



Warning to readers: access to the quoted articles is dependent on the subscription taken out by your institution.

Intermediary regulation processes and steering in educational systems

[The intermediary regulation process: definition and justification](#) | [Moving towards a merging of the centralised and decentralised systems](#) | [Contradictory research on the impacts of decentralisation policies](#) | [The intermediary regulation process in France](#) | [Several intermediary regulation models](#) | [International studies on intermediary regulation](#) | [Political control of the intermediary regulation process?](#) | [Research work and studies carried out on steering and regulation processes](#) | [Upcoming colloquiums on steering and intermediate regulation](#)

Despite the fact that numerous articles have been published on internal school regulation processes, little research has been carried out on the intermediary level between the State and the school itself. This subject nevertheless deserves specific attention in view of the trend towards decentralisation and the increased autonomy enjoyed by schools, which are keen to create new partnerships, notably with local administrations.

The issues related to the regulation and steering of school systems encompass a broad range of topics and skills, including management sciences and techniques, education sociology and political sciences. For each given country, steering models must adapt to the history of the schooling systems and to the pre-existing organisation of the different categories of actors. This notably leads to a reinforcement of the assessment process and consequently the implementing of indicators. It also clears the way for local adjustments in order to take into account more diverse requirements.

According to Jean-Louis Derouet (1), the emergence of the concept of standards, *accountability*, users etc. has placed schools somewhat in limbo between the commercial and civic worlds by legitimising questions relating to the efficiency and quality of educational systems as a whole. In general terms, the political authorities in charge of the education sector define all of the objectives to be attained, whilst at the same time guaranteeing a form of control and assessment of the schools' work. Although the latter now enjoy an increasing degree of autonomy, notably vis-à-vis the construction of their projects, they are nevertheless accountable to their supervisory bodies. In their research report, [Barroso and Bajomi](#) (2) show that this redistribution of roles between the State and the schools themselves is tending to make the distinction between centralised and decentralised systems increasingly obsolete.

The intermediary regulation process: definition and justification

According to Y. Dutercq (3), the aim of regulation is to ensure that public measures are suitably defined and controlled with sufficient flexibility. It involves the work of numerous different authorities and regulation centres, which, unlike steering, indicates that only one authority is responsible for defining the approach to be adopted. It requires a framework and must be defined in accordance with all implementation conditions. It is therefore based around a specific and pinpointed approach.

Both the number of control authorities and the centres where standards are defined are on the increase, both locally and globally. Decentralisation trends were seen in numerous countries in the Eighties and Nineties. Since the turn of the century, new forms of regional management have been introduced, such as the inter-district approach, for example, which is now in force in 80% of the districts in France. France, Portugal and most significantly the Scandinavian countries have reinforced their decentralisation policy, whilst other countries, such as the United Kingdom, have reinforced their centralisation approach through the implementing of national assessments and curricula. One can note that there is no real coherence on a European scale, however, notably because the local, regional and national interference is both considerable and varied. This creates tension, although this again varies from country to country.

It is interesting to take a closer look at the intermediary regulation processes that take place between the central public authorities and the schools themselves. *"For any teaching system, these processes are the work of the public steering authorities or the private, public or mixed networks which, thanks to their official accreditation, are authorised to regulate the work of the local players involved in the teaching sector (i.e. departments or teachers)"* (4).

Moving towards a merging of the centralised and decentralised systems

According to data from the [OECD](#) and the [PISA](#) programme, we can clearly see a dual centralisation and decentralisation trend on an international scale. On the one hand, the centralisation trend is impacting to a greater extent the definition of academic systems, the assessment of these academic systems and the pupils. However, we can clearly see that local players are becoming increasingly involved in the actual curricula. The schools prefer to choose their manuals and recruit their teach-

ers themselves. Local administrations very often participate in financing the educational systems, and the schools' budgets are defined to an increasing degree in conjunction with these administrations.

Indeed, it seems that States which are favourable to decentralisation (i.e. Hungary, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and Spain) have reinforced their steering role – notably through the implementation of standards. In 1998, the United Kingdom, having for a long time adopted the ultra-decentralisation model, turned to “maths and reading strategies” in primary and secondary schools. One of the principal features of these strategies is the very tight control over the teaching methods adopted. Hungary, which opted for the decentralisation approach at the beginning of the Nineties, reinforced the powers of its central government in 1998. In these countries, the State delegates all aspects of management to the local players (notably the schools), whilst limiting its own powers to regulation and control. According to [Nathalie Mons](#), “*this is a case of management delegation in the broadest sense of the term. The local authorities, and especially the schools, are primarily involved in defining the curricula: the central State steers the system in accordance with the results obtained, by fixing minimum objectives or compulsory programmes. It is up to the schools to define the curricula in more detail, with the aim of enabling pupils to attain performance levels that justify this degree of delegated liberty when they take the standardised national tests (or during the numerous and detailed national inspections). The local players are also responsible for managing human resources: they hire and fire teachers, and (less frequently), partially determine teachers' salaries. They define their own budget and can generate funds locally. The status of 'legal entity', often granted to schools with this model, allows them to be almost entirely autonomous in their management approach*” (5).

More centralised States such as Iceland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Poland and the Czech Republic have delegated a high proportion of their powers to the local administrations and the schools themselves. According to N. Mons (6), in these countries “*schools can participate in the definition of academic activities through the implementation of varied mechanisms: teaching-hour quotas left to their discretion, free options, and the possibility of increasing the amount of time dedicated to compulsory subjects whilst respecting a maximum national ceiling [...] Nevertheless, the central State continues to retain strict control over academic activities through the definition of obligatory subjects with a fixed amount of hours. The room for manoeuvre enjoyed by the local players is generally [...] limited with regard to human resources management. The scope of their powers, however, is much broader with regard to the financing and administration of schools. As they are much in demand from a financial perspective (with this model the local administrations contribute to the financing of the system out of their own funds), they are granted the powers of management – in line with the financing obligations. The towns, provinces and other regions – all autonomous political powers – are consequently responsible for the administration of entire schooling levels (and, in general terms, the primary and general secondary level)*”.

At the end of the Nineties, following the introduction of national educational standards (initially optional and subsequently increasingly tight), federal States such as Canada, the United States, Brazil and Germany, limited the room for manoeuvre enjoyed by their States, provinces and districts. Although they delegated responsibility for their educational systems to the latter, they also initiated a trend towards centralisation, whilst at the same time broadening the scope of the schools' powers. The centralisation process was carried out by the federal government imposing national standards (this was the case in Australia, Brazil and the United States), and through co-operation between the provinces, districts or ‘Länder’ (as was the case in Canada, Switzerland and Germany). The transfer of these new powers to the schools was made possible thanks to numerous experiments carried out on school autonomy, favouring greater liberty for the local education professionals (notably in Australia, Brazil and the United States).

The decentralisation of the school systems, which was initiated during the Eighties, has since spread to all countries in the OECD. Nevertheless, various approaches have been developed. Certain States, such as France, Luxembourg and Japan, have a decentralisation policy that does not call into question the centralisation of their educational system. Other States, such as England, Hungary, Spain and Sweden, have reviewed their former structures, and have delegated significant powers to intermediate structures.

The local players that have benefited from the decentralisation process vary according to the country in question. In Spain and Argentina, it is essentially the local political authorities that have benefited; in England and in New Zealand, it is the schools; and in the Scandinavian countries, it is both the schools and the local administrations. With the notable exceptions of Belgium and Spain, the central State still remains in charge of defining the academic structures and curricula, as well as financing the establishments and managing the teaching staff.

Contradictory research on the impacts of decentralisation policies

According to different experts (notably working for the World Bank), the decentralisation reforms seem to be reinforcing pupil attendance levels (surveys in Brazil (7) and in India (8)), and reducing the absenteeism of teachers (India and Nicaragua (9)). In the United States, the experiments carried out in Chicago (10) and Memphis (11) in 1988 and 1995 revealed that a period of 5 to 10 years is required before the reforms impact on a pupil's education. These experiments also showed that it is preferable to put the emphasis on academic activities rather than to reform the structures. In Argentina (12), the decentralising reform implemented during the Nineties (with the objective of transferring secondary establishments' responsibilities to the provinces), had a positive impact overall on pupils' academic results (except in the poorest provinces (13)). The English reform of 1988 (significant autonomy enjoyed by the schools and parental choice of school), clearly improved pupil performance (14).

Certain research studies illustrate that there is no link between the decentralisation process and pupils' results. This is the case with an international survey carried out in 12 OECD countries (15). The results of the school autonomy experiments also illustrate this lack of causality (16). It would seem that whereas decentralisation does modify the structures, it does not generate changes in the educational methods adopted (17). Certain authors (18) suggest that a balance must be found in order to optimise the decentralisation reforms, and that consequently a total decentralisation of the educational system is to be avoided.

Other studies show that decentralisation boosts academic inequalities. This is the case with the education municipalisation policy that led to economic disparities in Chile with regard to the resources allocated to education (19). It seems that the quality of the educational services in Argentina and Brazil (20) has fallen off as a result of a dispersion effect.

With regard to improving levels of efficiency, different research work and studies indicate that:

- It is better to transfer powers to the establishments themselves than to the local authorities (21);
- Of the reforms introduced, the school autonomy models that give priority to education and to teachers are the most efficient (22);
- The external monitoring of results goes hand in hand with the process of increasing a school's degree of autonomy (23);
- The State must continue to define the system's educational objectives and finance them, but that it must also assess the schools, teachers and pupils (24).

The intermediary regulation process in France

The Eighties saw the start of a progressive transfer of responsibilities from the central administration to local authorities, the State's decentralised departments and schools. With regard to investments and the functioning of the establishments: primary schools were accountable to the district authorities, junior secondary schools to the departmental authorities and senior second schools to the regional authorities. The [policy law of 1989](#) outlined an objective to adapt school systems to the diversity of pupils' needs and to regional requirements. The "[deconsolidation charter](#)" of 1992 granted the Education Offices and Academic Inspection bodies a common law status at an administrative level. The central administration nevertheless retained an exclusive role with regard to steering tasks and national assessments. The decentralised departments of the Ministry of National Education intervened at different levels: movement of intra-academic staff, lists of schools (showing forecasts for regional requirements), creation of primary school teacher jobs, administration of exams and entrance exams, creation and management of establishments, etc. However, with their obligatory and regulated expenditure, and the grants attributed by the ministerial departments with fixed pre-determined usage, schools still did not enjoy sufficient financial autonomy for decentralisation. Moreover, according to the French Government accounting office ([Cour des Comptes](#)), operational academic projects were fairly few and far between. It is therefore clear that the *Établissements Publics Locaux d'Enseignement* (EPLÉ – Public Local Teaching Establishments) had very little available in the way of human or financial resources (between €230k for a small junior secondary school and €1.5m for a large senior secondary school). Similarly, the schools' level of autonomy remained very limited, from a legal perspective, especially when the administrative control process seemed to be carried out on a 'when appropriate' basis (if the [IGEN report](#) is anything to go by). This report also stressed that "establishment projects", which became obligatory with the law of 1989, were not always implemented in the EPLÉ, and when they were, were often initiatives imposed by school managers and limited to school life. Despite the fact that the centralised model adopted in the French educational system has been taken up in other countries, a [2004 report by the national commission on the future of schools](#) (24b) states that very little progress in the area of its management has been seen, and that progress is taking place at a slower rate than in other OECD countries. Notably, it seems that "*although a third of the OECD countries (such as France) still adopt the compulsory national curriculum, nearly half of these countries (42%) have delegated responsibilities to their schools or local administrations with regard to defining curricula [...]. The centralised States have entrusted schools with the responsibility of creating a proportion of the curricula via different mechanisms: the choice of so-called 'local' curricula (Russia and Spain); hourly quotas left to the discretion of the schools (Sweden or the Czech Republic); the option of adapting the hourly quotas for a given subject or group of subjects within each year of a given academic year group (Sweden); the option of increasing the hourly quotas of certain compulsory subjects (Spain); and even the freedom (in zones where the ultra-decentralised approach is adopted) to create one's own curricula whilst respecting national objectives (New Zealand or the United Kingdom)*". France is consequently isolated in its centralised approach to defining its teaching curricula, as we can see that in most countries (including those that are heavily centralised), curricula are defined on the basis of a co-decision mechanism.

The centralisation of the French State (like that of the other European States) will have to face up to the pressure being exerted by the other regulation models, both from a supra-national and infra-national perspective. The towns and regions of Europe have become regulation centres, and often very significant ones. The intermediary frameworks, and notably regional education inspectors, are being forced to adopt a dual stance (25).

While keen to assert their authority over regional administrations, they still subscribe to a strong hierarchical approach to defining curricula. Nevertheless, at the same time, they challenge this approach by favouring delegation, participative management, transparency of resources management and a networking of skills. Although the regional education inspectors are still the main representatives for the regional administrations, their low degree of autonomy forces them to refer to their Chief Education Officer (26). The administrative overlaps seen in the National Education System (caused by the different forms of geographical divide and the resulting responsibilities) allow the intervention of several different political and administrative levels, and this can often slow the decision-making process. It seems that the different regional authorities (notably the regions and departments), "*have only made claims with regard to very specific circumstances and even then are somewhat hesitant to take on more power*" (27).

According to Y. Dutercoq, the decentralisation trend has not left much room for the participation of citizens, even via associations. Could decentralisation allow more room for diversity, and consequently confrontations that could improve the educational system?

Several intermediary regulation models

According to [J. Barroso and I. Bajomi](#) (28), the United States represent an exemplary model for the diversification of deregulation and privatisation procedures. Measures referred to as [School-based Management](#) have made it possible to transfer significant decision-making powers to school establishments, in addition to a capacity to manage their own resources. The [Educational management organizations](#) are responsible for managing the schools, and their contracts are paid out of public funds. They have sufficient power both to manage their own staff (recruitment and salaries) and to intervene in the choice of curricula. Certain measures, such as the [Education Flexibility Program](#), which was partially adopted in ten States, resulted in the exemption of certain States, districts or schools from the application of curricula-based or financial standards. Contracting measures, such as [Charter schools](#), make it possible to delegate the responsibility of governing state schools to associations, companies, teachers and parents. Other measures, such as [school vouchers](#), give parents complete freedom with regard to choosing their children's school. There is also the [Home schooling](#) approach, which enables families to educate their children in their own homes (whilst respecting legal obligations). This generally involves calling on the services of private companies specialising in distance learning.

According to [S. J. Ball](#) (29), the enforced introduction of a national curriculum in all state schools in England and Wales is a clear example of a reinforcement of central power, at a time when the management of curriculum-based issues was the responsibility of a Local Education Authority (LEA) for each school. This initiative by the State to regain control of the educational system is similarly visible in both the fact that a pupil is now obliged to sit national exams and tests throughout his school career and in the introduction of standards with regard to learning to read, write and do sums.

According to [H. Draelants and C. Maroy](#) (30), the entire educational system in Belgium's French-speaking Community rests on the principles of equality and freedom of choice, thereby making it possible to both adapt the teaching approach to different beliefs (i.e. non-religious or religious), and to give parents complete freedom in the choice of their children's school. The schools' supervisory authorities (themselves private or public) consequently enjoy a great deal of freedom in defining the curricula and educational methods, whilst respecting the minimum requirements with regard to hourly study and curriculum quotas, with a view to benefiting from financing and examination recognition from the State. School directors also enjoy a high level of autonomy in relation to their supervisory body with regard to the organisation of lessons and the implementing of different procedures. Exams are organised at a school level in accordance with the directives issued by each supervisory body (and are consequently not national). However, as of the Nineties, different measures have imposed objectives within the curricula defined in terms of "skill levels", in addition to various referentials (terminal skills, training profiles, etc). Committees were responsible for implementing assessment tests that respected the different skill levels. The [decree of objectives](#) of July 24, 1997, defined the objectives of primary and secondary education. It introduced new basic skill levels that needed to be attained, which were referred to as skill platforms, terminal skills and required knowledge levels. The State was consequently attempting, through these different measures, to regulate the diversity of the assessment systems.

According to [J. Barroso et al.](#) (31), Portugal's national curriculum must be adopted in all the country's schools, whether public or private. However, schools may choose their own course books, assess their pupils and introduce alternative curricula. Between 1996 and 2001, all the players in the educational sector worked together to define a certain number of essential skills to be attained with basic teaching. The result was the [Projecto de Gestão Flexível do Currículo](#), in which numerous schools participated between 1997 and 2002. The defining of general and specific skills (based on the programme management experiment carried out in these schools) was validated through an implementation process at school level. Following this work on the basic skills, the basic teaching curriculum was re-organised at a national level as of the beginning of the 2001/2002 academic year (decree-law 6/2001). As of 2004/2005, the programme based on these skills was used throughout the entire basic teaching approach. An Educational assessment bureau (GAVE) was created within the Ministry of National Education with the objective of defining and organising national exams, thereby reinforcing the external pupil assessment process.

International studies on intermediary regulation

In Europe, the decentralisation trend observed in the educational systems has reached most of the member countries since the Eighties. According to A. Green, A. Wolf and T. Leney, "... one can observe [...] a growing trend involving the transfer of certain aspects of the decision-making process and certain operational powers to levels lower than the existing levels. This is normally described as a general "decentralisation" process. The term is undoubtedly not subtle enough to express the complex process of change occurring within the educational power structures of the different countries, but it is a very clear sign of what could be described as a common trend in the political decision-making process within the EU. This broad political restructuring is underpinned by several factors (common to a large number of states), which include financial restrictions, the impact of the increase in social pluralism, pressure to increase regional autonomy levels and the impact of neo-liberal political ideologies" (32).

According to the [Reguleducnetwork](#) study, which focused on French-speaking Belgium, France, Hungary, Portugal and the United Kingdom, the development of teaching system regulation models is being accompanied everywhere (except in the United Kingdom) by a reinforcement in the different forms of intermediary regulation. According to C. Maroy (33), who participated in this study, "in most of the zones observed, this development is justified by rhetoric that demands higher levels of "quality" in the teaching systems, whether in the form of an improvement in "national standards" (England, France and French-speaking Belgium), adaptation and response to local users' expectations and requirements (Portugal and Hungary) or economic streamlining in terms of the efficiency of the resources implemented (Belgium's French Community and Hungary). The reference to a greater equality or equity in the educational system is nevertheless present...". Certain common trends may be revealed: "Diversity of the systems and levels of control; reinforcement of venal regulation; erosion of the professional situation and the social control over the school; reduction in the supply of financial resources; and finally, promotion of the degree of social participation in the governance of state schools" (34).

The positioning of the States with regard to the management of their educational systems has changed. It reveals less steering and more regulation and assessment, as is revealed in the conclusions of a study carried out by [C. Lessard, A. Brassard and J. Lusignan](#) (35) on the educational policies implemented in Canada, the United States, France and the United Kingdom: "The State is not withdrawing from education. It is adopting a new role, i.e. that of a regulator and evaluator, which defines the major policies and targets to be reached, whilst at the same time creating a control and assessment system capable of verifying whether the required results have or have not been obtained. Whilst, on the one hand, it is continuing to invest a considerable proportion of its budget into education, it is also partially abandoning daily management and organisation tasks, which it is transferring to local and intermediary levels (both in collaboration and in competition with the private players, which are keen to acquire a significant share of the educational "market").

Political control of the intermediary regulation process?

In certain Latin American and African countries, the renunciation by the State of its powers has led to a deregulation of the teaching system, which has been misappropriated by different private and public authorities (36).

As a result of the results-based regulation approach adopted in the Anglo-Saxon countries and in French-speaking Belgium, teachers have adopted certain corporatist attitudes, which are no longer in line with the stance adopted by the rest of the school world, and which can consequently conflict with that of the pupils (37). It seems that this is due to a lack of confidence shown on the part of the school administration managers in the teachers, preventing them from allowing these teachers to enjoy the high level of autonomy that they had previously enjoyed over a considerable period (38).

Recent analyses of the teaching systems reveal the development of almost market-driven types of regulation (39). In France, competitive strategies are developing between the different establishments.

However, with the emergence of intermediary regulation centres, it seems that the diversification of those involved in the regulation process is both complicating and democratising the different decision-making processes, whilst legitimising the State's intervention: According to J. Barroso (40), " ... factors such as the re-politicisation of education, the multiplication of decision-making authorities, the diversification of the forms of association within the public bodies and the participation of a large number of players are making the education regulation system more and more complex. This complexity requires that the State is attributed a new role, so that the respect that one hopes will continue to be shown in questions of diversity and of individuality will not hamper the attaining of common objectives, which are necessary for society to survive (and for which, of course, education is an essential instrument). The consolidation of these two objectives is only possible through reinforcement of the democratic forms of participation and decision-making. However, in contemporary societies, this reinforcement process demands that information reaches an increasingly broad audience and is qualified to an ever-greater extent; that the local and intermediary decision-making authorities are more widespread and finally that all citizens are included (in particular those who have been systematically excluded until now - both from the inside and the outside). It is for these reasons that the intervention [of the State] is essential".

It can consequently be concluded that responsibility for the regulation process is shared by several different authorities. The State can then intervene as the regulator of this regulation process. The political regulation of education should make it possible to prioritise the areas of intervention and to place the economic aspects under the control of the politicians. The emergence of intermediary regulation authorities, in liaison with the State, could be more efficient than the distant and removed authority of the latter. To a certain extent, the State should above all define the "rules of the game" for the regulation process and not impose standards that are difficult to implement locally (41).

NOTES

(1) Derouet J.-L., 1992, *École et justice*, Paris : Métailié.

(2) Barroso J., Bajomi I. (dir.), 2002, *Systèmes éducatifs, modes de régulation et d'évaluation scolaires et politiques de lutte contre les inégalités en Angleterre, Belgique, France, Hongrie et au Portugal*, Research report [<http://www.girsef.ucl.ac.be/Deliverable3.pdf>].

(3) Dutercoq Y. (dir.), 2005, *Les régulations des politiques d'éducation*, Presses universitaires de Rennes, 204 p., p. 10.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 13.

(5) Mons N., 2004, *De l'école unifiée aux écoles plurielles : évaluation internationale des politiques de différenciation et de diversification de l'offre éducative*, Thesis on Educational Sciences presented at the university of Burgundy under the management Marie Duru-Bellat, Dijon, p. 97 [<http://www.inrp.fr/vst/Recherches/DetailThese.php?these=411>].

(6) Mons N., 2004, « Politiques de décentralisation en éducation : diversité internationale, légitimations théoriques et justifications empiriques », *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, n° 146, January-February-March, p. 41-52.

(7) Paes de Barros R., Silva Pinto de Mendonça S., 1998, The impact of Three institutional Innovations in Brazilian Education, in Sevedoff W.D. (eds.), *Organisation Matters : Agency problems in Health and Education*, Washington D.C. : Inter-American Development Bank.

(8) Panday R., 2000, *Getting to Scale : The Story of DPEP in India*, A presentation made as part of the Education Ministers Series, Education Reform and Management Group, Washington D.C. : World Bank.

(9) King E., Özler B., 1998, What's Decentralization Got To Do with Learning? The case of the Nicaragua's school autonomy reform, Development Economics Research Group, Working Paper series on Impact Evaluation of Education reforms, n°9, June, Washington D.C., World Bank.

(10) Bryk A.S., Thum Y.M., Easton J.Q., Luppescu S., 1998, *Examining Productivity: Ten-Years Trends in the Chicago Public Schools*, Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

(11) Ross, S. M., Sanders, W. L., Wright, S. P., & Stringfield, S. (1998). The Memphis restructuring initiative: Achievement results for years 1 and 2 on the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS), Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis; Ross, S. M., Wang, W. L., Alberg, M., Sanders, W. L., Wright, S. P., & Stringfield, S. (2001, April). Fourth-Year Achievement Results on the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System for Restructuring Schools in Memphis, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

(12) Gilliani S., Schargrodsky E., "Evaluating the Impact of School Decentralization on Education Quality", *Economia LACEA*, n°2,2 pp. 275-314, 2002.

(13) Eskeland G.S., Filmer D., 2002, "Autonomy, Participation, and Learning in Argentine Schools. Finding and their Implications for Decentralization", *Policy Research Working Paper*, WPS, n°2766, Washington D.C., World Bank.

(14) Gorard, S., Taylor C., Fitz J., 2003, *Schools, Markets and Choice Policies*, London, RoutledgeFalmer.

(15) Meuret D., Prod'hom J., Stocker E., 1995, Comparer les structures de décision des systèmes éducatifs : un bilan de l'approche quantitative, in OCDE-CERI, *Mesurer la qualité des établissements scolaires*, Paris, OCDE-CERI.

(16) Duru-Bellat M., Meuret D., 2001, Nouvelles formes de régulation dans les systèmes éducatifs étrangers : autonomie et choix des établissements scolaires, *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, n°135, p. 173-221.

(17) Leithwood K., Menzies T., 1998, Forms and Effects of School-based Management: A Review, *Educational Policy*, 12, 3, p. 325-346.

(18) Wössmann L. 2000, Schooling Resources, Educational Institutions, and Student Performance : The International Evidence, Kiel Working Paper, n°983, Germany : KIWE. [<http://www.uni-kiel.de/ifw/pub/kap/2000/kap983.pdf>]

- (19) Winkler D., Rounds T., 1996, Municipal and Private Sector Response to Decentralization and School Choice. *Economics of Education Review*. 15,4, p.365-376.
- (20) Di Gropello E., 1999, "Educational Decentralization models in Latin America", *Cepal Review*, n°68, pp.155-173.
- (21) McEwan P., Carnoy M., 1998, *Public investments or private schools ? A Reconstruction of Educational Improvements in Chile*, processed, Washington, D.C., World Bank.
- (22) Bryk A.S., Thum Y.M., Easton J.Q., Luppescu S., 1998, *Examining Productivity : Ten-Years Trends in the Chicago Public Schools*, Chicago : Consortium on Chicago School Research. Thrupp M., Harold B., Mansell H., Hawksworth L., 2000, *Mapping the Cumulative Impact of Education Reform : Final Report*, New Zealand : University of Waikato.
- (23) Cox C., Lemaitre M.J., 1999, Market and State Principles of Reform in Chile Education: Policies and Results, In Leiptziger D. and Perry G. (eds.), *Chile: Recent Policy Lessons and Emerging Challenges*.
- (24) WDI Development Studies Series. Washington D.C.: World Bank; Walberg H., Paik S., Komukai A., et Freeman K., 2000, "Decentralization: an International Perspective", *Educational Horizons*, n°78,3, pp. 155-165.
- (24b) Mons N., 2004, Quel est l'impact des politiques éducatives ? Les apports de la recherche. Une étude à la demande de la Commission, Commission du débat national sur l'avenir de l'école, 31 p. [<http://www.debatnational.education.fr/upload/static/lemiroir/pdf/apport3.pdf>].
- (25) Van Zanten, A., 2001, *L'école de la périphérie. Scolarité et ségrégation en banlieue*, Paris, PUF.
- (26) Van Zanten A., 2005, La régulation par le bas du système éducatif. Légitimité des acteurs et construction d'un nouvel ordre local, in Dutercq Y. (dir.), 2005, *op. cit.*, p. 99-119.
- (27) Dutercq Y. (dir.), 2005, *op. cit.*, p. 179.
- (28) Barroso J., Bajomi I. (dir.), 2002, *op. cit.* p. 24-25.
- (29) Ball S.J. et al., 2002, *Changes in regulation modes and social reproduction of inequalities in education systems: a European comparison. Work package 2. England*, Institute of Education and King's College, London, Rapport.
- (30) Draelants H., Maroy C., 2002, *Analyse de l'évolution des modes de régulation institutionnalisée dans le système éducatif de la Communauté française de Belgique*, GIRSEF, Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain, Report.
- (31) Barroso J. et al., 2002, *Analyse de l'évolution des modes de régulation institutionnalisée dans le système éducatif du Portugal*, Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Report.
- (32) Green A., Wolf A., Leney T., 1999, *Convergence and Divergence in European Education Systems*, London, Institute of Education, p. 53-54.
- (33) Maroy C., 2005, Une comparaison des formes de régulation intermédiaires dans cinq pays européens, in Dutercq Y. (dir.), 2005, *op. cit.*, p. 81.
- (34) Barroso J., 2005, Les nouveaux modes de régulation des politiques éducatives en Europe : de la régulation du système à un système de régulations, in Dutercq Y. (dir.), 2005, *op. cit.*, p. 157.
- (35) Lessard C., Brassard A., Lusignan J., 2002, *Les tendances des politiques éducatives en matière de structures et de régulation, d'imputabilité et de reddition de comptes. Les cas du Canada (Ontario et Colombie britannique), de la France et du Royaume-Uni*, Montréal, Labriprof-Crifpe, Faculté des sciences de l'éducation, Université de Montréal, p. 35.
- (36) Meyer J., Scott W.R., 1983, *Organizational Environments: Ritual and Rationality*, Beverly Hills (CA), Sage; Meyer J., Scott W.R., Strang D., 1987, "Centralization, Fragmentation and School District Complexity", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32, p. 186-201.
- (37) Lang V., 1999, *La professionnalisation des enseignants*, Paris, PUF.
- (38) Maroy C., 2005, Une comparaison des formes de régulation intermédiaires dans cinq pays européens, in Dutercq Y. (dir.), 2005, *op. cit.*, p. 51-85.
- (39) Lang V., 2005, « La ligne hiérarchique de l'administration de l'éducation nationale à l'épreuve de la déconcentration », in Dutercq Y. (dir.), 2005, *op. cit.*, p. 85-99.
- (40) Barroso J., 2005, Les nouveaux modes de régulation des politiques éducatives en Europe : de la régulation du système à un système de régulations, in Dutercq Y. (dir.), 2005, *op. cit.* p. 171.
- (41) Jessop B., 2003, *The future of the capitalist State*, London, Polity Press.

Research work and studies carried out on steering and regulation processes

International research groups

- **Reguleducnetwork: change of regulation modes and social production of inequalities in the education systems: a European comparison.**

The objective of the Reguleducnetwork project was to understand how different regulation modes are combined in six schooling systems (located in different urban schooling contexts in Budapest, Charleroi, Lille, Lisbon, London and Paris), how they are changing under the influence of national educational policies and how they are reacting to local or global social trends. The research was carried out on national regulations, intermediary regulations and specific local regulations. It was financed by the European Commission.

- **Réseau européen des responsables des politiques d'évaluation des systèmes éducatifs (European network of managers of educational system evaluation policies):**

This EC body encompasses the representatives of fifteen member States together with Iceland and Norway. The network's site displays their publications in PDF format: colloquium proceedings, studies and newsletters.

National research teams

- [GIRSEF](#), Catholic University of Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgium).
- [Cerisis](#), Catholic University of Louvain (Belgium).
- [IFRÉSI](#): Federative Institute of Research on Industrial Societies and Economies, CNRS, Université Lille I, (France).
- [Observatoire Sociologique du Changement](#), National Foundation of Political Sciences (France).
- [LAREQUOI](#), Management research laboratory, Université de Versailles Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines.
- [The London Centre for Leadership in Learning](#), Institute of Education, London, (Great Britain).
- [London Business School](#) (Great Britain).
- [National college school leadership](#) (Great Britain).
- [Centre for Public Policy Research](#), King's College London (Great Britain).
- [Educational Policy Research Unit](#), London Institute of Education (Great Britain).
- [Institut et École postuniversitaire de sociologie et de politique sociale](#) at the Faculty of Arts of the University Loránd Eötvös (Hungary).
- [Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação](#) da Universidade de Lisboa (Portugal).
- [Faculté de psychologie et des sciences de l'éducation](#), University of Geneva.

National Steering Organisations

- Great Britain: [The National College for School Leadership](#)
- United States: [The Center for Educational Leadership](#)
- Sweden: [The Swedish National Agency for School Improvement](#)
- Switzerland: [formation romande pour les responsables d'établissements scolaires](#) (FORRES) - French-speaking training for school directors: Texts by Alain Bouvier, Michèle Garant, Monica Gather Thurler, Antoine Mudry, Guy Pelletier, Philippe Perrenoud, Marc Thiébaud.

Professional Associations

- [Éducation et Devenir](#) (Education and Future)
- European forum for education administration (EFEA)
- [AFAE](#): has a journal entitled *Administration et Education*
- [Association francophone internationale des directeurs d'établissements scolaires](#) (International French-speaking association of school directors)
- [Fórum Europeo de Administradores de la Educación](#)
- [ADMEE](#) Europe: Association for the development of educational assessment methodologies
- [SICI](#): ongoing international conference for the central and general school inspectorates (organisation encompassing 20 European countries, which work together to improve the understanding of the education sector and the inspection processes)
- [ESHA](#) European School Heads Association

Journals that regularly or occasionally cover steering and regulation issues

- [Administration et Education](#)
- [Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy](#)
- [Educational Administration Quarterly](#)
- [Educational Management Administration & Leadership](#)
- [Educational Management Abstracts](#)
- [Educational Policy](#)
- [Human Resource Management International Digest](#)
- [International Electronic Journal For Leadership in Learning](#)
- [International Journal of Educational Management](#)
- [Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management](#)
- [Journal of Management Education](#)
- [Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership](#)
- [Journal of Educational Administration and History](#)
- [Policy Futures in Education](#)
- [Politiques d'éducation et de formation \(Education and training policies\)](#)
- [Studies in Educational Policy and Educational](#)
- [School Leadership and Management](#)
- [Tertiary Education and Management](#)

Upcoming colloquiums on steering and intermediate regulation

- International AFIRSE Conference organised in conjunction with the UNESCO Further Education Division, the Management Laboratory (LAREQUOI) at the University of Versailles Saint-Quentin and the Association Francophone d'Éducation Comparée, "[Logiques de gestion et approches critiques de l'éducation. Le pilotage des systèmes, des établissements et des dispositifs d'éducation et de formation](#)" (Educational management policies and critical approaches. The steering of systems and establishments, and of training and education systems), 15-17 June 2006, University of Versailles Saint-Quentin en Yvelines.
- CCEAM Conference 2006: "[Recreating Linkages between Theory and Praxis in Educational Leadership](#)" 12 - 17 October 2006, LEFKOSIA (Nicosia) - CYPRU.

You can see the list of bibliographical references used for this newsletter in our [collaborative bibliographic database](#) (theme selection: "[pilotage des établissements](#)").

Written by: [Olivier Meunier](#)

This newsletter is published on a monthly basis by the **Veille Scientifique et Technologique** division.
© INRP

- [Subscribe or unsubscribe](#) <http://www.inrp.fr/vst/LettreVST/Abonnement.htm>
- [Contact us](#) <http://www.inrp.fr/vst/Contact.php>
- [See what's new](#) http://www.inrp.fr/vst/Dernieres_MAJ.php

Veille scientifique et technologique
Institut national de recherche pédagogique
19, allée de Fontenay – BP 17424 – 69347 Lyon cedex 07 France
Tel: +33 (0)4 72 76 61 00 – Fax. : +33 (0)4 72 76 61 93