



# European Physical Education Observatory

Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



## EuPEO Intellectual Output 1 Intermediate Report

*National Preliminary Results*

*FRANCE*

*English Version*

---

## Technical Sheet

**Title:** EuPEO Intellectual Output 1 Intermediate Report National Preliminary Results (France) – English version

**Authors:** Bruno Cremonesi

**Project Coordinator:** Marcos Onofre

**Year:** 2018

**Cite as:** Cremonesi, B. (2018). EuPEO Intellectual Output 1. Intermediate Report. National Preliminary Results  
*FRANCE – English version*

**Project:** European Physical Education Observatory

**Funder:** European Commission

**Programme:** Erasmus+ Sport Collaborative Partnership 2017

**Reference:** 590560-EPP-1-2017-1-PT-SPO-SCP

**Timeline:** January 2018 – December 2020

**Project Sheet:** <https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/projects/eplus-project-details/#project/590560-EPP-1-2017-1-pt-SPO-SCP>

For further information on the EuPEO Project please follow the links:

**Website:** [www.eupeo.eu](http://www.eupeo.eu)

**Facebook:** [www.facebook.com/European-Physical-Education-Observatory](https://www.facebook.com/European-Physical-Education-Observatory)

**Twitter:** [www.twitter.com/EuPEOproject](https://www.twitter.com/EuPEOproject)

The authors wish to thank the European Commission for funding the EuPEO project under the Erasmus+ Sport Collaborative Partnership scheme, with the project reference: 590560-EPP-1-2017-1-PT-SPO-SCP.

The authors wish to acknowledge the contribution of the European Physical Education Observatory (EuPEO) – [www.eupeo.eu](http://www.eupeo.eu) – project team for the development of the tools here referenced for EuPEO (2018) in the persons of: Marcos Onofre (PI), Ana Quitério, Dora Carolo, João Martins, Maria João Martins, João Costa (Co-PI), Nuno Ferro, Claude Scheuer, Martin Holzweg, Bruno Cremonesi, Roland Naul, Dennis Dreiskämper, Nils Neuber, Stefanie Dahl, Michael Fahlenbock, Daniel Möellenbeck, Rose-Marie Repond, Ruedi Schmid, Fiona Chambers, Wesley O'Brien, Jana Vašíčková, Gregor Jurak, Gregor Starc, Tamás Csanyi, Zoltán Vass, Jo Lucassen, Annet Komen.

Disclaimer: The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein

---

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>1. The EuPEO Product – Initial Results</b>	7
1.1. NELAS	7
1.2. ECQ	8
1.2.1 PE National Strategy	9
1.2.2. Teacher Workforce	9
1.2.3. Teacher Education	10
1.2.4. Curriculum Flexibility	11
1.3. ESQ	13
1.3.1. Community Partnerships	13
1.3.2. Facilities, Equipment and Resources	14
1.3.3. Teacher Workforce	14
1.3.4. Teacher Education	15
1.3.5. Curriculum Flexibility	15
<b>Conclusions</b>	17
<b>Appendices</b>	18

## List of Tables

Table 1 - Key strengths and challenges of the NELAS .....	7
Table 2 - Key strengths and challenges of PE National Strategy at the Country level .....	9
Table 3 - Key strengths and challenges of Teacher Workforce at the Country level.....	9
Table 4 - Key strengths and challenges of Teacher Education at the Country level.....	10
Table 5 - Key strengths and challenges of Curriculum Flexibility at the Country level.....	11
Table 6 - Demographics of ESQ’s Participating Schools by Educational Level, Context, Government Dependence, Student Population (global, PE and SS) .....	13
Table 7 – Key strengths and challenges of Community Partnerships at the School level .....	13
Table 8 - Key strengths and challenges of Facilities, Equipment and Resources at the School level .....	14
Table 9 - Key strengths and challenges of Teacher Workforce at the School level .....	14
Table 10 - Key strengths and challenges of Teacher Education at the School level .....	15
Table 11 - Key strengths and challenges of Curriculum Flexibility at the School level .....	15

---

# Introduction

The European Physical Education Association identified the diversity of Physical Education (PE), School Sports (SS) and other forms of school-based Physical Activity (PA) conditions within Europe and the importance of implementing a systematic monitoring for PE and HEPA as the European Physical Education Observatory (EuPEO). The EuPEO project is co-led by the Laboratory of Pedagogy, Faculty of Human Kinetics in the University of Lisbon and by the Portuguese Society of Physical Education, involving 12 partners and two observers from a total of nine countries.

The EuPEO project aims to implement a monitoring system by developing the EuPEO webpage, a manual for external monitoring (MEA) at Europe-wide country level, and a toolkit to prepare and provide internal self-monitoring (TIM) of quality PE and SS at the school level.

This intermediate report highlights the preliminary products of the activity developed during the first seven months of the project and aims to appreciate both the strengths and challenges in all dimensions contributing to Quality PE in France. Since January 2018, the European School Questionnaire (ESQ), the National External Assessment Systems (NELAS) inventory, and the European Country Questionnaire (ECQ) were prepared. The first step of this preparation was workshop-based and resulted in the framework dimensions for these instruments. The final framework is highly based on one adaptation of the UNESCO (2015) proposal for Quality Physical Education dimensions, all the researchers were involved in the discussion and definition of its' indicators for each instrument. The original English version of the ESQ, applied in the schools of each country, and answered by the Head of the Physical Education School Department, was translated into the mother language of the participating countries and tested to verify its ecological validity. The ECQ and NELAS questionnaires were only developed in an English version considering that the respondents were the project participants as national representatives with expert knowledge. The final versions of the questionnaires were digitised to an on-line format, using the Limesurvey software (version 2.65.0+170502).

The project and these instruments were submitted to the approval of the Portuguese National Data Protection Commission, and to the Ethics Commission of the coordinating institution (Faculdade de Motricidade Humana). Each questionnaire further includes an informed consent procedure. Particularly, for the ESQ application, an informing letter was written in English and translated to each national version that was then sent to each school's principal and Head of PE.

---

The collected data was first exported from Limesurvey to an excel format (version 15.17), and then to SPSS (version 23). A descriptive analyse of the different variables was run. The results were spread to the countries, which used them to develop this report.

To better understand the following analysis of the process and product of this first project phase, some contextual aspects of methodological implementation of our country must be raised.

First, there are some questions from the survey that can't be answered by PE teacher -like for example ethnical statistics, which are forbidden by law in France.

Second, our sampling (only 3 respondents) does in not give a fair idea of PE teaching in France. For example, we report 50% of respondent from private school, whereas the reality is closer to 20% at best.

The current report is critical for the EuPEO future steps, namely as it enables a data-based decision making on the innovative EuPEO Pupils Questionnaire (EPQ), thus directly in the next work-package where the EuPEO MEA and TIM will be developed and piloted. The EPQ will essentially focus on the pupils' perceptions about the required learning outcomes and respective assessment processes, from what is identified as most common across the partners' countries in terms of "curriculum flexibility". Moreover, at this level, it is envisioned that the questionnaire addresses their perceptions about participation opportunities in SS and other forms of school-based PA, as well as on the "facilities, equipment and resources" as supporting infrastructures and policies that promote participation in all forms of school-based PA. The validation process of this questionnaire will result in a pupil-centred instrument to be part of the MEA and TIM in WP3.

---

# 1. The EuPEO Product – Initial Results

We faced several difficulties in collecting data.

On ECQ, the survey doesn't allow to return to the answers to the questions. We had to fill the questionnaire manually, as it was not possible to correct answers once they were filled.

For ESQ the first difficulty comes from the questionnaire itself. It takes quite a lot of time to complete it, and usually the respondent do not have the answers and have to ask their hierarchy, which adds further delays.

Also, as pointed out, ethnical statistics are forbidden by law in France so questions about the number of Roms and immigrants were irrelevant to French school system. Some questions, despite a contextualized translation effort, refer to a culture of PE that is not relevant to French PE and therefore makes the answer complex or subject to many personal interpretations. A second difficulty comes from the mode of data collection. The sending of e-mail and the telephone exchanges with the teachers of PE lead to a very high drop-off rate from the survey.

This first phase of the project has allowed our organization to better assess the skills needed to carry out this type of data collection and analysis.

It is desirable that we contract a researcher specialized in the analysis of this type of data in order to better work with us and PE teachers.

The data collection of the questionnaire and its length requires it to be filled in a face-to-face interaction.

An official solicitation not only of the teaching staff but also of the head of the college will help to give a more formal tone and will register the study work in a more formal context.

## 1.1. NELAS

*Mandatory teaching hours varies: 4 hours at year 6, 3 hours from year 7 to 9 and 2 hours from year 10 to 12. The curriculum is divided into 5 different types of activities: in "college" (junior high school), there are four "domains": domain 1 (measurable activities), domain 2 (activity with environmental uncertainty), domain 3 (artistic domain), domain 4 (confrontational activities like basket, table tennis, judo, etc.); at senior high school, the labels are not "domains" but 5 "competences" specific to PE. Both share similar classification. At this level (year 10 to 12), there is a 5<sup>th</sup> competence (self-training activity). The curriculum is organized at school level by the local PE staff. However, there are national guidelines stating that at middle (year 6-9) and high school (year 10 to 12) (At the end of high school (year 11), each pupil course determined by the pedagogical team, the PE*

teachers should grade each student according to a 20-points referential (20 being the best grade) on the 5 domains of the common base of skills and culture.

"For common culture the final level of mastery in a domain or competence corresponds to the best level attained by the student (during the cycle), according to a grading system that takes into account performance, but also different types of competences such as motor competence, social competences, methodological competences. This assessment should be carried out in at least two different physical activities. Whenever possible, this level should be checked for two significant domains. As a reminder, the physical activity assessment of a mastery level for domains 2, 3, 4 and 5 is made with reference to the end-of-cycle expectations of the learning field in question., as is stated by the governmental website Eduscol, which help PE teacher to build their curriculum. Based on the pupil's productions, PE teachers decide which level of competency is mastered according to a referential that counts 4 levels on each of the 5 competences domains. It is expected that each student reaches the level 4 in each of the physical activity during year 10 to 12.

Table 1 – Strengths and main challenges of NELAS

Categories (Section)	Key Strengths	Key Challenges
<b>1. Physical</b>	We assess these domains through physical sports and artistic activities. For each activity, a national reference system proposes an evaluation test and a points system. This evaluation system is complex by nature, and takes into account all the four categories mentioned	Establish a way of evaluating students' achievements with tests that really evaluate the knowledge taught in EP. These tests must be practical and focused on the knowledge of physical, athletic and artistic activities. This test is developed by a group composed of activity experts, eps teachers and researchers. It's a national test
<b>2. Psychological</b>		
<b>3. Social</b>		
<b>4. Cognitive</b>		

In the document link, we write an article to present our assessment system in France in French language

## 1.2. ECQ

There are national analyses on programmed activities or on the number of teachers. These analyses are not made public and remain primarily physical education injection management tools. We cannot access these data and criteria that are not taken into account in the actual achievements of students.



### 1.2.1. National Physical Education Strategy

Table 2 - Key strengths and challenges of PE National Strategy at the Country level

Categories (Section)	Key Strengths	Key Challenges
<b>1. Existence</b>	There is national strategy focussed on the application of the official recommendation about PE. All the training courses and the meetings are designed to follow the evolution of this program, which is decided nationally. On average, major changes occur every 5 to 8 years.	This is a top-down strategy. Unions and active teacher are not consulted. Teachers' and unions' opinion is not really taken into account. This lack of social dialog leads to a lot of tensions and strikes among the profession every time the curriculum changes. Here the challenge consist in building a system in which programs are decided with different actors of PE and that is more adaptable to local contexts.
<b>2. Support</b>	This strategy is supported at regional level by the different inspectors, who provide necessary training to PE teacher. When the curriculum changes, every high school sends at least one delegate to different meeting where the inspectors will explain the principles that should be applied to enact the changes throughout PE. Also, those inspectors used to come, assess and hold advice to each PE teacher every five years. Continuing education is also provided for those who volunteer to attend to it.	The fact that the program is nationally decided makes it sometimes hard to adapt to local specificities. The hierarchical structure of this system makes the inspections quite difficult moment to pass for the teacher and are often considered as moment where one must show how good they apply the curriculum prescriptions rather than how they really teach in their school contexts. It therefore appears quite hard for the top level to have a relevant assessment of what is really going on at local level. Again, the challenge consist in building a system in which programs are decided with different actors of PE and that is more adaptable to local contexts.

### 1.2.2. Teacher Workforce

Table 3 - Key strengths and challenges of Teacher Workforce at the Country level

Categories (Section)	Key Strengths	Défis Clés
<b>1. Teacher Demographics</b>	According to the documents provided by the ministry of education ( <a href="http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid74482/bilan-social-du-ministere-de-l-education-nationale-de-l-enseignement-superieur-et-de-la-recherche-2014-2015-partie-1-enseignement-scolaire.html">http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid74482/bilan-social-du-ministere-de-l-education-nationale-de-l-enseignement-superieur-et-de-la-recherche-2014-2015-partie-1-enseignement-scolaire.html</a> ), there were a total of 37621 PE teachers in French schools (30252 working in public high schools and 7369 in private high schools). This	Increase the number of the woman in the PE workforce. To this endeavour, university curriculum to become PE teacher should be more adapted and appealing to women. The curriculum in high school should be also considered, as girls on average have lower grades in PE. This might have negative

	<p>represents about 8.5% of the total workforce of the teachers. There is a gender imbalance, with only 43.5% of women in public system (vs 38.6% in private system). The average age of teacher in France is 43 years old, and shows good age balance. PE teaching is very appealing for the students. Last year, for the On the last five years, for about 750 position offered nationally, there were about 7100 candidates. All the positions could be filled. .</p>	<p>consequences on women’s involvement in PE studies.</p>
--	--	---

### 1.2.3. Teacher Education

*Table 4 - Key strengths and challenges of Teacher Education at the Country level*

Categories (Section)	Key Strengths	Key Challenges
<p><b>1. Initial Teacher Education</b></p>	<p>The vast majority of PE teacher are highly-educated</p> <p>PE teacher start with an undergrad level (licence) consisting in 6 semesters, 4 of which have content specifically related to physical education. After their licence, they have to apply for a master’s degree in Physical Education, where a numerus closus is applied since this year. At the end of the first year of master, students participate to a competitive examination. Only about 25% of them will be admitted as probationary officials, but all of them are allowed to finish their master.</p>	<p>Physical activity and pedagogy are both part of initial teacher education, but about half the volume of this education is related to more general subjects (biomechanics, physiology, sociology), which are not directly related to teacher education. One challenge is thus to connect those subjects to their future profession.</p>
<p><b>2. Induction</b></p>	<p>The transition from university to professional community is well organised</p> <p>Once those who succeed in the competitive examination and first year of master (which is done in parallel) are admitted in second year of master, which is totally oriented toward teacher’s education. Half of the volume there is devoted to theoretical subjects about education system; Trainee also have to engage in scientific research and prepare a master thesis. The other half of the curriculum is an experience internship of 10h/ week (7 hours PE, 3 hours of school sport called UNSS). A tutor (which is a professional) is appointed, should see teaching at least once a week,</p>	<p>The training is often viewed as rigid and hierarchized. Also there is very few possibility for the trainee to choose the content of their curriculum according to their needs.</p>

	and should help them to design lessons in the context of the school. Other tutors, independently, are appointed by the inspection Academique. Their role is to visit the trainee while teaching 2 or 3 times per year, to provide some teaching and training advices, but also to act as whistle-blower in case something goes wrong with the trainee. In that case, inspector decides whether the probationary period should or not be postponed. In some rare cases, the inspectors can decide to fire the trainee. In that case he/she loses the benefits of the competitive examination.	
<b>3. Continuous Professional Development</b>	A minimum of 2 days per year (maximum 10 days) is granted to each PE. Each region develop its own continuous Professional Development training on various subjects, varying from how to cope with the national programs to more general subjects like violence management within the class, or very specific topic based on the PE didactics	Continuous professional development is in fact optional, so many teachers do not use this right, so they lose contact with the evolution of PE. One challenge is thus to increase the time and the diversity of the offer in the Continuous Professional Development, and make the participation to continuous professional development a plus for career development.

#### 1.2.4. Curriculum Flexibility

Table 5 - Key strengths and challenges of Curriculum Flexibility at the Country level

Categories (Section)	Key Strengths	Key Challenges
<b>1. Physical Education</b>	<p>The curriculum is split in two separate parts: in college (year 6-9), and in higher school (year 10-12). Both curriculum expect the pupils to reach certain competence level, expressed as “the ability to...”. This provides pedagogical freedom; due to the fact that the curriculum is more product-oriented and also that the end product is prone to local interpretation.</p> <p>In college, the new curriculum (from 2015) is characterized by the fact that teachers from all subject should contribute to the building of 5 different type of competences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• languages to think and communicate;</li> <li>• methods and tools for learning;</li> <li>• the formation of the person and citizen;</li> <li>• natural systems and technical systems;</li> <li>• the representations of the world and the activity.</li> </ul>	

	<p>It is therefore the role of PE teacher to show to what extent they contribute, in each of their lessons, to build those competences. And despite the fact that some program specific to PE exist, there is room for interpretation which gives the teacher some flexibility.</p> <p>In higher school, the curriculum is organized around 5 competences described above. Although each pupil should have a teaching unit in each competence, the physical activities associated with them are quite important. For example, competence 4 (“confrontational activities”) encompasses football, judo, table tennis, and so on. This provides some flexibility to the teacher to choose among a wide panel of physical activities. Last, there is no required teaching method: teacher are free to provide their content in any pedagogical style, as long as it contributes to students’ well-being and help him/her progress in a safe environment.</p>	
<p><b>2. School Sports</b></p>	<p>Every PE teacher is allowed to participate and organize sport school on the basis of 3 hours per week, as an integral part of his/her teaching hours. This makes the sport school association (UNSS) the biggest sport association in France with 1 117 454 licences in 2017.</p> <p>With these hours, PE teacher are allowed to organize whatever sport activity they want, and participate in a wide range of sport activities organized by the UNSS from local to international level. This system offers a lot of flexibility for the PE teacher.</p>	<p>School sport is one promising mean to increase the level of physical activity within the context of school. However, the time slot devoted to PA is often dependent from the school board, and has to adapt to a wide range of constraints which makes it less appealing to the pupils, especially in higher school. One of the main challenges might therefore be to convince school boards and principal to give more importance to sport school, to help increase global level of physical activities.</p>
<p><b>3. Other Forms of PA</b></p>	<p>PE teachers are not expected to provide PA in other places than PE or school sport.</p>	<p>Develop thinking about how to teach the PE to increase the PA, like for example in participating to school design (both from organisational and architectural point of view), that promotes PA in absence of structured activity.</p>

### 1.3. ESQ

We had a very low answer rate to the questionnaire. These elements cannot be representative of the situation of French schools and of physical and sports education.

*Table 6 - Demographics of ESQ's Participating Schools by Educational Level, Context, Government Dependence, Student Population (global, PE and SS)*

<b>Educational Levels (ISCED)</b>	<b>Context</b>	<b>Government Dependence</b>	<b>School Population</b>	<b>PE Students</b>	<b>SS Students</b>
3 Lower Secondary	Urban 1	Public 2	Total 99 488 Girls 41 276	Total 329 488 Girls 41 276	Total 20 152 Girls 0 69
	Rural 2	Private 1	SEN 0 24 Low SES 0 35 Migrant 0 Roma	SEN 0 24 Low SES 0 35 Migrant 0 5 Roma	SEN 0 24 Low SES 0 35 Migrant 0 Roma

Remark: the number of PE student is wrong. It's not allowed to not let the children participate to PE for any kind of reason. Also please notice that ethnical statistics are forbidden in France, which is why this field cannot be filled.

#### 1.3.1. Community Partnerships

*Table 7 – Key strengths and challenges of Community Partnerships at the School level*

<b>Categories (Section)</b>	<b>Key Strengths</b>	<b>Key Challenges</b>
<b>1. Public</b>	We do not have enough data to answer this question. From the answer provided, 1 in 3 teachers consider receiving local governmental support, for education purpose (research/expertise) to promote sport through sport facilities and logistic support once a year.	<p>Only one of the respondents provided an answer, and considered governmental cooperation as neither important, nor unimportant; A challenge would be therefore to enact synergies from local to governmental level.</p> <p>The state is disengaging more and more from financial support for school sports and physical education and sports. Projects that make it possible to leave conventional courses such as school trip become more and more complex to achieve.</p>
<b>2. Private</b>	We do not have enough data to answer this question	

### 1.3.2. Facilities, Equipment and Resources

Table 8 - Key strengths and challenges of Facilities, Equipment and Resources at the School level

Categories (Section)	Key Strengths	Key Challenges
<b>1. Facilities</b>	Every city has its own sport infrastructure, which school can access and have priority. Some schools have their own facilities, but most of the time they use the one provided by the city	Allow access to indoor and outdoor facilities outside class hours. organise a development plan for sports facilities to gradually arrive at a gymnasium by school
<b>2. Equipment</b>	Provided by the department or the region level to the school. PE teacher are also allowed to negotiate some fundings for equipment each year	increase the budget devoted to buy and maintain the equipment specific to PE.
<b>3. Finances</b>	Provided by the department or the region, depending on the level of the school.	determine a specific line in schools specially allocated for organise project to develop physical education and sport

### 1.3.3. Teacher Workforce

Table 9 - Key strengths and challenges of Teacher Workforce at the School level

Categories (Section)	Key Strengths	Key Challenges
<b>1. Weekly workload</b>	The weekly workload is between 14 and 17 hours of class. Three hours should be added for school sports. A teacher cannot exceed 6 hours of classes per day. Class sizes and working conditions can vary significantly from one school to another. Classes can be from 20 to 25 students, which necessarily lead to a wide variety of situations.	
<b>2. Performed Roles</b>	Physical education teachers fill different roles. They may be principal teachers, play a role in the school board of their school or coordinator of their discipline. They will then have to work with other physical education teachers to develop the quality of physical education by identifying common projects and assessments. Teachers will at least have to agree on the training path that students will have to follow.	
<b>3. Teacher Demographics</b>	We do not have enough data to answer this question. All we can provide is the national statistics among teachers According to the documents provided by the	The data show that there is a gender unbalance in favour of men. It seems important to develop strategies to increase the number of the girl who chooses to go to

	ministry of education <a href="http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid74482/bilan-social-du-ministere-de-l-education-nationale-de-l-enseignement-superieur-et-de-la-recherche-2014-2015-partie-1-enseignement-scolaire.html">http://www.education.gouv.fr/cid74482/bilan-social-du-ministere-de-l-education-nationale-de-l-enseignement-superieur-et-de-la-recherche-2014-2015-partie-1-enseignement-scolaire.html</a> ), there were a total of 37621 PE teachers in French schools (30252 working in public high schools and 7369 in private high schools). This represents about 8.5% of the total workforce of the teachers. There is a gender imbalance, with only 43.5% of women in public system (vs 38.6% in private system). The average age of teacher in France is 43 years old, and shows good age balance	study to become PE teacher. At least, we must to encourage the girl in the professional university to choose to become PE teacher.
--	---	--

### 1.3.4. Teacher Education

Table 10 - Key strengths and challenges of Teacher Education at the School level

Categories (Section)	Key Strengths	Key Challenges
<b>1. Continuous Professional Development</b>	Teachers are encouraged to participate in teacher continuous education. They are allowed between 2 and 10 days of training per year	The content of these programs are decided by the general inspection, which does not consult teachers or unions. Teachers should be more involved in the process of selecting these programs.

### 1.3.5. Curriculum Flexibility

Table 11 - Key strengths and challenges of Curriculum Flexibility at the School level

Categories (Section)	Key Strengths	Key Challenges
<b>1. Physical Education</b>	Teachers are free to choose their pedagogical approach.	Develop clear assessment criteria for the sport and art skill expected in PE and take in consideration the mark to have the diploma for the end of the school.  Determine specific skills targeted in physical activity, sport and art for the whole country.
<b>2. School Sports</b>	The school sport proposes a lot of activity. The number of student is 20% at the national level.	The content and the competition must to be designed to allow everyone to reach their full potential, whether it is local or national level. Also, in sport activity, it could be worth to allow changes in the rules to open to increase the number ant the possibility of the competition especially for disability peoples and girls.



<b>3. Other Forms of PA</b>		No comment
-------------------------------------	--	------------



---

## Conclusions

The low response rate does not allow us to make a reliable analysis of the French educational system. We based our response on national statistics, which are publicly available on different official websites.

It is however important to notice that every pupil, whatever his condition, has an access to PE in France, as pupil do not have to prove there are fit for practice to be involved in PE. There is also a well-trained workforce, with the vast majority of PE teacher having, like any other subject, a 5 years-training background that lead them to validate a master's degree and pass a competitive examination (CAPEPS or Agrégation). PE teacher are therefore considered as Category A civil servant, which is one of the highest category, making this position quite enviable. Once in a position, a PE teacher only teaches his subject, which is mandatory for pupils every year. PE teacher can also choose in which sport activity they want to be involved in during sport school, for which they are paid 3h/week, that is, about 1/6<sup>th</sup> of their working time. That makes PE teaching a very appealing position, which might explain the ratio between applicant successful candidates is varies from 1/5 to 1/10, depending of the year. However, as most of the teachers are civil servants, the number of positions is decided each year nationally, and thus varies greatly as a function of the political orientation of the government. Therefore, the number of positions offered often does not fill the real need, and some pupils might therefore have well trained teachers or no teacher at all

The different possibilities to do PA (PE, school sport, sport club,) for the pupils have a good quality. It would be interesting to build a net with these different times and find spaces for collaboration.

The political system based on the search for permanent economy does not facilitate this common work and puts into competition these different times.

One of the wrong end is the fact that the number of sports facilities are insufficient at national level for schools, especially in very populated cities and disadvantaged neighbourhood.. There is great territorial inequality.

# Appendices

## **ECQ Complete Results**

Insert here complete outputs

## **ESQ Complete Results**

Insert here complete outputs