

TITLE: When crisis follows crisis, what does social work training do?

Subtitle: a plurality of experiences rooted in higher education at Ocellia

Since the early 2000s, crisis after crisis has been piling up, including a social crisis that has seen precariousness explode, a health crisis, and a recruitment crisis in the social sector. At the same time, attention to the specific practices and difficulties of social workers has led, more or less deliberately, to the development of training courses, drawing on the creativity of various players and integrating emerging practices. Against this backdrop, the Advanced Training, Research and International team at Ocellia Lyon (Ecole des métiers Santé Social en Auvergne Rhône Alpes et à Tahiti) wishes to provide food for thought by drawing on its experience and knowledge of three significant developments.

From now on, numerous texts, reports and recommendations insist on the necessary participation of vulnerable people in training, including a 2017 report by the High council of social work (Jaeger, 2017), which devotes a large section to this and considers the "co-construction" movement to be "inescapable" in social work. Thus, a new type of speaker is gradually emerging in our training courses: vulnerable people. Having experimented with a number of scenarios within our team and beyond, we feel it would be useful to discuss the possible variations, the impact of vulnerable people's participation on the role of permanent trainers, the effects linked to the positioning of these players within the establishment, and the new organizational modalities that need to be thought through (Amaré, Bourgois, 2022). We need to consider the possible "reconfiguration of professional norms, which sometimes require the transgression" of so-called "traditional" intervention models.

The participation of the vulnerable people in Ocellia's training programs takes the form of two main types of intervention. On the one hand, an individual intervention by the vulnerable person, as a professional or academic speaker, mobilizing expertise, or experiential knowledge (Gardien, 2017). On the other hand, co-facilitation based on a "Skills Duo", mobilizing a vulnerable person, a professional or academic speaker and drawing on respective expertise and skills, in a co-intervention dynamic recognizing the full legitimacy of each person's expertise.

But vulnerable people also participate upstream of the interventions, in pedagogical engineering, in the co-design of training modules or in a form of "testing" of the engineering thought out by the permanent trainers.

These different scenarios enable us to pool our different types of knowledge to develop a more detailed understanding and knowledge of the issues addressed in our training courses.

Two major partnerships, one in mainland France and the other in French Polynesia, anchor Ocellia's advanced training in a recent trend among social work training establishments: building closer links with universities.

Firstly, Ocellia's training for the Diplôme d'Etat d'Ingénierie Sociale corresponds to a high degree of articulation with a university diploma, the ANACIS (Analyse et Conception de l'Intervention Sociale) specialization of the IDS (Intervention et Développement Social) Master's degree at Lyon 2 University. This alliance came to fruition in September 2022, when the Master's accreditation was renewed, during which the teaching methods that had linked the two courses since the 2000s were rethought, with a shift from "concomitance" to "hybridization" between the content of a university degree and that of professional certifications.

The aim is to work out the differences between the different anchors and frames of reference, in a cooperative spirit of "permanent research" (Desroche): the long-accepted historical asymmetry between the "experts of the lecture halls" (Anacis) and the "field experts" (Deis) is thus called into question. Rather than opposing the two training frameworks (academic on the one hand, professional on the other), the aim is to create a space for dialogue and confrontation, in an "acting together" approach that invites us to risk trample on each other's ground. This risk-taking translates, for example, into the integration of content specific to one or other of the training courses into what becomes their common core. At the pedagogical level, these reconfigurations lead to a constant redefinition of what is common and what is specific, thus creating a third training space, marked by a high degree of reflexivity in which students are involved.

In French Polynesia, the university (UPF) approached Ocellia with the support of the country's services to meet training needs in the social and medico-social sector, as it had neither the expertise nor the accreditations required to issue state diplomas. This partnership began in 2021 with the introduction of CAFERUIS training, with the aim of training Polynesian managers and future managers (almost 90% of whom were unqualified). Since then, Ocellia has been working with the UPF to develop a training program never before offered in the region, in response to the local authorities' desire to participate in the "Oceanization of managers" and to improve social action in Polynesia. Jointly, the training of a dozen Polynesian social engineers from the start of the 2023 academic year is undoubtedly the best illustration of the complementarity and even interdependence between the two partners: Ocellia offers the university its expertise and shares its resources in terms of pedagogical engineering and support, sometimes remote, sometimes face-to-face, and for its part, the university hosts the training on its premises and provides local resources from the academic world, notably among its teacher-researchers at the MSH du Pacifique. This work of bringing together the professional and academic worlds around a common training project also aims to match researchers and field workers around social issues (homelessness, domestic violence, inter-island mobility and migration, etc.) as part of studies and research designed for action.

Finally, our international outlook also contributes to breaking down barriers and challenging tried-and-tested formats. Our involvement, of different kinds and in numerous territories, is an opportunity to question the content of our training courses in response to local issues, to question social work practices and integrate emerging practices elsewhere, and to revisit our own practices as trainers. Faced with the ecological crisis, trainers and researchers in Quebec and Belgium are taking an interest in "green social work": their contributions benefit from being integrated into French students' courses, as a means of questioning the perimeters of social intervention and its means of action (Dominelli, 2018).

Partnerships with some forty universities in Europe promote student mobility. For the CAFERUIS diploma, this takes the form of a study trip abroad, bringing together students and training managers. By visiting medical-social institutions, students - future middle managers - are invited to integrate other models of intervention and put into perspective the professional practices at work in France.

These mobility opportunities are also open to professionals, including trainers. For example, a member of the team has joined a European network, the Housing First Hub, bringing together European social workers and trainers working on Housing First policies. Through theoretical and reflective contributions, and exchanges of practice between members, the aim

is to build training modules on Housing First public policies in the face of the housing crisis, for both students and professionals in the field.

We are examining the effects of these developments and the integration of new practices into training courses, through *in itinere* surveys of several batches of students and practitioners. Reflexivity on our own practices is a constant focus of attention, and revolves around the three main points mentioned above: training review times will incorporate items relating to participation, links with the university and international openness, for students but also for lecturers wherever they come from, both in an attempt to measure the effects of these changes and to document the experience of those involved.

Many questions arise that go well beyond social work training establishments, but which can be addressed within the framework of their networks, such as AIFRIS. Is it a response to a time of crisis (declining attractiveness of the professions, lack of legitimacy, etc.)? How does it depend on factors that make it fragile? In the context of links with the university, what are the transactions at work, and are they unstable in times of crisis? Can we sustain the exploration of local responses to a global crisis, within the framework of our international openness?