



DECS/EDU/HIST (99) 61

**Activities for the Development and Consolidation
of Democratic Stability (ADACS)**

Seminar on

**"The initial and in-service training of history
teachers in the Russian Federation and their
evaluation"**

Nijniy Novgorod, Russian Federation,

15 – 17 April 1999

Report

Strasbourg

Seminar on

" The initial and in-service training of history teachers in
the Russian Federation and their evaluation"

Nijniy Novgorod, Russian Federation,

15 – 17 April 1999

Report by

Dr Julieta SAVOVA
Sofia University
Bulgaria

The opinions expressed in this work are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe.

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTORY WORDS	5
II.	THE AIMS OF THE SEMINAR.....	6
III.	SEMINAR FORMAT	6
IV.	PLENARY SESSIONS	7
V.	OVERALL CONCLUSIONS.....	12
1.	The growing role of history teachers at a time of economic, social and political constraints	12
2.	Initial and in-service training for history teachers	13
3.	Evaluation in history education and history teacher appraisal	15
VI.	WORKING GROUPS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	16

APPENDIX I

PROGRAMME OF THE SEMINAR.....	17
-------------------------------	----

APPENDIX II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	22
---------------------------	----

APPENDIX III

WORKING GROUPS' REPORTS	28
-------------------------------	----

I. INTRODUCTORY WORDS

The Nijniy Novgorod Seminar was part of the Council of Europe's Activities on the Development and Consolidation of Democratic Stability. The Seminar's topic "Initial and in-service training of history teachers in the Russian Federation and their evaluation" suggests that the issue of teacher education and the training of history teachers remains on the agenda of both - the Council of Europe and the Russian Federation education authorities. It represents a priority in present-day educational policy.

The Seminar was jointly organised by the Council of Europe, the Ministry of General and Professional Education of the Russian Federation, the regional educational authorities of Nijniy Novgorod, and the Institute of Regional Educational Policies in Nijniy Novgorod.

There were 40 participants. They were administrators and professionals in charge of history teachers' education and training on a central and a regional level. The Council of Europe's speakers as well as the speakers from teacher training institutions in Moscow, Ekaterinburg and St. Petersburg formed a specific target group which contributed in a unique way to the success of the seminar. A significant number of teachers - the major group - who took part in the Seminar's work suggests that the main issues concerning teacher education and training as well as teacher appraisal and expertise in history education were raised and discussed in the most relevant environment. In this environment, professionals, teachers and policy-makers were supposed to identify and discuss the major problems, as well as to suggest possible solutions and comprehensive measures to upgrade history teachers' education and improve the standards of teacher appraisal. This approach encouraged us to have a new look at the issues of history education in the Russian Federation, and, in particular, in the Volgo-Viatska area and the Nijniy Novgorod region.

The Seminar programme lasted for three days. The opening of the Seminar took place on Thursday 15 April 1999. It ended on Saturday 18 April 1999. The Seminar was held near Nijniy Novgorod, where the participants stayed at Berezka. The facilities, the beautiful surroundings and the remarkable natural environment, as well as the rich history of the region of Nijniy Novgorod, had a very positive effect upon the Seminar's results and the participants' satisfaction.

II. AIMS OF THE SEMINAR

The major aims of the seminar were to:

- i. discuss the philosophical and methodological basis of the present-day education of history teachers;
- ii. describe the model of in-service teacher training and teacher appraisal taking into account technological and humanitarian concepts for history education;
- iii. elaborate evaluation criteria for the purposes of history education;
- iv. introduce strategies for effective communication among the participants in the Seminar in order to enhance their personal and professional capacities.

III. SEMINAR FORMAT

The Seminar was planned and organised in order to achieve the desired outcomes and to reach high levels of effectiveness and efficiency. The Seminar was held in:

- i. plenary sessions, where presentations were given by invited Russian and foreign speakers;
- ii. working group sessions: three working groups were formed and acted as bodies for fruitful discussions in a professional and friendly environment. Their work was organised in parallel sessions where the participants were given both freedom and responsibilities to question the existing practice of teacher education and training, including interrelated issues of teacher appraisal and to suggest more effective and innovative ways of resolving the problems identified in these areas.

The way in which the discussions and the team work were organised was relevant to the participants' expectations and assisted in creating valuable outcomes. All the discussions challenged conventional ways of thinking and encouraged the participants to look for new decision-making strategies. The questions raised and the problems highlighted during the discussions were well identified and related to the main topics of the Seminar.

The chairs led the working groups' activities. The rapporteurs performed the roles assigned to them creatively. The Council of Europe speakers took part in the groups and acted as resource persons. The work was well organised and the aims were fulfilled.

The working groups were organised as follows:

Working Group N°1: In-service teacher training in the Russian Federation

Chair: Ms Svetlana MAKSIMOVA

Rapporteur: Ms Ludmila SHILOVA

Resource person: Dr Alois ECKER, Austria

Working Group N°2: Evaluation in history education

Chair: Ms Nina HRYASOVA

Rapporteur: Mr Aleksey MIRONOS

Resource person: Assoc. Prof. Julieta SAVOVA, Bulgaria

Working group N°3: The appraisal of history teachers

Chair: Ms Tatiana ZAICHIKOVA

Rapporteur: Ms Elena VOLKOVA

Resource person: Mr Mark McLAUGHLIN, United Kingdom

For the purposes of the Seminar, two working languages were used - English and Russian. The use of these two working languages helped to create better mutual understanding and the feeling that the problems under discussion were common to all.

The general understanding was that the strategies for the resolutions of the problems should be recognised as crucial for the next stages of development.

IV. PLENARY SESSIONS

The opening plenary session, which was chaired by **Dr M. SYVOV**, Director of the Institute of Regional Educational Policies in Nijniy Novgorod started with welcoming words on behalf of the Governor of the Nijniy Novgorod region. The Governor's representative - **Ivan SKLYAROV** introduced **Alison CARDWELL** from the Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport - Council of Europe; **Tatiana MILKO** - from the Council of Europe; **Alois ECKER** - Vienna University, Austria; **Julieta SAVOVA** - Sofia University, Bulgaria, and **Mark McLAUGHLIN**, HMI, United Kingdom who were invited by the Council of

Europe. He also introduced other officials - **Sergey NAUMOV** - from the Department of Education and Science of the region of Nijniy Novgorod; **Tamara TULIAEVA** - Leading Specialist, Ministry of General and Professional Education of the Russian Federation.

Sergey NAUMOV, speaking on the behalf of the Education Department of the region of Nijniy Novgorod, presented some basic historical information and present-day features of the region. He drew attention both to the importance of education and the teachers working in education. Strong emphasis was put on the importance of history teaching in order to preserve national identity and historical treasures.

The governor's representative, **Ivan SKLYAROV**, pointed out the importance of the role of people in history. He underlined the present economic constraints, especially the financial shortages which contemporary education is facing. On a national scale, the country and education are faced with serious economic constraints. However, the regional education system is not only preserved, but growing and expanding. One of the main concerns he expressed was how to adjust education to the dynamics of the present day situation.

Another important concern was related to the unique role of history education in personal growth, in forming attitudes, independent evaluation and judgment. History was defined as a core subject for education and as an essential part of the social sciences.

Alison CARDWELL, representing the Council of Europe, expressed her thanks to the host institutions and their representatives. She introduced the Council of Europe as the widest intergovernmental and interparliamentary forum in Europe with 47 member States including 21 new country members. The 50th anniversary of the Council of Europe was considered a good reason to evaluate its education programmes which have been designed to "promote human rights,... strengthen confidence and mutual understanding..., enable all Europeans to realise their potential to the full throughout their lives". Programmes in history were and remain among the basic priorities of the Council. New perspectives to history, support and assistance to the history teaching reforms in Central and Eastern European countries were carried out through cooperation programmes, including a series of national and international seminars, conferences and other activities. She reviewed some of the most important seminars held recently by the Council of Europe in teaching history. Together with the programmes related to curricula and standards; textbooks and teacher training, Ms Cardwell introduced one of the most recent Council of Europe initiatives, that of the Black Sea Initiative on History.

Tamara TULIAEVA, Leading Specialist from the Ministry of General and Professional Education, identified some of the most worrying problems in history textbook policy and implementation. She presented standards for history teaching, including core subjects and the content of standards. The changes and challenges facing the Russian Federation also affected history teaching in her opinion. Any change or political turn has had an almost immediate effect on history textbook policy and implementation. Standards, history textbook evaluation and the education and training of history teachers were considered to be among the Ministry's priorities.

Dr Mikhail SYVOV, Director of the Institute of Regional Educational Policies, gave a presentation on "The main criteria for the evaluation of history teachers in present-day secondary schools in the Russian Federation". He shared his ideas and the Institute's orientation towards the model of professional competency of a history teacher. The model presented consisted of four components - psychological and pedagogical competency; subject-based competency; social competency and the professional competency of the history teacher. Professional competency was considered to be crucial for history teachers.

Another important message in his presentation was that accelerated communication processes in present times and the widening of the scope of factors having an impact on pupils' knowledge and attitudes put both the schools and teachers in an unprecedented position. They have to take into consideration all the information sources to the fullest possible extent. Opening the schools and history teachers to the changing environment are at the heart of the educational reform here, and the Institute's contribution to this process is vital. The new courses introduced, skill-based orientations, support of pilot projects, teacher appraisal - all these characterise the Institute's struggle for reform.

Alois ECKER's presentation focused on two interrelated issues - the professional profile of a history teacher and the role of teacher education in building it up. Teacher training was analysed in the context of the accelerated cultural changes where the complexity of both society and the learning processes was continuously recognised. He pointed out that the challenges confronting teacher education and training need to be carefully analysed in order to allow history teachers to achieve the desired level of reflection in the changing environment. In this process, history pedagogy will play necessary role. The professionalisation of history teacher training was considered as an important step in the efforts to reform the education and training of history teachers. The ideal profile of a history teacher was presented as consisting of two major components: academic competence and pedagogical competence. Both competencies were analysed through the prism of teacher training needs.

Dr Ecker also drew attention to the view of pedagogy as a special self-referential learning system where the balance between theoretical advice and practical experience was the responsibility of a team of trainers. His experience in history teacher training allowed him to draw valuable conclusions about reforming the training system bearing in mind the need also to train teacher trainers.

Ludmila ANDRUKHINA, Institute for the Development of the Regional System of Education of Ekaterinburg, introduced the working methods for the working groups. She stressed that the success of the groups' work greatly determines the overall success of the Seminar. She drew the participants' attention to some typical problems concerning group work, and then introduced the basic principles for their discussions. Her advice was well chosen and guided all the group work.

Svetlana MAKSIMOVA, Head of the Department of History Education, Institute of Regional Educational Policies of Nijniy Novgorod, gave a presentation on "The main problems in in-service teacher training in present-day Russia". She pointed out the importance of the content issues, as well as the potentials of history teachers who are supposed to implement history curricula at school level. Special attention was given to the psychological and pedagogical interrelations between the socio-cultural situation and history teachers' activities. The division of the social and cultural situation into three levels - regional, national and European - produces special expectations of history teachers. Qualities such as openness, tolerance, flexibility, analytical skills, positive thinking, innovative approaches, etc. are progressively becoming more important for history teachers. Svetlana Maksimova pointed to some of the problems appearing in today's Russia, which account for the difficulties in history teacher training. Her analysis of the regional specificities showed the need to employ several models for teacher training courses – a comprehensive information-based course; skills' development-based course; and project-based course where planning and design activities occupy the major part of the course.

Mark McLAUGHLIN, HMI in the United Kingdom, based his presentation on his professional experience. He introduced the participants to the basics of training of secondary school history teachers in England. His presentation on "What newly qualified history teachers are expected to know, understand and be able to do" was a combination of descriptive - what the teacher training system in England is - and procedural knowledge - how the system works. The stages such as: enrolment in training courses, involvement of student teachers in real teaching practice at school level, as well as the requirements for acquiring the status of "Qualified Teacher" were presented. The four standards for the award of Qualified Teacher Status are:

- i. knowledge and understanding;
- ii. planning, teaching and classroom management;
- iii. monitoring, assessment, recording, reporting and accountability;
- iv. other professional requirements.

Elena OUSOVA, Deputy Head of the Education Department of the region of Nijniy Novgorod, gave a presentation on: "The appraisal of history teachers: the main purposes and organisation". She gave her vision and reflections on the existing appraisal practice of history teachers in the region of Nijniy Novgorod. The definition of appraisal as an overall assessment procedure, as well as the description of the main purposes of history teachers' appraisal, helped the participants to understand the main successes and problems facing the practice of teacher appraisal. Generally speaking, appraisal was viewed as a crucial process for upgrading the quality of teaching, for rising the status of history teachers as a professional group and for raising the quality of education as a whole. Appraisal characteristics were introduced in a systematic way, and what was interesting was that appraisal was viewed as a voluntary process and a growing number of teachers wished to be appraised.

Special attention was given to the different stages in the appraisal of history teachers as well as the content, and appraisal instruments. The importance of having a well balanced team of evaluators was also underlined.

Assoc.Prof. **Julieta SAVOVA**, PhD, University of Sofia, Faculty of Pedagogy, drew the participants' attention to: "Appraisal challenges for history teachers at a time of economic constraints". She described briefly the typical economic constraints for the transition countries and their interrelations with the so-called "survival syndrome". In this context, the growing importance of history teachers and their appraisal were underlined. Appraisal was analysed and discussed in the light of standards based on a careful analysis of teaching as a profession and the teacher's competence model built on the recognised functions and/or responsibilities of a history teacher.

The basic challenges for the appraisal of history teachers were classified into two groups: external and internal challenges. Experts involved in teacher appraisal are supposed to take into account the major implications of these challenges in order to avoid non-anticipated appraisal outcomes. Finally, in the presentation, the issue of the selection of experts and their recognition as "eligible" appraisers was raised.

V. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

1. THE GROWING ROLE OF HISTORY TEACHERS AT A TIME OF ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONSTRAINTS

It was widely recognised by the Seminar participants that the history teachers' role is growing in the context of social, economic and political dynamics. They should meet the challenges coming from the past and the present as well as anticipating the demands of the future. A special part of the history teachers' mission, which gives them strong privileges, but also places on their shoulders heavy responsibilities, is to prepare students to become sensitive, reflective and socially competent citizens. In this respect, the indisputable interrelations between the social and cultural situation, on the one hand, and the history teachers' activities and functions on the other were pointed out by a number of participants.

New expectations and demands towards history teachers are being developed. History teachers are considered to be responsible for preserving the national identity and for educating up the new citizens of Europe and the world.

History teachers are expected to be "open-minded", and be able to stimulate the development of mutual understanding, tolerance, foster critical thinking and problem-solving skills in their students. In this respect, history teachers' competencies (general and specific) were touched on by a number of participants. They stressed the importance of taking into account the needs and expectations of history teachers and to re-design and renovate the systems for both initial and in-service training.

History teachers were considered a key factor in the development of students' beliefs, attitudes and value systems. In order to do this successfully, history teachers are expected to build up and create a new meaningful environment for their students where they are considered as continuous learners and creative partners. History teachers are expected to assist their students in overcoming possible misconceptions, in becoming capable of identifying and dealing with controversial issues and avoiding "one fact - only one interpretation" attitude. Thus, the notion of preserving history teachers and teaching history from "one ideology-one politics" emerged in the discussions.

The Seminar also raised the issue of innovative approaches, positive ways of thinking and analytical skills in history teachers. Creative solutions and new approaches related to this issue were frequently discussed and recognised by all the participants as being crucial.

There was agreement by all the participants that the value of looking at the changes and challenges facing history teacher was indispensable, because it raised the awareness of other professionals and society as a whole to the importance of history teachers who have to perform complex functions and activities.

The effective communication issue and the appearance of a growing number of sources of information about history were given particular attention in the discussions.

Seminar participants also raised the question of the regional native of the history teachers' work. The difficulties and limits confronting history teachers in rural and remote areas were underlined by some speakers and raised again in the working groups. There has not been yet great success in creating favourable working conditions for this particular group of teachers.

2. INITIAL AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR HISTORY TEACHERS

A valuable exchange of views and professional experience in the area of teacher education and in-service education and training took place at the Nijniy Novgorod Seminar. The participants who touched on history teachers' education and in-service education and training issues pointed out some of the main challenges facing professionals working in these interrelated areas.

The necessity for re-evaluation and re-thinking both systems - purposes and aims, structure, contents and methods - was strongly defended by a number of participants. Several participants articulated the need for a better linkage between pre- and in-service training for history teachers.

In the discussions, some dissatisfaction about the practices in both areas was expressed. The content issue, the lack of innovative approaches as well as the limited dissemination of the best practices were among the most frequently voiced problems. Some participants raised the question of the lack of understanding and recognition of expertise already gathered in history teaching by the teachers. In order to reform and to create more effective training systems for history teachers for all training offered, contents and methods should be based on serious considerations about the preliminary experience of history teachers.

It was clearly stated in all the papers and discussions that the quality of in-service teacher training has a strong impact on the up-grading of the professional development of the history teacher, on the one hand, and, on the other, on the quality of history education as a whole.

In-service teacher training should take into account the regional specificities in order to be more relevant to the needs of teachers working in local and regional circumstances. Teachers working in rural areas were recognised as one of the groups deserving special attention.

When defining some possibilities for organising the in-service education and training, it was felt that the school itself is one of the most suitable and best places for in-service activities.

History teacher training was also seen in the light of continuous education, which broadens the perspectives for re-thinking the concepts of it.

A number of participants discussed a variety of in-service education and training forms and innovative practices based on the assessment of history teacher's needs. Some new developments were presented.

The need for better communication between the people working in the areas of initial and in-service training for history teachers was also expressed and discussed. Again, innovation and experimentation were presented as being welcome. People involved in history teacher training should seek and develop a variety of programmes where such innovation is offered.

Knowledge of the subject was widely recognised as important for history teachers, but integration among theoretical (especially pedagogical, psychological and methodological components) and practical training should be included. Much still remains to be done in this area was the conclusion reached by the Seminar's participants.

The participants also showed great concern about the training of trainers. All the participants agreed that the quality of both systems depends on the quality of the teacher trainers involved. Special measures should be taken in this respect.

In-service training for history teachers was presented as a priority for policy makers, especially in the light of its impact on teachers' basic competencies and their professionalism.

Generally speaking, the building of up-dated and well-balanced systems for initial and in-service training for history teachers, seen as continuum, was considered as being of great importance.

3. EVALUATION IN HISTORY EDUCATION AND HISTORY TEACHER APPRAISAL

Among the core issues discussed in the Seminar were evaluation in history education and the appraisal of history teachers. All the participants stressed the importance of evaluation and appraisal, on the one hand, and expressed their concerns about the existing practices, indisputable successes and typical difficulties on the other. Both evaluation and appraisal were considered as having a strong impact on the quality of the teacher's work and on education as a whole. The need for evaluation and appraisal was widely recognised and strongly defended by all the participants. Active discussions were held on the criteria for evaluation and appraisal. A strong desire was expressed for the creation sets of effective and widely applicable criteria. All the participants believed in the need for evaluation and appraisal procedures taking into account regional and local specificities, as well as the place where a history teacher works.

Most of the participants recognised the need for special training for evaluators and appraisers which should be carefully designed and organised. Evaluation and appraisal were also discussed in the light of the so-called "internal" and "external" needs, expectations and requirements.

One of the interesting features of the discussions on evaluation in history education - aims, purposes, objects and subjects of evaluation, evaluation criteria - was that evaluation was put in the context of the "expertise" issue in history education. Although a different meaning was attached both to the terms "evaluation" and "expertise", it became clear that these terms are used as synonyms. Advocates for the growing role of expertise in fact defended the point about the expanding significance of evaluation in history education. The expertise was presented as a scientific procedure where the quality of experts involved in it has an important role to play.

The appraisal of history teachers was discussed in the light of their competency and functions. Existing models of teacher appraisal were discussed. The appraisal model developed and used in the Nijniy Novgorod region with the involvement of the Regional Institute was presented and discussed. Its advantages and disadvantages were analysed by a number of speakers. Teacher appraisal was viewed as a right more than as a duty for all history teachers. And a growing number of history teachers issues to exercise this right.

Summarising both evaluation (expertise) in history education and history teachers' appraisal issues were considered among the highest priorities in today's educational policy in the Russian Federation.

VI. WORKING GROUPS CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The three working groups provided the participants with excellent opportunities to discuss in depth problems selected in advance and to exchange valuable professional information, opinions and visions about:

- the framework and specificities of the in-service training of history teachers in the Russian Federation, the interrelation between training and the professional development and promotion of teachers, and the main approaches for its upgrading;
- the status of expertise in history education, the eligibility of those who are entitled to make it and the criteria applicable to the most "hot" areas of history education;
- history teachers' appraisal - main issues such as: methodology of appraising, the criteria to be used by the people responsible for appraisal.

All the groups discussed the problems identified including the European and broader international perspectives. Some comparisons among selected European countries (Austria, Bulgaria, Russia and England) were made.

APPENDIX I

PROGRAMME OF THE SEMINAR

Wednesday 14 April 1999

Arrival of the participants

Thursday 15 April 1999

09.30 - 11.00

Plenary Session

Chair: Dr Mikhail SYVOV, Director, Institute of the
Regional Educational Policies

Opening of the Seminar by:

- i. Mr Sergey NAUMOV, Administration of the
Region of Nijniy Novgorod
- ii. Ms Elena OUSOVA, Deputy Director, Education
Department of the Region of Nijniy Novgorod
- iii. Ms Alison CARDWELL, Administrator,
Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport,
Council of Europe
- iv. Ms Tamara TULIAEVA, Leading Specialist,
Ministry of General and Professional Education,
Moscow

11.00 - 11.30

Break

11.30 - 13.00

Plenary Session

Chair: Dr Mikhail SYVOV, Director, Institute of the Regional Educational Policies

- i. Presentation on: "The main criteria for the evaluation of history teachers in present-day secondary schools in the Russian Federation" by Dr Mikhail SIVOV, Director of the Institute of Regional Educational Policies, Nijniy Novgorod, Russian Federation;
- ii. Presentation on: "The ideal profile of a history teacher and how initial teacher training should provide it" by Dr Alois ECKER, Vienna University, Austria.

Discussion with all the participants

Introduction to the group work:
Dr Ludmila ANDRUKHINA, Consultant, Institute for the Development of the Regional System of Education, Ekaterinburg

13.00 - 14.30

Lunch

14.30 - 16.00

Plenary Session

Chair : Dr Mikhail SYVOV, Director, Institute of the Regional Educational Policies

- i. Presentation on: "The main problems connected with in-service teacher training in present-day Russia" by Dr Svetlana MAKSIMOVA, Head of the Department of History Education, Institute of Regional Educational Policies, Nijniy Novgorod, Russian Federation;
- ii. Presentation on: "What newly qualified history teachers are expected to know, understand and be able to do" by Mr Mark McLAUGHLIN, England.

16.30 - 17.00 Break

17.30 - 19.00 **Three Parallel Working Group Sessions**

i. Working Group No. 1

Chair: Ms Svetlana MAKSIMOVA;
Rapporteur: Ms Ludmila SHILOVA
Resource person: Dr Alois ECKER, Austria

ii. Working Group No. 2

Chair: Mr Gerasim MKRTCHAN
Rapporteur: Ms Nina HRYASHOVA
Resource person: Professor Julieta SAVOVA,
Bulgaria

iii. Working Group No. 3

Chair: Ms Tatiana ZAICHIKOVA
Rapporteur: Ms Elena VOLKOVA
Resource person: Mr Mark McLAUGHLIN,
United Kingdom

20.00 Dinner

Friday 16 April 1999

09.30 - 11.00 **Plenary Session**

Chair: Dr Mikhail SYVOV, Director, Institute of
Regional Educational Policies

i. Presentation on: "The appraisal of history
teachers: the main aims and the organisation of
the appraisal" by Ms Elena OUSOVA, Deputy
Head of the Education Department of the Region
of Nijniy Novgorod, Russian Federation;

- ii. Presentation on "Appraisal challenges for history teachers at a time of economic constraint - do we need to appraise teachers and why?" by Professor Julieta SAVOVA, Sofia University, Bulgaria.

Discussion with all the participants

11.00 - 11.30	Break
11.30 - 13.00	Continuation of the parallel working groups sessions
13.00 - 14.30	Lunch
14.30 - 16.00	Continuation of the parallel working groups sessions
16.00 - 16.30	Break and end of the parallel working groups sessions
16.30 – 17.30	The rapporteurs should report to the General Rapporteur and the Secretariat on the conclusions and recommendations of their working group. They should prepare their texts in writing and submit a copy to the Secretariat. These texts will be included in the final report.
20.00	Official Dinner

Saturday 17 April 1999

09.30 - 11.00 Plenary Session

Chair: Dr Mikhail SYVOV, Director, Institute of the Regional Educational Policies

- i. Presentation of the conclusions and recommendations of the rapporteurs of the working groups
- ii. Discussion with all the participants
Comments by the three speakers invited by the Council of Europe on the discussions held in the working groups in which they took part

- iii. Presentation by the General Rapporteur of the overall conclusions and recommendations of the Seminar

Comments by the participants

11.00 - 11.30 Break

11.30 - 12.30 **Closing speeches of the Seminar by:**

- i. Ms Alison CARDWELL, Administrator, Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport, Council of Europe;
- ii. Ms Tamara TULIAEVA, Leading Specialist, Ministry of General and Professional Education, Moscow
- iii. Dr Mikhail SIVOV, Director of the Institute of Regional Educational Policies, Nijniy Novgorod

Lunch

Afternoon Departure of the participants

APPENDIX II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

GENERAL RAPPORTEUR

Professor Julieta SAVOVA, Associate Professor, Sofia University, Faculty of Education, 15 Tzar Osvoboditel, Sofia 1000, Bulgaria

Tel: +359 2 849 563

Fax: + 359 2 464 085

Working language: E/R

SPEAKERS

Dr Alois ECKER, Institut für Wirtschafts und Sozialgeschichte, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien, Austria

Tel: + 43 1 4277 41320

Fax: + 43 1 4277 941

Working language: E

Mr Mark McLAUGHLIN, Office for Standards in Education, Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools, Alexandra House, 29-33 Kingsway, London WC2B 6SE

Tel/fax: + 44 171 421 68 00

EKATERINBURG

Dr Ludmila ANDRUKHINA, Consultant, Institute for the Development of the Regional System of Education

Tel: + 7 3432 74 19 36

Fax: + 7 3432 74 36 00

MOSCOW

Ms Tamara TULIAEVA, Leading Specialist, Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation, Lusinovskaya Street, 51, RF-113833 Moscow, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 095 925 72 75

Fax: + 7 095 924 69 89

ST.PETERSBOURG

Dr Nina HRIASHEVA, General Director of the Centre of Teacher Training

Tel/Fax: + 7 812 314 69 6

SAMARA

Mr Vladimir PAHOMOV, Vice-rector, Institute of In-service Teacher Training
Tel: + 7 8462 51 66 70 Fax: + 7 8462 51 19 51

YOSHKAROLA

Ms Natalia STADNIKOVA, Vice-rector, Institute of In-service Teacher Training
Tel: + 7 8362 55 43 21

CHEBAKSARY

Mr Vladimir DANYLOV, Rector, Institute of In-service Teacher Training
Tel: + 7 8352 42 85 22 Fax: + 7 8352 42 81 82

Mr Antonina DANYLOVA, Methodologist, Institute of In-service Teacher Training
Tel: + 7 8352 42 85 22 Fax: + 7 8352 42 81 82

SARANSK

Ms Nina ANOUFRIEVA, Head of the Department of Social Studies, Institute of In-service Teacher Training
Tel: + 7 8342 33 51 29 Fax: + 7 8342 33 07 35

KAZAN

Ms Zuhra VASYNA, Leading Specialist, Ministry of Education of Tatarstan
Tel: + 7 8432 32 08 89 Fax: + 7 8432 38 46 05

KIROV

Mr Anatoliy CHOURIN, Head of the Education Department of Kirov Region
Tel: + 7 8332 62 87 81 Fax: + 7 8332 62 62 53

YAROSLAVL

Mr Sergey VOSKRESENSKIY, Leading methodologist, Institute of In-service Teacher Training
Tel/fax: + 7 0852 21 06 83

VLADIMIR

Mr Sergey MININ, Head of the Department of Social Studies, Institute of In-service Teacher Training

Tel: + 7 0922 32 72 06

KOSTROMA

Ms Nadejda PIGALEVA, Head of the Department of Social Studies, Institute of In-service Teacher Training

Tel: + 7 0942 31 35 57

Fax: + 7 0942 31 60 23

ARZAMAS

Mr Giryi SAGATELIAN, Vice-rector, Arzamas State Pedagogical University

Tel: + 7 83147 4 33 33

Ms Marina KOZLOVA, Leading Specialist, Education Department

Tel: + 7 83 147 4 44 16

Fax: + 7 83 147 4 09 14

KOTOVO

Ms Svetlana KRIVOROTOVA, Head of the Education Department

Tel: + 783145 2 20 42

SHAHUNIA

Ms Ekaterina VARAKINA, Head of the Information Centre

PAVLOVO

Mr Mikhail KISELEV, History teacher, School N 6

Tel: + 7 83171 3 43 70

BOR

Ms Marina SUBBOTINA, History teacher, School N 4

Tel: + 7 83 159 2 19 14

Mr Andrey ELISOV, History teacher

DZERJINSK

Mr Vladimir KOROTKOV, History teacher, School N 28
Tel: + 7 8312 42 74 13

NIJNIY NOVGOROD

Dr Mikhail SYVOV, Director, Institute of Regional Educational Policies
Tel: + 7 831 2 68 65 09 Fax: + 7 831 2 68 54 35

Ms Svetlana MAKSIMOVA, Head of the Department of History Education,
Institute of Regional Educational Policies
Tel: +7 8312 68 92 17 Fax: + 7 831 2 68 54 35

Mr Nikolay BARMIN, Pedagogical Institute

Ms Elena SHIPOVA, Vice-Rector, Institute of Regional Educational Policies
Tel: + 7 831 2 68 65 09 Fax: + 7 831 2 68 54 35

Mr Gerasim MKRTCHAN, Vice-Rector, Institute of Regional Educational Policies
Tel: + 7 831 2 68 33 77 Fax: + 7 831 2 68 54 35

Ms Tatiana ZAYCHIKOVA, Director, Appraisal Centre
Tel: + 7 831 2 68 28 89 Fax: + 7 831 2 68 54 35

Ms Elena VOLKOVA, Head of the Department of Psychology, Institute of
Regional Educational Policies
Tel: + 7 831 2 68 76 63 Fax: + 7 831 2 68 54 35

Mr Alexey MIRONOS, Associated Professor, Nijniy Novgorod State University
Tel: + 7 831 2 36 69 96

Ms Tatiana BESPALOVA, Head of the Education Department, Regional
Administration
Tel: + 7 831 2 33 02 68

Ms Olga TRAPESNIKOVA, History teacher, school N° 180
Tel: + 7 831 2 42 74 13

Ms Svetlana KOULIEVA, History teachers, Technical Gymnasium
Tel: + 7 831 2 24 03 82

Ms Elena KALINKINA, History teacher Lyceum N° 40
Tel: + 7 831 2 35 01 72

Ms Stella SIDORKINA, History teacher Gymnasium N° 13
Tel: + 7 831 2 36 57 18

Ms Bella GRIBKOVA, Head of the Department of Foreign Languages, Institute of
Regional Educational Policies
Tel: + 7 831 2 67 76 85 Fax: + 7 8312 68 54 35

Ms Polina GALKEVICH, Methodologist, Department of Foreign Languages,
Institute of Regional Educational Policies
Tel: + 7 831 2 67 76 85 Fax: + 7 8312 68 54 35

Ms Olga LADYKOVA, Methodologist, Department of Psychology, Institute of
Regional Educational Policies
Tel: + 7 831 2 67 76 63 Fax: + 7 8312 68 54 35

Ms Irina FARAONOVA, Rector's assistant, Institute of Regional Educational
Policies
Tel: + 7 831 2 68 65 09 Fax: + 7 8312 68 54 35

Ms Galina CHIBILEVA, Head of the Information Centre, Institute of Regional
Educational Policies
Tel: + 7 831 2 68 85 89 Fax: + 7 8312 68 54 35

Ms Elena OUSOVA, Deputy Director, Institute of Regional Educational Policies
Tel: + 7 831 2 33 04 22 Fax: + 7 8312 33 37 24

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Ms Alison CARDWELL

Acting Head of the Technical Co-operation and Assistance Section, Directorate of
Education, Culture and Sport

Council of Europe, F - 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX, France

Tel: 33 3 88 41 26 17

Fax: 33 3 88 41 27 50/27 56

E-mail: alison.cardwell@coe.int

Ms Tatiana MILKO

Programme Officer, Technical Co-operation and Assistance Section, Directorate of
Education, Culture and Sport

Council of Europe, F - 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX, France

Tel: 33 3 88 41 36 97

Fax: 33 3 88 41 27 50/27 56

E-mail: tatiana.milko@coe.int

APPENDIX III

REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUPS

Report on the activities of Working Group No. 1

Chair: Ms Svetlana MAKSIMOVA

Rapporteur: Ms Ludmila SHILOVA

Resource person: Dr Alois ECKER, Austria

“In-service teacher training in the Russian Federation”

Fourteen people took part in the Working Group on "In-service teacher training in the Russian Federation", including representatives of higher education establishments, staff from in-service training institutions, administrators and teachers.

Also among the participants was Tamara Ivanovna Tyulyayeva, senior specialist at the Ministry of General and Professional Education and Lyudmila Mikhailovna Andrukhina, expert at the Institute for the Development of Regional Education and Further Teacher Training in the Sverdlovsk area.

Dr Alois Ecker acted as resource-person and the working group was chaired by Ms Svetlana Maximova.

The participants began by stating their views on the materials presented at the plenary meeting, and determining the topic for group discussion.

In the course of the discussion, the following issues emerged: in-service training models and formats, interaction between the various elements of the in-service training system.

Particular attention was paid to the issue of distance learning, teachers' methodological culture and the role of school administrative authorities in organising continuous training for teachers.

Mention should be made of the keen interest shown in the issues discussed, the business-like nature of the discussions, the willingness to co-operate and the professionalism of all who participated in the working groups, under the able leadership of Ms Maksimova and Dr Ecker.

The most lively contributions were those made by Mr Vladimir Petrovich Pakhimov, concerning the specific aspects of the current model of in-service

training for history teachers in the Samara area; by Dr Ecker concerning the flexible system of in-service training, based on an activity-centred approach, which encourages teachers to analyse their own activities, and helps to develop pupil interaction in the classroom; by Dr Andrukhina concerning the need for a new approach to the preparation of methodological literature for teachers working in education development; by Mr Vladimir Korotkov and Ms Tamara Tyulyayeva.

In the opinion of the working group participants, one particularly promising area of in-service training is distance learning for history teachers in rural schools, for which there are various possible formats.

Of particular importance in in-service training is the issue of teaching methods. There is a clear need here to produce collections of reference material together with notes on textbooks, explaining the methodological approach adopted by the authors of the textbooks and how to use them.

The participants agreed that school is an important link in the system of continuous training. And that one of the main tasks of any school principal is to create the necessary conditions for teachers' ongoing professional development by examining educational needs and providing teachers with the appropriate incentives and support.

To this end, more provision needs to be made for in-service training for school principals.

The working group participants came up with the following recommendations:

- With regard to Nijniy Novgorod Regional Department of Education and Science. The participants recommended that the Department should:
 - i. continue its efforts to set up and support inter-district in-service training centres;
 - ii. produce newsletters containing regionally-oriented educational literature;
 - iii. create a databank of analytical materials on syllabuses for history teachers.
- With regard to the Russian Ministry of General and Vocational Education. The participants recommended that the Ministry should:

- i. update the basic rules and regulations on in-service training for secondary school teachers;
 - ii. arrange for the publication of collections of analytical material on modern teaching methods.
- With regard to the Council of Europe. The participants recommended that the Council of Europe should:
 - i. seek support for the idea of creating a database on educational technologies for young people;
 - ii. assist in the development and implementation of a distance-learning system of in-service training for teachers in rural schools.

In conclusion, the group wishes to express its gratitude to the Council of Europe for giving it the opportunity to discuss some of the key issues of history education in modern-day Russia. It also wishes to thank the Department of Education and Science and the Institute for Education Development for the highly professional manner in which they organised the Seminar. The group is particularly grateful to all the participants in the Seminar for their highly imaginative approach, their open-mindedness and willingness to co-operate.

Report on the activities of Working Group No. 2

Chair: Ms Nina HRYASOVA

Rapporteur: Mr Aleksey MIRONOS

Resource person: Assoc. Prof. Julieta SAVOVA, Bulgaria

"Evaluation in history education"

Between nine and 11 people took part in the working group at one point or another. The following issues were discussed:

- the role and specific aspects of evaluation in history education (EHE) and its possible outcomes;
- what needs to be evaluated, and who should do it;
- the mechanisms and criteria of evaluation in history education.

The participants in the discussion acknowledged that EHE was a subject that had been relatively little explored and that, consequently, much of the discussion would be aimed at identifying the most common problems and the aims of EHE.

One positive outcome of the discussion was the fact that the participants managed to find some common ground, and to set about tackling the issue of EHE in a constructive manner.

1) The following points emerged early on in the discussion:

- in today's changing and ever more complex world, when the role and aims of history education are likewise changing and becoming more complex, the shift from administrative forms of supervision (inspections) to an investigative systemic analysis (expert appraisal) of history education is of great significance;
- the concept of EHE can involve an (inter-disciplinary) analysis of the declared aims and organisational structure of history education, and its outcomes in social terms. It can also be about predicting the consequences of particular innovations and trends in the development of history education;
- the participants in the discussion observed that, at present, the practical side of EHE is being hampered by the lack of a clearly defined, standardised set of objectives in history education, reflecting a particular system of social values. When clarifying the aims and specific features of EHE, the participants felt it was essential to look

at possible definitions of the aims of history education. Mr A. Elisov presented research findings on how teachers in the Nijniy Novgorod region view the aims of history education. According to these findings, only 7% of teachers regard pupils' moral development as one of the major tasks of history education. The overwhelming majority see acquainting pupils with the factual aspects of the historical process as being the main aim of history education.

In the course of the discussion, the working group participants unanimously agreed that the aims of history education - ensuring compliance with which is the main purpose of EHE - should be in keeping with the parameters advocated by the Council of Europe. Among the most important of these parameters, in the opinion of the participants, were: the development of tolerance, positive thinking, responsibility, openness and the capacity for dialogue.

2) The discussion on what needs to be evaluated and who should do the evaluating led the participants to the following conclusions:

Suitable subjects for EHE might include:

- the declared aims of historical development;
- teaching content and resources;
- teachers' professional competence;
- the outcomes of history education;
- the management of the history education system (at various levels).

In the opinion of the participants, EHE could be performed by groups of experts organised along interdisciplinary lines. These groups should include specialists in history (ie school teachers and lecturers, academics), methodologists, sociologists, culturologists, etc. By bringing together qualified specialists from different fields, it should be possible to carry out a comprehensive, impartial, responsible evaluation.

3) When it came to discussing the mechanisms and development of criteria for EHE, the participants chose three possible subjects for evaluation: textbooks, history teaching resources and the outcomes of history education. The discussion took place in small groups.

As a result of the discussion, the following criteria were identified:

Evaluation of textbooks

- I. Polygraphic and physical characteristics.
- II. Content:
 - anthropocentricity (human-centredness);
 - authenticity;
 - suitability for particular age groups;
 - the positiveness of the exposition;
 - structure;
 - style;
 - connection with the material being studied;
 - balance between world, national and regional history
- III. Appendices and reference material:
 - methodological appendices, teacher's handbook;
 - sources, literature;
 - maps, drawings, diagrams, etc.

Evaluation of teaching resources:

- i. consistency with the declared aims and objectives;
- ii. ability to create positive cognitive motivation;
- iii. effectiveness from the point of view of the established educational objectives;
- iv. use of more than one channel of communication;
- v. ability to stimulate cognitive activity.

Evaluation of the outcomes of history education:

- I. Values:
 - solid knowledge;
 - structure (hierarchy);
 - consistency;
 - (operational) effectiveness.

II. Knowledge:

- soundness;
- completeness;
- comprehensiveness (facts, theory).

III. Skills:

- comprehensiveness;
- capacity to use historical knowledge.

IV. Creative mental activity:

- ability to hypothesise;
- ability to come up with alternative solutions to problems.

In the course of the discussion, the participants noted that it was essential to establish a link between whatever is being evaluated, the criteria and the methods of verifying these criteria.

The participants in the discussion produced the following recommendations:

1. With regard to the Russian Ministry of Education: speed up the development of standards in history education, including the aims of history education. When formulating these aims, reference should be made to a specific set of social values.
2. With regard to Nijniy Novgorod Regional Department of Education and Science:
 - set up a group of experts to implement the various types of EHE;
 - with the help of Nijniy Novgorod Institute for Education Development, devise and implement a training programme for evaluators.
3. With regard to the Council of Europe: continue working on the development of EHE, facilitate the exchange of information on national systems of evaluation in history education and support the work of the group responsible for developing mechanisms for EHE.

The working group wishes to express its gratitude to the Council of Europe representatives for providing the opportunity for this discussion and so helping to generate new ideas in the development of history education.

Report on the activities of Working Group No. 3

Chair: Ms Tatiana ZAICHIKOVA

Rapporteur: Ms Elena VOLKOVA

Resource person: Mr Mark McLAUGHLIN, United Kingdom

"The appraisal of history teachers"

Eleven people took part in the working group. All actively and freely discussed the matters on the working group's agenda and made constructive suggestions. Among the participants of the working group were teachers, lecturers, senior administrators, representatives of the State inspectorate and staff from appraisal and diagnostic centres.

In the course of the discussions, all the issues on the agenda were raised and dealt with, in particular items no. 1, 2, 3 and 6 (see Seminar Programme).

A comparative analysis of models of teacher appraisal in Britain, Bulgaria and Russia was of most interest to the working group participants. It was established that despite the wide range of approaches to teacher appraisal within Russia, they are all based on a similar model.

Of all the history teacher appraisal systems looked at, the Nijniy Novgorod system was examined in most depth.

The chief merits of this particular model were considered to be the following:

- its compatibility with conditions in modern-day Russia;
- its suitability for use with a wide range of teachers;
- the standardised nature of the appraisal;
- the balance between quantitative and qualitative assessments;
- the comprehensive nature of the evaluation;
- the variety in terms of types of appraisal;
- objectivity;
- the fact that participation is voluntary;
- the possibility of comparing the claims made with the level actually attained by a particular teacher;
- the possibility of making an informed choice about ways of upgrading a teacher's professional skills.

The main limitations of the model are due to:

- the lack of a concrete plan for career development;
- the implicit dependence on the model of professional competence and the teacher's recognised functions;
- the possible formalisation of the process of a teacher's professional development;
- the somewhat static nature of the procedure;
- the considerable expense entailed in this particular model.

The participants agreed on the need for teacher appraisal. Such practices are in the interests of everyone involved in the educational process, as appraisal is a way of protecting a child's right to a proper education and, at the same time, a means of improving the level of education.

Despite the wide variety of appraisal methods, the underlying structure appears to be fairly constant, consisting of:

- an evaluation of the teacher's professional competence;
- an evaluation of the effectiveness of a teacher's performance, based on an examination of his or her pupils' achievements;
- an evaluation of the social aspect of educational activities.

In the course of their contributions, Mr Mark McLaughlin (United Kingdom) and Ms Elena Usova (Nizhniy Novgorod) both made the point that, in order to appraise history teachers, it is essential to define more closely the requirements that history teachers are expected to meet. These requirements should be suited to the teacher's professional competence model and his or her functions. The development of such models and functions is an area well worth exploring when looking for ways to tackle appraisal.

The criteria for history teacher appraisal should be improved by pooling the findings of an expert evaluation of the content and procedural aspects of history teaching. On the basis of the criteria developed by the experts, the various levels of administration (school, district, municipal, regional) could make decisions about teaching staff appraisal. Such appraisals should draw on both general evaluation criteria and more specific criteria, which might require changes in the socio-cultural environment and individual outlook of the teacher concerned.

The discussions proved very rewarding and one of the main ideas to emerge concerned the interrelation between in-service training, evaluation and appraisal.

Proposals and requests.

- i. with regard to the Council of Europe: encourage the exchange of experience in the area of history teacher appraisal in various European countries, publish consolidated documents on this subject and make them available to all the Regions of the Russian Federation.
- ii. Submit a proposal to the Council of Europe's Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport concerning the possibility of holding a series of 1- or 2-day seminars in the Volga region on appraisal issues (teacher's professional competence model -> teacher's functions -> appraisal criteria -> training for appraisers).
- iii. with regard to the Russian Ministry of General and Professional Education: when discussing and approving the regulations governing the procedure for conducting appraisals of teaching and administrative staff, consider the findings of this Seminar (particularly as regards the need to develop a single model of professional competence, a set of functions and appraisal criteria).
- iv. with regard to the Department of Education and Science of the Region of Nijniy Novgorod: develop and approve a training programme for appraisers specialising in history education.
- v. The group also wishes to thank the Nijniy Novgorod Regional Department of Education and Science, the Nijniy Novgorod Institute for Education Development and the Council of Europe's Directorate of Education, Culture and Sport for organising this Seminar on in-service training, evaluation and appraisal in history education.

