers (Frisson-Rickson & Rebuffot, 1985; Wilton et al., 1985; Jones, 1984; Tardif, 1984) in designing this first semester.

The TRP ensured integration of most of these recommended elements into its design. The first element, general education training, was not included since the participants have already had this in their pre-service teacher training. The second element, acceptable linguistic competence levels upon completion of a program, was altered to include an acceptable, albeit lower linguistic competence upon entering the program. Due to the nature of the clientele and the program, the TRP had to ensure a certain level of linguistic ability in order to confidently set about helping them to reach a very good-to-excellent level of competence in French. The remaining elements outlined in the CAIT report (Frisson-Rickson & Rebuffot, 1985) on teacher training for French immersion, as well as those suggested in the CAIT (Wilton et al., 1984), were incorporated into the courses offered in the first semester of the TRP at Simon Fraser University. Interestingly, the second and third phases of the TRP, the design of which was strongly based on feedback from the participants, provided a continuation of many of these elements.

**Conclusion**

It appears that the SFU TRP which was designed based on thoughtful consideration of research on effective in-service can be
considered to have been successful. The time element, participant input into program design, ongoing support for ideas and practices introduced during coursework, follow-up evaluation, sensitivity to individual needs, recognition of the difficulties of 'returning to the system', and the presence of a conceptual basis upon which this program is based, are all elements which research has suggested be taken into account when planning an in-service innovation. The developers of the SFU TRP have adapted and extended them into the context of retraining practicing teachers in the regular program, to teach French immersion. Elements of effective in-service/retraining has been applied to the context of French immersion retraining for which the objectives were language development and French immersion methodology. Teaching French immersion requires not only French language skills, but also an understanding of second language learning and teaching, an ability to teach curriculum content via the medium of a second language with a view to constantly maximize the development of that second language, and the skill to devise teaching situations in which the students will have a need to speak the language. This is on top of the effective teaching skills expected of teachers of the regular program and provides the rational for including a strong methodological component in the SFU TRP.

The educational researchers and writers who provided the rationale for the design of the SFU TRP had definite ideas for implementing effective change processes for practicing teachers. The SFU TRP design was based largely on in-service models reported in the literature, however the it illuminated a factor which was not
found in the research literature on in-service. From the beginning to
the end of the program the participants lauded the people involved in
its organization and its instructional and facilitative aspects. For
the most part, all of the personnel treated the participants with
professional respect. The role of the coordinator, although in itself
important, was very well received mainly because of the credibility,
skills, and personality of the person who took on that role. Given the
same program design and available resources, the SFU TRP may well
have had vastly different results if the personnel had been less than
sensitive, flexible, open, and professional in their approach to teacher
retraining.

Fullan, (1982) talks of the need for understanding the
resocialization factor i.e: people faced with the complexities of
change when planning an innovation, however he and other educational
researchers do not appear to emphasize the people factor. The
program is the people who run it, who have the responsibility of
constant contact with its clients. It is their facilitative and
professional skills and flexible approaches which may determine the
success or failure of an in-service program, perhaps more so than the
model on which it is designed.

How do we know the program has been successful? Of the eight
successful participants, seven found immersion teaching jobs which
represents an 88% success rate. It is also necessary to consider the
participants' self confidence as it has developed over the course of
the program, in which case almost total success can be claimed.
Looking at the experience from the participants' point of view can
also assist in determining the worth of the program. The personal and professional growth they experienced contributes to the view that the SFU TRP was highly successful.

To what can this success be attributed? It has been shown that the SFU TRP took its design basis from research on elements of effective educational in-service and professional development innovations. It is the consideration of these elements, and an understanding of what teaching French immersion is, which have contributed to the success of the SFU TRP. A case in contrast is the TRP developed at UVIC which had the same objectives but which took a very different route to meet them. The foundations of the UVIC program were not based on research outlining the most effective route to take when helping professionals undergo major changes in their career. The UVIC TRP focused on language development through academic coursework as it existed within the Department of French Language and Literature to train teachers to teach French immersion. The attitudes of the UVIC TRP participants toward their program were vastly different (much less positive) from those which the SFU TRP participants had towards theirs. 25% (3/12) of the UVIC participants successfully completed the entire program. At the time of writing, the writer is aware that three of the UVIC participants have found employment teaching French immersion (two of the participants were not heard from nor located after the Québec phase).

It is the writer's belief that the reasons for these differences in participant attitude and outcome data is based in the difference between the foundations of the two programs. The SFU program was
designed and nurtured within a Faculty of Education with a long record of research based pre-service and in-service educational programs. Being involved in the latest research on French immersion instruction was also an asset to the SFU TRP. The personnel, facilities, and resources necessary to complement the research based design and implementation of the SFU TRP were therefore more readily accessible at SFU. The SFU TRP was conceptualized as an in-service program and therefore some flexibility in its design was relatively easily accommodated within the university structure. The UVIC TRP however was designed largely to fit into the existing course structure of a university department with no experience in designing various programs dealing with teachers undergoing a change in career direction. The French language department's emphasis was on content knowledge rather than examining an effective process for teacher in-service. Program organizers at UVIC then had little if any experience upon which to draw when considering a program to retrain teachers, nor were they part of the 'French immersion network' which would have facilitated a deeper understanding as to the nature of French immersion teaching and learning.

Comments of the writer pertaining to the UVIC TRP are based on a) questionnaire data received directly from the UVIC participants b) whether the participants were hired as immersion teachers by school districts, and c) the final linguistic tests administered under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education at the end of the program. Methodologically, UVIC was not given as much attention as
SFU since virtually no observation time was spent there. This difference in information gathering may be partially accountable for the wide discrepancies in the reactions and opinions of the two groups of participants. The writer believes however that more time spent with the UVIC participants would not have uncovered substantially different opinions from those reported in this study but would rather have lead to a deeper understanding as to why the UVIC participants held those opinions.

Implications

**French immersion staffing**

The underlying objective of the TRP is to help to ease staffing difficulties of districts which have had to look outside of their district, if not outside of the province, for qualified, competent teachers of French immersion. For some districts this has been very difficult since this practice has been perceived to have contributed to the laying off of teachers of the regular English program. School districts will now be able to ease friction caused by this perception by encouraging one or more of their teachers who speaks French relatively well to enroll in the TRP. That teacher will then be able to return to his district and take on a French immersion position without feeling that they displaced another staff member.

The TRP will likely have a defined lifespan since the supply of French speaking teachers teaching in the regular program is not without limits. This is perhaps not a bad thing since a high number of native French speakers is needed in any system to provide excellent linguistic models for students and for their colleagues.
In-service / Retraining

The lessons learned in the implementation and evaluation of the SFU TRP should not end if and when the program has met the needs of the province's school districts. Many of the elements upon which this program is based can be applied to similar programs in other areas of need. The elements of retraining which encourage an effective change process can likely be modified and applied to any curricular area such as computer education, transfer from secondary to elementary education, or peer supervision. Since many of the TRP candidates are French as a second language teachers, as they retrain to teach in immersion there could feasibly be a need in the near future to train teachers to teach French as a second language. Recent research (Lewis, 1986) indicates that French immersion educators need to take a hard look at the quality of teaching at the secondary level. This may spur the development of a program of 'perfectionnement' for teachers already teaching French immersion at this level. This could take the form of a modified retraining program or of an in-service practicum.

Future Research

The participants who have successfully completed the SFU TRP and who have teaching positions in French immersion, are undertaking an in-service practicum as the final component of the program. This study does not consider this component, however it would be of interest to know, via a follow-up study, whether the presence of an in-service associate in a supportive, facilitative role actually assists the participants to adjust to their new professional environment.
It will also be of interest to follow these participants through the first few years of their new careers to capture their reflections of their TRP experience in their professional context. Do they remain committed to teaching French immersion? Are their confidence levels maintained? Are they continuing to grow professionally?

If changes to the second year TRP are made as a result of this study, it is incumbent upon program organizers to check the effectiveness of the changes as they touch the experiences of this year's group of participants. Will they have the same concerns and worries as did the first group? Will they develop a new set of concerns as a result of changes made? Each year should be a learning experience to refine the program even further.
**APPENDIX A**

**LISTE D'ÉTAPES D'UN PROGRAMME DE FORMATION OU DE PERFECTIONNEMENT DES PROFESSEURS EN IMMERSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>1. FORMATION PROFESSIONNELLE GÉNÉRALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration scolaire, philosophie de l'éducation, psychologie de l'apprentissage, histoire de l'éducation, curriculum...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>2. NIVEAU ACCEPTABLE DE COMPÉTENCE LINGUISTIQUE (FRANÇAIS) EN FIN DE PROGRAMME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. LANGUE ET CULTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Étude des structures et des fonctions du français parlé et écrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Analyse différentielle de l'anglais et du français</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Initiation à la sociolinguistique et connaissance de la culture franco-canadienne et de la francophonie : histoire, institutions, coutumes, ouvrages littéraires et artistiques, compréhension du bilinguisme et de l'éducation bilingue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Analyse du discours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>6. DIDACTIQUE DU FRANÇAIS LANGUE SECONDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Les grands courants contemporains en didactique du français langue seconde et leur approche avec la didactique du français langue maternelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Les situations d'enseignement en immersion au Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Résultats des recherches sur l'immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* La programmation et le choix des ressources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Les styles d'enseignement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Les styles d'apprentissage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Les théories de l'évaluation en enseignement des langues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>7. CONNAISSANCE DES DISCIPLINES À ENSEIGNER EN FRANÇAIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Formation de généraliste (écoles primaires ou élemantaires)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Spécialisation dans la Chs matière(s) enseignée(s) en français dans les écoles secondaires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>8. EXPÉRIENCES PRATIQUES : STAGES DANS LES ÉCOLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>9. METHODOLOGIE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT EN IMMERSION : SAVOIR-FAIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Savoir établir des critères de sélection (habilités, langue et contenu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Savoir choisir et adapter des activités d'apprentissage selon les caractéristiques individuelles et la situation de l'apprenant (habilités, langue et contenu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Savoir diagnostiquer et évaluer les progrès de l'apprentissage (habilités, langue et contenu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Savoir mettre sur pied des activités d'échanges culturels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Savoir planifier des activités d'apprentissage à court et à long terme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Savoir analiysier l'enseignement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAVOIR-FAIRE</th>
<th>EN SUIVANT LE PROGRAMME...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACHÈVE MARS 1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Layout of Statements and Data to be collected by the
Evaluator of Educational Programs

(Stake, 1967)
The Cycle of Supervision

"A central objective of the whole process is the development of the professionally responsible teacher who is analytical of his own performance, open to help from others, and withal self-directing".

As a student teacher moves through the Professional Development Program, it is critical that the school and faculty associate and the student teacher continue to ask:
- is there a commitment to teaching?
- is there potential to become a competent teacher?
- how can each be more effective in his/her role?

(See p. 11 & 12 items 6 & 7)

**DEVELOPMENTAL SUPERVISION MODEL**

```
PRECONFERENCE ➔ OBSERVATION ➔ POSTCONFERENCE

OBJECTIVES ➔ RECORDING ➔ PATTERNS

LESSON PLAN ➔ ANALYZING ➔ ALTERNATIVES

OBSERVATION FOCUS ➔ FOLLOW-UP

OPEN COMMUNICATION
```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ORIENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Seminar 7600 Study Group A 9511/2</td>
<td>17 Curriculum Workshop 3 9511/2</td>
<td>18 Tour of Learning Resource Centres 9511/2</td>
<td>19 Computer Workshop 1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar 7610 Study Group A 9511/2</td>
<td>17 Curriculum Observation Skilrs 9511/2</td>
<td>18 Tour of Learning Resource Centres 9511/2</td>
<td>19 Computer Workshop 2 9511/2</td>
<td>20 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Computer Awareness (LRC) Conversation 7610</td>
<td>19 Computer Workshop 1 9511/2</td>
<td>19 Computer Workshop 2 9511/2</td>
<td>20 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 Computer Awareness (LRC) Conversation 7610</td>
<td>19 Computer Workshop 1 9511/2</td>
<td>19 Computer Workshop 2 9511/2</td>
<td>20 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 In Schools</td>
<td>26 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>26 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>27 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 In Schools</td>
<td>26 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>26 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>27 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>26 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>26 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>27 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>26 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>26 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>27 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Seminar 7610 Study Group A 9511/2</td>
<td>10 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>10 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>11 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar 7610 Study Group A 9511/2</td>
<td>10 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>10 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>10 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>11 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Curriculum Seminar/Planning 7610</td>
<td>8 Grammar 7610</td>
<td>8 Grammar 7610</td>
<td>11 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Curriculum Seminar/Planning 7610</td>
<td>8 Grammar 7610</td>
<td>8 Grammar 7610</td>
<td>11 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Curriculum Workshop 3 9511/2 Study Group A 9511/2</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>18 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Curriculum Workshop 3 9511/2 Study Group A 9511/2</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>18 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 In Schools</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>18 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 In Schools</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>18 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 In Schools</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>18 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 In Schools</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>18 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>18 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>18 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>18 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>17 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>18 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Seminar 7610 Study Group A 9511/2</td>
<td>29 Curriculum Seminar/Planning 7610</td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar 7610 Study Group A 9511/2</td>
<td>29 Curriculum Seminar/Planning 7610</td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29 Curriculum Seminar/Planning 7610</td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29 Curriculum Seminar/Planning 7610</td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 In Schools</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>31 Language &amp; the Curriculum 7610</td>
<td>1 9511/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
400/409 Programme d'Immersion

Formation Continue

Description de cours

On ne m'avait pas dit que l'immersion c'était comme ça......

Madame...
J'ai un frog pour toi.......
Bienvenue au Programme de Formation Continue
pour
Le Programme d'Immersion Française

Nous espérons que cette année de renouvellement pédagogique vous apportera une grande satisfaction personnelle et l'enrichissement de votre carrière. Vous êtes à féliciter pour votre hardiesse, car vous faites partie d'un tout nouveau programme. Nous avons hâte de le démarrer avec vous.

Vous trouverez, ci-inclus, l'horaire pour le semestre. Les composantes ont été sélectionnées selon vos besoins. Suivant ce principe, il est donc possible qu'il y ait des changements durant le semestre. Les pages suivantes sont des descriptions de cours. Nous espérons qu'elles vous aideront à mieux voir le semestre qui vous attend.

Donc...........

Bonne Chance............

et Bonne Année Scolaire!!!
Le Programme de Recyclage en Immersion Française

Jour et heure: le lundi, de 9h30 à 12h
Animatrice: Josette Desquins

Lieu: MPX 7610

But: Une fois par semaine, les professeurs de formation continue se réuniront afin de partager leurs expériences dans les classes d’immersion. Ces sessions seront un véhicule pour le partage d'idées, pour l'enseignement de certains concepts et notions particulières à l’immersion et au programme-cadre.

Format: table ronde, présentations, travaux pratiques.

Sujets d’étude et de discussions:
- planification de leçons et d’unités
- évaluation
- stratégies d'enseignement en immersion
- la discipline dans une classe d’immersion
- les centres d'activités
- l’enseignement individualisé en immersion
etc.

Evaluation:
- contrats établis selon des objectifs précis
Study group / Groupe d’Etude

pour

Le Programme d’Immersion et le Programme - Cadre

Jour et heure: Le lundi, de 13h à 15h30

Animateur: André Obadia

Lieu: MPX 9511/12


Format: Exposés, travail de groupe, discussions, présentations audio-visuelles...

Sujets d’étude et de discussions:
Curriculum Workshops / Ateliers

pour

Le Programme d'Immersion et le Programme - Cadre

Jour et heure:

le mardi, de 9h à 12h

Animateurs:

Francine Frisson-Rickson
Laurent Savard

Lieu:

MPX 9511/12

But:

Les ateliers ont pour but de fournir au professeur de formation continue l'occasion de se familiariser avec le contenu et les stratégies pédagogiques des matières enseignées en immersion. Pendant l'atelier, le participant aura l'occasion d'examiner des ressources pédagogiques et des manuels scolaires dans les différentes matières. Il/elle participera aux activités pratiques qui faciliteront la planification des leçons et unités qui seront mises en œuvre durant le premier stage.

Format:

Présentations, travaux pratiques, travail de groupe, discussions; le participant aura l'occasion de mettre "la main à la pâte"...

Evaluation:

Certains travaux de nature très pratique seront requis. Le professeur de formation continue pourra ensuite les utiliser dans la salle de classe.
Practicum / Stage de Perfectionnement

pour

Le Programme de Recyclage en Immersion Française

Jours:
- tous les mercredi, ainsi qu'un stage de perfectionnement du 18 novembre au 6 décembre

Assistantes pédagogiques:
Josette Desquins
Francine Frisson-Rickson

Buts:
Le stage de perfectionnement offrira, au départ, au professeur de formation continue, l'occasion d'observer une classe d'immersion à l'œuvre ainsi que le professeur, ses techniques, son rapport avec les enfants. Plus tard, le/la stagiaire pourra enseigner quelques leçons et unités à cette même classe.

Format:
Une progression...........de l'observation vers l'enseignement, suivi d'un stage intense de trois semaines.

Evaluation:
Le modèle de "Clinical Supervision" de Acheson et Gall sera utilisé par les assistantes pédagogiques. Ce modèle sera présenté aux stagiaires lors de la semaine d'orientation.
Le Programme de Recyclage en Immersion Française

Jour et heure: 
le jeudi, de 9h à 12h

Animatrice: 
Josette Desquins

Lieu: 
MPX 7610

But: 
A l'aide de sessions de micro-enseignement, l'animatrice présentera aux professeurs de formation continue le vocabulaire essentiel de la salle de classe, le langage requis pour enseigner le curriculum. L'élève devra se familiariser avec ce vocabulaire, ce langage, afin de démontrer une certaine aisance avec la langue française dans une situation d'enseignement.

Format: 
Au départ, les élèves étudieront des vidéo-cassettes montrant des professeurs d'immersion à l'œuvre. Ensuite, le groupe analysera l'enseignement des participants par le truchement des techniques d'observation systématique. Toutes les sessions auront lieu en français et préconiseront une ambiance de respect et de critique constructive.

Évaluation: 
L'aisance au niveau du langage facilitant le débit pédagogique sera à la base de l'évaluation.
La Culture Francophone

pour

Le Programme de Recyclage en Immersion Française

Jour et heure: le jeudi, de 13h à 15h30

Animatrice: Michelle Paquin

Lieu: MPX 7610

But: De nos jours plus que jamais, la survie des cultures et des nations repose sur une ouverture d'esprit quant à nos différences. Le monde francophone est lui-même hétéroclite. Ce cours propose de fournir aux professeurs l'occasion de se familiariser avec le monde francophone, le Canada francophone, mais surtout avec la Colombie-Britannique francophone. À l'aide de projets pratiques, le professeur connaîtra mieux ce milieu francophone qui l'entoure.

Format: Quelques sessions de préparations suivies de travaux pratiques afin d'accomplir les projets d'excursions.

Evaluation: Les professeurs de formation continue devront créer des excursions et activités para-scolaires aux différents sites offrant la possibilité de développer des activités en français. Ces projets et excursions seront partagés oralement et visuellement avec le reste de la classe.
Jour et heure: le vendredi, de 9h à 12h

Animatrice: Marie Castex

Lieu: MPX 9511/12

But: Ce cours rafraîchira la mémoire linguistique. L'enseignement et la pratique de la grammaire occuperont la majeure partie du cours. Nous nous occuperons explicitement de la structure de la langue française telle qu'elle est enseignée dans les programmes d'immersion. Le contenu sera donc basé sur le programme de français (en immersion) décrit dans les guides du Ministère de l'Éducation de la province.

Format: Le professeur en formation continue enseignera la grammaire à ses collègues. Le cours se déroulera uniquement en français. Nous espérons que ces situations fourniront à l'enseignant/e plusieurs occasions d'essayer ses ailes. L'animatrice sera une personne ressource, fournissant à la classe des exemples à exploiter.

Evaluation: Les critères d'évaluation seront présentés aux élèves lors du premier cours.
Conversation
pour
Le Programme de Recyclage en Immersion Française

Jour et heure: le vendredi, de 13h à 15h30

Animateur: Claire Descamps

Lieu: CC 5125

But: Chaque semaine, pendant deux heures et demie, les professeurs de formation continue pourront se détendre dans une situation moins formelle pour parler français. Cette classe offrira aux enseignants l'occasion de pratiquer leurs compétences nouvellement acquises et/ou renouvelées. L'animateur tentera de créer une variété de situations orientées vers la salle de classe. Celles-ci stimuleront des discussions avec l'ensemble de la classe ou en petits groupes.

Format: tables rondes, café-causeries,...

Evaluation: L'animateur basera son évaluation sur la correction du français mais principalement sur la participation orale du professeur de formation continue.
List of courses offered during Spring Semester 1986 and their descriptions.

EDUC. 473-4 L'APPRENTISSAGE ET L'ENSEIGNEMENT DE LA LECTURE

Le but général de ce cours est d'inculquer aux étudiants les notions fondamentales de l'apprentissage de la lecture dans les classes d'immersion.

EDUC. 474-4 L'ENSEIGNEMENT DES SCIENCES HUMAINES EN IMMERSION FRANCAISE

Le but principal de ce cours est d'offrir aux enseignant(e)s l'occasion d'acquérir une meilleure compréhension des notions conceptuelles importantes dans le domaine des Sciences Humaines afin d'examiner les stratégies de salle de classe propres à cette discipline.

EDUC. 496-3 LA PHONETIQUE CORRECTIVE DANS LA SALLE DE CLASSE

Le but principal de ce cours est à double volet. Le premier consiste à permettre aux étudiants d'améliorer leur propre diction et le second à se familiariser avec les différentes techniques d'enseignement de la phonétique et de la diction françaises.

FREN. 206-3 INTERMEDIATE FRENCH III

Study in depth of the structure of French and extension of competence in the skills of oral and written expression.

FREN. 301-3 ADVANCED FRENCH - COMPOSITION I

Emphasis is placed on written command of French. Detailed study of syntax.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>date</th>
<th>salle</th>
<th>thème</th>
<th>avec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 janvier</td>
<td>8633</td>
<td>libre</td>
<td>personne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 janvier</td>
<td>8633</td>
<td>Apprentissage Individuel Styles d'apprentissage</td>
<td>Josette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 janvier</td>
<td>7610</td>
<td>Le cours de langue en immersion</td>
<td>Francine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 janvier</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>Approche communicative Pilôé</td>
<td>Rhoda Tafler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 février</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>Le cours de langue en immersion (avec 405)</td>
<td>Francine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 février</td>
<td>8633</td>
<td>Ecrivains en herbe</td>
<td>M.P. Joanis/Kramer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 février</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>Orthopédagogie</td>
<td>Émme Thibodeau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 février</td>
<td>7610</td>
<td>Le cours de langue en immersion</td>
<td>Francine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 mars</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>Math Their Way</td>
<td>Mélodie Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 mars</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>Le cours de langue en immersion/arts plastiques</td>
<td>Francine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 mars</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>libre</td>
<td>Josette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 mars</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>libre</td>
<td>Josette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1er avril</td>
<td>8633</td>
<td>Bamfield ou excursion</td>
<td>Josette/Francine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autres idées: une réunion de classe, Ed.phys., musique, théâtre, marionnettes, classe de sc. nat.
Emploi du temps pour le printemps '86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9h30 à 11h30</td>
<td>9h30 à 11h30</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>8h30 à 12h30</td>
<td>8h30 à 12h30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Français</td>
<td>Ateliers</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Educ. 496 - 3</td>
<td>Educ. 474-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206-02 et</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phonétique et Diction</td>
<td>Designs for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPX - 7506</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPX 8633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPX 7506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13h à 17h:</td>
<td>13h30 à 15h30</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13h30 à 15h30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ - 473-4</td>
<td>Ateliers</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Fren.206-3 (03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentissage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fren.301-3 (02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de la lecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPX-8633</td>
<td>MPX - 8633 et 7600</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>MPX - 8633</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPX - 7506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MPX - 7506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dates et lieu pour les ateliers:

7/1  
14/1  
11/2 MPX 8633  
1/4  
6/4

21/1 4/3  
28/1 11/3
4/2 18/3  
18/2 25/3

MPX 7600

***Il y a la possibilité que les cours de français soient remis à plus tard le lundi et le jeudi soir: de 5 heures à 7 heures.
# General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Dependents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## University Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree(s)</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Training</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Formal Academic Training in French

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other types of experiences in French (i.e., travel, work, living in a francophone environment...)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade(s)</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |       |      |         |

|          |       |      |         |

|          |       |      |         |

|          |       |      |         |

Total number of years of teaching experience: ________
Please take the time necessary to reflect and to thoughtfully answer the following questions.

1. How did you first hear about this program?

2. Why did it interest you then?

3. Did the linguistic screening process have any effect on your attitude/expectations toward the program?

4. Have you had any previous experience in French immersion? (Describe)

5. Do you feel qualified/competent to teach French immersion now? Explain.

6. In what ways do you hope this program will help you to prepare to teach in French immersion?
7. Describe how you feel being a student again.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

8. Describe any concerns you have re: making a full-time commitment to complete this program.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

9. Why did you choose this program over any other options you may have investigated to prepare you for French immersion teaching? (ie: summer in Quebec/​France, study in a francophone environment, coursework on immersion teaching, language development coursework, similar program elsewhere)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

10. Do you anticipate any difficulties? Explain.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
ISSUES IN FRENCH IMMERSION

1. What arguments would you use to convince a school board to implement a French immersion program?

2. With what arguments against French immersion would they likely respond?

3. What criteria/qualities in French immersion teachers should school boards be looking for?

4. What kinds of students enroll in French immersion?

5. Why do you think most parents enroll their children in French immersion?
6. Should French immersion be accessible to all students? Explain.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

7. Do you have any perceptions re: the attitude of the general public toward French immersion? Please comment.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

8. What do you see as some issues of concern regarding French immersion programming?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
1. In the questionnaire you filled out in September, I asked some questions to elicit your concerns regarding your involvement in and commitment to this program. Have these (...) concerns remained, been alleviated, or been replaced by others?

________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

probe
Are these changes in any way directly caused/influenced by the program? Please explain.

________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

2. How would you describe your transition into student life?

________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

probe
(If not an easy transition)... Why do you think this is so?

________________________________________________________
3. Are your needs changing as the program progresses?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

probe
if no, what are your needs?
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

if yes, - is this because some needs have already been met?
- or have you changed your perception of your needs?
please explain.
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. Have program developers/administrators relied on your input for changes in the design of the program? If yes, give instances.
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. a) What are two very positive aspects of this program?
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
6. What would you consider to be the three most important criteria School District Personnel should be looking for when hiring French Immersion teachers?

7. What would you consider to be the sign(s) of a successful Teacher Retraining Program for French immersion? How will we know whether or not this program has been worthwhile?

8. At this midway point in the program, do you have any recommendations for modifications to next year's program?

9. Do you feel more confident now to teach in French Immersion than you were in September? Please explain.
1. If you were hiring teachers of FL for a School District, what are the three most important criteria you would look for in candidates?

________________________________________________________________________

2. At the outset of the program, what did you see as the most pressing needs of the participants?

________________________________________________________________________

3. Did/do you perceive the needs of the participants changing as the program unfolds?

Probe a) If yes, please elaborate ... i.e.: what needs disappeared and why. what new needs developed and why?

________________________________________________________________________

4. What would you consider to be the sign(s) of a successful Teacher Retraining Program for French immersion? How will we know whether or not this program has been worthwhile?

________________________________________________________________________

5. Many people involved in FL education have expressed support for the program yet a good number are reserving judgement on the ability of the program to help participants gain the ease with and depth of knowledge of the language within the allotted time. Do you have that same reservation?

Probe a) If yes, describe why you have this concern.

________________________________________________________________________

b) What do you think could be done for next year's program to eliminate/greatly reduce this concern?

________________________________________________________________________

Probe a) If no, do you then feel that the participants' fluency in French will be 'native like' enough to teach FL effectively in September?
6. a) What are two very positive (strong) aspects of this program?

b) What are two negative (weak) aspects of this program?

7. a) Do you think any (how many?) of the participants could have handled teaching FI last September?

b) Do you think most (how many) will be prepared to teach FI next September?

8. What does this program offer the participants in the way of preparation to teach specifically in a French Immersion setting?

9. Should the program be modified next year to better respond to the participants' needs and the program objectives? If yes, how?

10. All participants commented positively about your role in the program and many observed a change in your approach from the first to the second semester. (see contact form intrev sfu 86:03:21) Is this perceived change something you were aware of? If so, was it a conscious decision to change your approach? If so, why?
1. Can your school district benefit from such a program?

2. Would your school district be prepared to provide partial/full financial support for a participant from your district?

3. With what new skills/knowledge should participants leave the program?

4. Is such a program the most effective/efficient way to develop teachers with these desired skills/knowledge?

5. What are the three most important criteria you look for in a French Immersion teacher?
Welcome back!

I trust you had a safe journey and are glad to be home again with family, friends and familiar surroundings. As you may recall, my Master's thesis consists of the evaluation of the Teacher Retraining Program for which there remains one final but crucial phase of data collection. Your reflections on the latter part of the program and on your entire year in retrospect are of prime interest to me. I would truly appreciate you taking about half an hour or so to complete the following questionnaire and to mail it back to me in the stamped envelope provided.

Although putting your name on the questionnaire is, of course, optional, I encourage you to do so as I will then be able to do a more explicit cross-time analysis (comparing your responses from September through March through August). Confidentiality in the write-up of my thesis is assured.

I thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire and wish you all the best in your career.

Sincerely,
Teacher Retraining Program

name________________________

Spring Practicum

1. Please comment on the positive aspects of your spring practicum experience.

2. Please comment on the negative aspects of your spring practicum experience.

3. Please indicate any suggestions you have for changes to the spring practicum.

Québec

1. Please comment on the positive aspects of the program in Québec.

2. Please comment on the negative aspects of the program in Québec.

3. Please indicate any suggestions you have for changes to the organization and/or content of the Québec program.
The Program

1. Do you have a job to teach French Immersion in September?
   yes ____  no ____
   *If yes, - in what school district? ________________________

   - in what program.......early immersion ____
   - late immersion ____
   - programme-cadre ____

   - what grade ____
   *If no, have you been actively looking for a job?
   yes ____  no ____
   *If you have been looking for a job, what steps have you taken?
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   *If you haven't been looking for a job, please explain why.
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

2. How confident do you now feel about teaching French Immersion?

   1  2  3  4
   very confident  confident  somewhat confident  unconfident
*What aspects of the retraining program have most contributed to your confidence


*How could the retraining program have better served you in reaching a higher confidence level?


3. How well did the Teacher Retraining Program help you develop in the following areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very much</th>
<th>quite a bit</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oral expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in general</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to work collegially</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with other teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge of French immersion methodology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immersion teaching experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What skills, knowledge, or teaching practices do you feel need the most attention during the first few months of your new teaching assignment?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. Please rate the following aspects of the program. Please add a comment to explain your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very</th>
<th>strong</th>
<th>fair</th>
<th>weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program design (was it designed to effectively prepare you to teach French immersion?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ______________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very</th>
<th>strong</th>
<th>fair</th>
<th>weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program staff (were they able to help to prepare you to teach French immersion?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ______________________________________

6. List, in order of importance, suggestions for modifications to next year's program.

1. __________________________________________

2. __________________________________________

3. __________________________________________

4. __________________________________________

7. Please add any other comments you feel may be pertinent to the study of the Teacher Retraining Program.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
ISSUES IN FRENCH IMMERSION

1. What arguments would you use to convince a school board to implement a French immersion program?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. With what arguments against French immersion would they likely respond?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. What criteria/qualities in French immersion teachers should school boards be looking for?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. What kinds of students enroll in French immersion?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

5. Why do you think most parents enroll their children in French immersion?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
6. Should French immersion be accessible to all students? Explain.

7. Do you have any perceptions re: the attitude of the general public toward French immersion? Please comment.

8. What do you see as some issues of concern regarding French immersion programming?
Contact Summary Form

Site ____________
Contact Date ______
Contact type:
visit ___
phone ___
interviews ___

1. What were the main issues or themes that struck me in this contact?

2. Summary of the information I got (or failed to get) on each of the target questions you had for this contact.

3. Anything else that struck me as salient, interesting, illuminating or important in this contact?

4. What new (or remaining) target questions do I have in considering the next contact with this site?
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