



COUNCIL      CONSEIL  
OF EUROPE    DE L'EUROPE

Language Policy Division  
Division des Politiques linguistiques

**DGIV/EDU/LANG (2007) 2**

# Languages of Schooling: towards a framework of reference for Europe

Intergovernmental Conference, Strasbourg, 16-18 October 2006

## ***Report***

Language Policy Division – [www.coe.int/lang](http://www.coe.int/lang)  
Division des Politiques linguistiques – [www.coe.int/lang/fr](http://www.coe.int/lang/fr)

*NB : This conference marked the start of a project in a new field of work. As a result, we apologise for any possible lack of coherence in terminology.*



## Contents

Executive summary .....	5
General introduction .....	6
Opening of the conference .....	8
Session I - Exploring the issues .....	18
Introduction .....	18
Aims and objectives for teaching/learning language(s) of Education (LE): <i>Laila Aase, Nordisk institutt, Universitetet i Bergen, Norway</i> .....	18
Content considerations for a Framework of Reference for Language(s) of School Education: <i>Florentina Samihaian, National Board for Curriculum, Bucharest, Romania</i> .....	19
Evaluation and Assessment: <i>Michael Fleming, University of Durham, United Kingdom</i> .....	20
Switzerland – A case-study .....	21
Norway – A case study: <i>Jorunn Berntzen, Ministry of Education and Research, Norway</i> .....	22
Results of a Preliminary survey on curricula for teaching national/official/school languages in compulsory education: <i>Jean-Claude Beacco, Adviser to the Language Policy Division</i> .....	22
Group work 1 .....	23
Session II - Addressing the issues .....	25
Introduction .....	25
Language Across the Curriculum: <i>Helmut J. Vollmer, Universität Osnabrück, Germany</i> .....	25
Socially disadvantaged learners in Flanders: <i>Piet van Avermaet, Centre for Diversity and Learning, Ghent University, Belgium</i> .....	26
Central results of the DESI Study: Competences in German as L1 and L2 in the context of the German school system: <i>Guenter Nold, University of Dortmund, Germany</i> .....	27
HarmoS Project – Language 1: Development of a competence model for the languages of schooling – Progress of work and prospects .....	27
Literature and “Bildung”: <i>Irene Pieper, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Germany</i> .....	28
Group Work 2 .....	29
Session III - Towards a common framework .....	30
Introduction .....	30
The OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA): <i>John De Jong, Language Testing Services, The Netherlands</i> .....	30
European Frameworks of Reference for Language Competences: <i>Waldemar Martyniuk, Language Policy Division, Council of Europe / Jagiellonian University, Poland</i> .....	31
Possible elements and issues for a reference framework: <i>Plenary session chaired by Mike Byram, Adviser to the Language Policy Division</i> . .....	31
Conclusions and perspectives: <i>J. Sheils</i> .....	34
Appendix 1: Conference programme.....	36
Appendix 2: List of preliminary studies .....	38
Appendix 3: List of participants.....	39
Appendix 4: Preliminary feedback forms .....	56



## Executive summary

*Language plays a crucial role in ensuring cultural diversity, democratic citizenship and social inclusion. It thus has a key role to play in promoting social cohesion, one of the Council of Europe priorities identified at the Warsaw summit held in 2005. Proficiency in language is essential to ensure access to the school curriculum. This conference launched a new project which will aim to support member states when seeking to raise achievement in language. The intention is to develop a common framework of reference to aid the development of policy and practice. The conference focused on 'language as subject' and 'language across the curriculum' (the idea that all subjects are involved in teaching and developing language) as part of a broad concept of 'languages of education' which also incorporates foreign language learning. Thinking about language education in this way as a broad, all-embracing notion rooted in a policy of plurilingualism, is a departure from a more traditional approach which treats these different components of language in isolation from each other. The project therefore is innovative in scope and complements the other work of the language policy division on foreign language learning. The conference was a landmark event in the development of this project because it was the first formal consultation with the member with a view to obtaining guidance and feedback on the future direction of the work.*

*A number of presentations illustrated the challenges involved in this new venture because the aims and content of 'language as subject' are so broad and wide-ranging and the assessment issues complex. Feedback from delegates in the plenary sessions and group work confirmed the wide range of issues which will need to be addressed in a framework but also confirmed the potential value of such a document in creating a common terminology and providing support for meeting the varied challenges. The case studies on the work of different countries and the presentations on other European projects provided examples of how some of the challenges are being addressed in different situations and illustrated the potential value of a framework document in sharing policy and practice. It was strongly emphasised that there was no intention to create a document that would be in any way prescriptive; it will not be a common curriculum or syllabus but more a 'framework of reference'.*

*There was some feeling from delegates that the document or framework should be encouraging and inspirational; its format and presentation therefore would need careful thought. It could provide a valuable focus for developing shared understanding while respecting differences in different contexts; it would also have considerable potential as a tool for reflection. The discussion of possible formats suggested ideas for addressing the challenge of having such a variety of potential audiences and needs. For example, an electronic format, in addition to a paper document, would allow more flexibility and ongoing dialogue. There would be potential for having a core publication with 'satellite' or 'module' publications on specific issues for specific audiences.*

*Although opinions varied on which aspects of policy and practice should receive more emphasis (whether for example this should be primarily on assessment or teaching and learning), there was strong endorsement for the value of new framework of reference in supporting the development of language competence as a key basis for promoting social inclusion and democratic participation.*

## General introduction

*The conference was organised by the language policy division of the Council of Europe to launch a new project on the languages of schooling. The conference had two key aims: to inform participants of the preliminary work undertaken which sought to clarify concepts and lay the groundwork for the project and to seek feedback from participants on how a European framework might best address the challenges facing member states when seeking to raise achievement in language.*

*The conference was organised to seek a balance between input, discussion and feedback from participants. The combination of presentations on key issues, plenary debate and focused group work gave the opportunity for delegates to share views and provide feedback on how the project should develop. The three sections of the conference on 'exploring the issues', 'addressing the issues' and 'towards a common framework' provided a structure which moved from consideration of wider issues to more focused attention on the possible content and form of a framework.*

*An important theme which emerged in the conference, particularly in the plenary discussions, was the need to evolve a shared terminology to help communication. Potential for confusion arises even in the use of the term 'languages of education' itself. This is a broad, umbrella term which embraces the language of instruction (or 'language as subject' or 'languages of schooling') as well as foreign language education. It also includes 'language across the curriculum', the idea that all subjects are involved in teaching and developing language. Thinking about language education in this way as a broad all-embracing notion is a departure from a more traditional approach which treats these different components in isolation from each other. Although the primary focus at the conference was on language as subject and language across the curriculum, the implications of the conceptual realignment were addressed. Other terms related to language education also are a potential source of confusion, particularly when these are translated from one language to another; it will be a necessary part of the project to evolve a common understanding of key terms.*

*There was also some discussion during the conference on what the most appropriate term might be to describe the eventual outcome of the project. The term 'framework' or more accurately 'framework of reference' (because the latter formulation avoids any misunderstanding that the outcome would be in any way prescriptive) was used as a provisional term.*

*The theme of integration emerged in a number of presentations and also in the plenary discussion. The whole project can be conceived as having the ultimate intention of seeking closer integration of the different components of language as education. The integration of language and literature in the teaching of language as subject was identified as a key topic for deliberation. A central challenge in developing a policy for assessment is to find a practical way of integrating the different purposes associated with summative and formative approaches to assessment. Integration was also a key concept in the presentation on socially disadvantaged learners, addressing the need to organise schooling in an integrated way to avoid segregation.*

*The background to the conference is provided in the details of the presentation given by Mr Joseph Sheils, Head of the Language Policy Division. A small expert group steered the initial preparatory work which included a seminar in Strasbourg and an academic conference in Krakow. The results of a preliminary survey of member states conducted in April 2005 on language as school subject was also part of the preliminary work; the results were reported during one of the conference sessions and were used as a stimulus for the first group session.*

*As part of the preparation for the conference, fourteen preliminary studies were written focused on key themes which it was thought needed to be addressed. These studies were not intended to be comprehensive but provided an overview of a range of relevant topics. Six of the studies were the subject of specific input during the conference in order to open up discussion. The preliminary studies and other conferences papers and powerpoints are available from the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe website [www.coe.int/lang](http://www.coe.int/lang).*

## Opening of the conference

### Introduction

*The opening speech by Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Director General, Director General IV welcomed delegates to the conference and placed the project in the wider context of the Council of Europe's policies and priorities. Referring to the Action Plan of the Third Summit of the Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe (held in Warsaw in May 2005), she emphasised the crucial role that language plays in promoting cultural diversity, democratic citizenship and social inclusion. Proficiency in language is essential to ensure full access to the school curriculum. She also emphasised the Council of Europe's commitment to promoting linguistic diversity as a basic right. Joseph Sheils, Head of the Language Policy Division set the conference in the context of the work of the Division and its role in assisting member states in developing policies for plurilingualism. This new project provides a focus for a process of dialogue to share experiences and expertise across national boundaries. He gave an outline of the other projects and publications of the Division relevant to this project: the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), the European Language Portfolio, and the Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe. The proposed framework will complement the content of these publications. As with the other work of the Division, there is no intention of proposing a common European curriculum or common European normative standards; the intention of the present project is to develop an instrument that would be a framework of reference. Jean-Claude Beacco provided more details of what a framework of reference document might entail. He described the terminology that has evolved so far in the preparatory work for the conference, distinguishing concepts such as 'mother tongue', 'language of schooling' and 'languages of education'. He also reiterated the key objectives of the conference in sharing perspectives and providing suggestions for the development of the project.*

### **Opening address: Ms Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI, Director General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport**

On behalf of the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, I welcome you to this first conference on languages of schooling, that is languages both as a school subject and as a medium of teaching and learning across the curriculum.

Why do these “non-foreign” languages, the languages of schooling, now fall within the scope of the Council of Europe's discussions and activities?

Because our member states are aware that all languages are involved in the building of a “more human and inclusive Europe”. The third Council of Europe Summit of Heads of State and Government held in Warsaw in May 2005 adopted an action plan in which, among other things, the following priorities were identified: promoting cultural diversity, promoting democratic citizenship and peaceful co-existence through intercultural education, and fostering inter-religious dialogue in order to “*build cohesive societies by ensuring fair access to social rights, fighting exclusion and protecting vulnerable social groups*”<sup>1</sup>.

These are not linguistic issues, and yet languages, all languages, are instrumental in promoting intercultural dialogue and social inclusion.

The role played in these processes by what are still referred to as *foreign* languages, although they are often the languages of other Europeans, is well known. One example of this is the role played by a knowledge of the languages of neighbouring countries and regions in peaceful cross-

---

<sup>1</sup> Warsaw Declaration, §7



border co-operation. Further examples are the role played by a knowledge of languages in the democratic debate at European level, or that of linguistic acceptance and tolerance in the development of open, non-racist attitudes.

It is essential now to turn our attention also to the role played by the languages of schooling, a command of which permits access to knowledge, to democratic life and to full participation therein as a responsible citizen. It is particularly important, from a European perspective, to focus on those children who have less linguistic capital than others in the languages of education: those from low-income or poorly educated families where nothing is done to develop an interest in reading and books, who make little use of the language (or languages) of schooling in its (or their) written or even spoken forms.

The stakes are crucial for equality of opportunity. This calls for the acquisition of language abilities in the language of schooling which are needed for the learning, reflection and communication specific to school.

To ensure participation in democratic life, national and regional education systems must provide pupils, by the end of compulsory schooling, with sufficient language skills for social interaction, so that they are not relegated to language ghettos, must educate them in European values, as embodied in so-called *literary* texts, and must turn them into attentive citizens capable of understanding written and spoken texts with the necessary degree of critical acumen.

At the same time it must be remembered that the Council of Europe is engaged above all in activities concerned with the upholding of human rights, which include linguistic rights and the protection of cultural diversity. It is important to continue supporting and protecting our continent's rich linguistic diversity. Naturally I am thinking of the languages of minorities, but also of the value of migrants' languages.

I was interested to see from a recent survey carried out in 22 of our 46 member states that there are 458 languages spoken as a mother tongue or a lingua franca in everyday exchanges.

Research has shown that if migrant children's mother tongue is kept up for a certain period, that can result in the acquisition of better skills in the language of schooling than among children who have not received the same support for their mother tongue.

Our policy, therefore, is to promote the enrichment, and not the impoverishment, of European citizens' plurilingual repertoire. The *European Language Portfolio* is a key instrument in enhancing the value of all these language skills, and I hope sincerely that it will play a part in this new project.

Issues relating to languages of schooling have hitherto been addressed individually by the member states, with each devising its own solutions to the problems facing the education system, such as providing fairer access to knowledge, reducing underachievement and using educational resources more efficiently.

I welcome this new venture by the Language Policy Division and the support given to it by the member states, which you represent here. It seeks to bring together these national educational traditions without taking away their diversity. The aim is also to create a forum for joint reflection on these issues and to ascertain whether the approach adopted in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* is not in fact, all other things being equal, appropriate for describing, in a consensual approach, the curriculum, and its content, for the language (or languages) of education when taught as a specific school subject or when used, in other subjects, to transmit knowledge.

This conference is therefore about enhancing and enriching the language repertoire of European citizens. This will not only involve considering the relations between “national/regional” teaching methods for languages used in school or the relations between these and the methods used for foreign languages, minority languages or those of migrant children, brought together under the overall heading of what became known in the 1980s as “language education”. It also involves pooling ideas on the contribution made by languages, all languages, to personal development, while detailing and clarifying the aims and goals which may be pursued by education systems in the context of plurilingual education – which includes linguistic tolerance as an essential value for intercultural citizenship.

I wish you, in conclusion, every success in this innovative and complex venture, which will take time and perseverance. I am quite certain that you will give it the benefit of your experience and expertise, and no doubt also your enthusiasm as responsible educators, and for that I extend sincere thanks to you, on my own behalf and on that of the Council of Europe.

**Aims and background to the conference: Joseph Sheils, Head of the Language Policy Division, Council of Europe**

I join with our Director General in welcoming you to this first intergovernmental conference on Languages of Education. Your presence here today represents a milestone in our innovative work in language policies that has been ongoing for almost five decades. This event is a landmark because it is our first formal consultation with the member states on policies for the languages of education.

It marks the beginning of a process of dialogue and networking that we hope will allow us to share our experiences and our expertise across national boundaries in the years ahead. The Language Policy Division is providing a pan-European forum for representatives of ministries of education and relevant national institutions and researchers. This will be a forum to share and to seek responses at European level to common issues and needs, while also acting as a catalyst for innovation in the field of language education.

Allow me to introduce to you the Secretariat team that has worked hard to prepare this conference and who will be happy to assist you if you have any queries or requests. Philia Thalgott; Johanna Panthier; Waldek Martyniuk; Christopher Reynolds; Corinne Colin; Jodie Clifford; Andrey Efremov (trainee).

A small group of experts have helped us with the preparation of the programme and the conference studies. This project, like the others in our work programme, is being developed under the guidance of the two Special Advisers to the Language Policy Division: - Jean-Claude Beacco, Professor at the Sorbonne University, Paris and Mike Byram, Professor at Durham University, UK. The other members of the preparatory group will be introduced when they make their presentations during the programme.

Our Director General has outlined the priorities of the Council of Europe and how this new project should contribute to our goals as set out in the Action Plan decided by the Heads of State and Government. My task is to set the project within the overall programme of the Language Policy Division which has so far dealt mainly – but not exclusively - with foreign, second and minority languages. In all projects our goal is to assist member states in developing policies for plurilingualism among our citizens.

**1. What do we mean by plurilingualism**

Plurilingualism refers to the ability of individuals to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural interaction. We usually have an uneven plurilingual competence. We achieve greater proficiency in one language than in others we

know, and our profile of competences will probably vary from one language to another. A plurilingual person has proficiency of varying degrees in several different languages and experience of several cultures. Plurilingualism refers to the full linguistic repertoire of the individual, including their mother tongue' or 'first language' – and different local or generational varieties of this language. It includes the language of school education if this is different to the mother tongue, and 'foreign' languages, as they are usually called.

Plurilingualism is a composite unified competence that includes all languages, both acquired outside school and learned at school. An individual's experience of language in cultural contexts expands from the language of the home to the language or languages of society at large and then to the languages of other peoples. As stated in the CEFR, we do not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated mental compartments. We build up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes, and in which languages interrelate and interact.

When we use the term multilingualism, we are referring to the presence of more than one language or variety of language in a geographical area. To put it simply, individuals are plurilingual and societies are multilingual (although clearly in some multilingual areas there will be individuals who remain more or less monolingual while others will become plurilingual).

## 2. Plurilingualism and the work programme of the Language Policy Division

Our work so far to promote plurilingualism includes the development of a number of European instruments and other initiatives to assist member states in pursuing policies for plurilingualism.

### *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)*

The CEFR is perhaps best known – you have a summary of the contents in your conference file. This is a descriptive tool for reflecting on what is required in language use and language learning. In addition to this comprehensive descriptive scheme it contains language proficiency levels – perhaps the best known part. These common reference levels provide illustrative descriptors of competences for planning and assessing progress in language learning. This framework has therefore both a horizontal descriptive dimension and a vertical dimension with a range of competence descriptors to illustrate progression in language proficiency.

Launched in 2001 after a substantial programme of research and development, the Framework document is now available in over 30 languages. It is widely used by education authorities and private institutions for curriculum planning, textbooks, testing and examinations, and teacher education. Its proficiency levels have been adopted by the European Union for the development of its European Indicator of Language Competence, and are included in its Europass framework for the transparency of vocational qualifications.

The Framework's immense popularity is gratifying but not without its challenges. Not every user seems to understand that it is a descriptive scheme and is not intended to be prescriptive. The framework does not set down strict 'norms' that all must follow. This is not how the Council of Europe works. Our aim was and remains to provide a reference tool that helps users to reflect on their decisions and to make them transparent to other partners in the teaching/learning process by using common reference points and a common terminology. This Framework is a mirror for reflection and not a straitjacket that users must fit into.

In our future work on a framework or equivalent instrument for the languages of education we will need to bear these basic principles in mind. The relevance and possible contribution of the CEFR to the languages of education is a subject that will be discussed at this conference.

### *European Language Portfolio (ELP)*

We have developed the European Language Portfolio - a document for learners based on the CEFR. It is designed to support and acknowledge their efforts to develop and enrich their plurilingual profile in school and in lifelong learning. The portfolio has been applied mainly in foreign and second language learning contexts, with some attempts to include first languages. In the interests of a coherent approach to the development of the individual's plurilingualism, there is, as our Director General has indicated, an urgent need to examine how best to include and acknowledge mother tongue and languages of education in the portfolio document.

We hope that this project can help make this a reality. The presence at this conference of the Chairman of the European Language Portfolio Validation Committee responsible for the accreditation of portfolios that respect agreed common principles, and of the General Rapporteur for the portfolio, are evidence of the importance that we attach to this.

### *Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe.*

You will find on our website and in this room copies of our Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe. This draft version will be published in revised form at the end of this year. The Guide presents Council of Europe policy and offers practical guidance on plurilingual education and the introduction of a global coherent approach to language education that includes all the languages in the curriculum. The Guide therefore deals also with mother tongue and the languages of school education.

### *Language Education Policy Profile*

We offer expert assistance to member states in analysing and reviewing their policies for language education. This Language Education Policy Profile activity is not an evaluation by the Council of Europe – we act as a catalyst in a self-evaluation by the ministry of education. The Profile activity covers all languages so once again issues relating to mother tongue and languages of education are addressed in a global approach.

### *Adult Migrants*

I will not go into any further detail on our different projects, but you may be interested to know that we are working on language policies for the integration of adult migrants and access to employment, residence or citizenship. We are also coordinating the work of teams of experts who are using the CEFR to develop a detailed description of the linguistic and cultural content necessary to teach their national or regional languages as second or foreign languages.

### *Romani*

Finally, we are making excellent progress on the development of a framework curriculum to support the teaching of Romani. I mention this because here mother tongue and language of education meet.

## 3. The languages of education - a new priority

All of these actions are designed to promote plurilingualism. The addition of a specific in-depth focus on the languages of school education is a logical and necessary step to further this policy goal. The languages of school education, along with mother tongue if different, lay the foundation for the ongoing successful development of plurilingualism.

Our Director General has reminded us that social cohesion is a priority for the Council of Europe. The languages of school education are a key factor in inclusion or exclusion in education processes, and therefore participation in society. This project is a direct response to this priority

of the Council of Europe and the concerns expressed by quite a number of member states about quality and achievements in the languages of school education.

In this project, therefore, we intend to address a range of issues concerning the language of education - as a school subject - and also as the medium of teaching and learning across the whole curriculum. We will look at both mainstream and disadvantaged pupils with a view to promoting quality in language education and equality of opportunity.

I wish at this point to stress one thing that we will not do. We have no intention of proposing a common European solution to anything; we have no intention of elaborating a common European curriculum; we have no intention of proposing common European normative standards. Rather, our aim is to develop an instrument that is a framework of reference, i.e.

- an instrument that is descriptive and not in any way prescriptive
- a framework of reference that reflects a European consensus on basic guiding principles for plurilingualism generally and specifically for the languages of school education
- a tool for reflection by users on the decisions to be made e.g. about policy strategies, curriculum, teaching/learning materials, methods, evaluation etc.
- a common language with a shared terminology for communicating policy decisions to others and thus promoting coherence and transparency within national education systems, as well as facilitating international cooperation.

I trust that our non-normative approach is clear. The Council of Europe respects the diversity of educational systems and cultures in its member states and does not seek to put constraints on national or local systems and supports an approach whereby decision making is brought as close to the point of learning as possible.

While we will focus on the languages of education in this project, we will continue to promote plurilingualism. Plurilingual education, embracing all the languages in the pupils' repertoire, means that we need to consider a coherent global approach to the overall language curriculum. We need to explore how we can reduce the isolation and compartmentalisation that usually exists between different kinds of languages – sometimes between different foreign languages and more often between foreign languages and the languages of school education. In this project, therefore, we can also seek appropriate convergences between the different languages, and we will have an opportunity to critically examine the major issues and the current models of language education in a cross-language perspective at a European level.

#### 4. What have we done to get this project started?

We set up a small expert group to help us begin our reflection last year. This group helped us to prepare a proposal for a project that was then approved by the Steering Committee for Education (CD-ED) as medium term project for the period 2006 – 2009 initially. We began by looking at some possible elements that might be contained in any future reference instrument. We sent a questionnaire to member states about the nature of the curriculum for the language of education as a school subject (LS) and the results are summarised in a document in your file and will be presented at the conference.

We organised a small seminar in Strasbourg with the expert group and some policy deciders from a small number of member states, mainly LE specialists from countries involved in our Profile activity. The aim was to try to get a better understanding of some of the issues and needs in the ministries of education. We followed this up with an academic conference in Krakow where researchers were invited to submit presentations on different projects on LE - the proceedings will be published shortly and abstracts are on our website.

All of this fed into our thinking in preparing this conference with the expert group. We then asked a number of specialists to write studies that would provide a further stimulus to the debate at this conference. There are 14 preliminary studies prepared specifically for this event. They are deliberately brief and focused on specific issues we think we will need to address. Some of those authors will present their work today and tomorrow. I want to thank all fourteen authors for their efforts and in the light of our discussions here I expect that a number of them will have an opportunity after the conference to develop their work in more depth as published papers.

I take this opportunity also to acknowledge the highly professional work of our translation services in dealing with this new terminology and the workload imposed by the translation of so many studies in a short time.

### Conclusion

We have managed to do quite a lot in the past year devoted to a preliminary exploration of this new field. Now it is your turn. The Secretariat of the Language Policy Division and its expert group is listening to you, to the member states represented by the delegates and experts in this room. You are the actors - the Council of Europe is you, and we are here to support your efforts and to provide follow-up.

I look forward to this process. Whatever instrument(s) we may develop for the languages of education, the process of interaction and international cooperation launched today will be equally important, and one of our objectives is to assist you in developing and sustaining dialogue and networking at a European level. I wish you fruitful interaction and networking over the coming three days. Thank you.

### **A framework for languages of education?**

#### ***J C Beacco, Adviser to the Language Policy Division***

Ms Battaini has described the general policy context in which this conference is set and how it fits into the activities of the Language Policy Division. It is for me now to elaborate on some of the more technical aspects of these language education policy issues which will fuel our discussions.

I would like to emphasise once again that, in keeping with the spirit of the CEFR, the aim of this project is not to develop a common European curriculum for languages of schooling, but to set out, while identifying the problems, an inventory of aims and goals and of the instruments and resources needed to achieve those goals, on the basis of which each state or region will be able to describe and pinpoint the choices made within its own educational area.

#### **1. Holistic approach**

These issues will therefore be addressed in the context of the holistic approach to language teaching and learning stemming from the concept of “plurilingual and pluricultural competence” and the derived concepts of linguistic (or language) repertoire and that of transversal competence (extending to the use and learning of different languages); this approach is described clearly in the *Guide for the development of language education policies in Europe*, where first languages figure prominently in terms of their relationship with the languages of education.

The problem is defined as follows:

“*First language* is the term of academic origin used to refer to what is generally understood by the term *mother tongue*. It designates the linguistic variety(ies) acquired in early childhood, up to

the age of two or three. This variety has a special status for the child since it is through it that he or she discovers the world in the framework of his or her early socialisation: linguistic interactions with other speakers are necessary for normal development. It is the variety in which the human faculty of language is first vested in a natural language. It may also be the variety through which the child begins to discover and appropriate the 'rules' of the language (or languages) of his immediate environment, and, at the same time, the rules of linguistic behaviour (for example, who, how and when to greet?).

[...]

The language policy issues presented by the first language are as follows:

- when the language of schooling is the same as the first language, it has to be decided whether and how to take into account in curricula and teaching approaches the language competences children have acquired before starting school, which are socially differentiated. This is a social question since schools must ensure equality of opportunity despite the differences that already exist when children first start school
- when the language of schooling is not the pupils' first language, it has to be decided what place is to be given to the first language. This is a political question since it is the conception of national cohesion and the creation of group identity that are at stake. It is also in this framework that sign languages should be examined, since they also have to be taught".

The issue of first languages and their relationship with the language(s) of schooling is viewed here in a general context of plurilingual and pluricultural education as defined in the CEFR and then in the *Guide*:

"Plurilingualism should be understood as:

- the intrinsic capacity of all speakers to use and learn, alone or through teaching, more than one language. The ability to use several languages to varying degrees and for distinct purposes is defined in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (p.168) as the ability 'to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural action, where a person, viewed as a social agent, has proficiency, of varying degrees, in several languages and experience of several cultures'. This ability is concretised in a repertoire of languages a speaker can use. The goal of teaching is to develop this competence (hence the expression: *plurilingualism as a competence*).
- an educational value that is the basis of linguistic tolerance, in other words, positive acceptance of diversity: speakers' awareness of their plurilingualism may lead them to give equal value to each of the varieties they themselves and other speakers use, even if they do not have the same functions (private, professional or official communication, language of affiliation, etc.). But this awareness should be assisted and structured by the language of schooling since it is no sense automatic (hence the expression: *plurilingualism as a value*).

Plurilingualism [...] constitutes a conception of the speaker as fundamentally plural and a value in that it is the basis of linguistic tolerance, an essential element of intercultural education".

It is posited that the linguistic competence of speaking subjects who invest in several linguistic varieties – either very similar (social varieties of the same national language) or different (foreign languages that seem remote from one another) - consists of transversal competences which may be implemented by what the CEFR describes as *strategies*. This transversality offers the basis for a shared teaching approach between the languages of schooling and foreign languages. For a long time there have been calls for such convergence, for example by E. Roullet

in his 1980 publication *Langue maternelle et langues secondes. Vers une pédagogie intégrée* (LAL, Crédif/Didier, Paris).

## 2. First terminology

This terminology adopted in the wake of the CEFR needs to be supplemented by a minimum terminology to denote the very things to which these educational issues relate. As you have already noted, the LPD and the ad hoc group of experts, after lengthy discussions, of which I will spare you an account, opted for the following terms:

**Language(s) of school education** or **language(s) of education**, abbreviated to LE, which are the generic terms for the “official” language(s) of the educational institution, ie that(those) used by teachers in their classes and by the administration

**Language as subject**, abbreviated to LS, to denote teaching devoted specifically to the language(s) of school education in courses identified accordingly (by curricula, number of teaching hours, teaching activities, forms of assessment, etc.) and provided by specialised teachers (English teachers or, for example, Polish teachers in Poland)

**Language(s) across curriculum**, abbreviated to LAC, to denote languages of school education when they are used in other subjects to transmit knowledge or skills, eg social science, philosophy, sports, art...

All terminology is a representation and therefore open to criticism, but we feel that these basic terms are neutral enough to allow us to hold an initial, clear dialogue amongst ourselves.

## 3. Aims of the conference

Our aim is therefore to provide the means of building an exchange of viewpoints and experience in a common language structured within a shared conceptual framework, based on certain data:

*What are you doing in your context?*

The answers to this question will allow the Language Policy Division’s contribution to be defined more clearly.

*What can the Council of Europe do at European level*, and hence transversally, to introduce greater transparency between national/regional education policies, greater awareness of the choices made (which, in a given area, may seem self-evident, in the light of educational traditions) and greater consistency in the work done by the various players in promoting the European project?

Numerous problems await us:

- nature of the goals assigned to the language(s) of schooling: competences vs knowledge, functional/practical/social/professional communication abilities in the language(s) of schooling and in languages of the individual repertoire vs education of the individual/*Bildung*/aesthetic education/language creativity/reflective ability with regard to language and discourse
- nature of the objectives: competences vs knowledge vs attitudes, what competences and minimum level of competence expected at the end of compulsory schooling
- nature of the teaching methods: what documents are useful for a knowledge of the curriculum for the language(s) of schooling? What surveys are available on teaching practices? Do examinations in these languages demonstrate their effectiveness? How are



these curricula developed and monitored? In the form of descriptors, a knowledge list, general guidelines to be adjusted to local requirements etc?

- what relationship between goals/objectives and age (ie pupils' cognitive and socio-affective development)? What curriculum dynamics?
- how to define the objectives of teaching literature (canon of literary works?)
- what forms and roles for metalinguistic teaching activities (including awareness of sociolinguistic variability)?
- what relationship to teachers of foreign languages (common methodological approaches, presence of foreign languages in the curriculum for languages as a subject)?
- what approach to adopt to the learning of literacy and access to the written word?
- what place for languages in the training of teachers in charge of other subjects?
- what forms of education in citizenship, active social involvement and European values?

This meeting's primary objectives are to:

- allow the member states to initiate a dialogue on the languages of schooling
- assess whether and how the experience gained with foreign languages (CEFR and others) can be transferred in part to the languages of education (type of shared reference instrument, methodology for devising it, elements of the CEFR that can be used as such (eg descriptors of level B and C communicative competence) or with adjustments)
- provide a clearer understanding of the role of foreign languages in the teaching of languages of education, from the point of view both of awareness of language and languages and of intercultural and citizenship education, so as to lay the foundations for a theory of plurilingualism not confined to foreign languages.

All these points and many others, with which we are all familiar, will, as is hoped, generate essential scientific and technical debates. It is equally essential, however, that these scientific discussions should not cause us to lose sight of the project's fundamental goals, which are to support the member states in their efforts to offer even more appropriate courses within education systems which will produce adults who are also responsible citizens. I wish you a fruitful conference.

## Session I - Exploring the issues

### Introduction

*The presentations on aims, contents, and assessment opened discussion on some of the key issues. A theme which emerged here was the sheer complexity and wide-ranging nature of the concept of 'languages of education', embracing as it does not just the language of instruction or language as subject but also the idea of language across the curriculum. The aims of language as subject are broad, ranging from knowledge of grammar and text genres to ideas of personal growth and development through literature study. The aims of language teaching also need to take account of the needs of the individual, society and the European community. The contents of language as subject are similarly wide-ranging with additional challenges related to structuring the contents of the curriculum to ensure progression. Contents can be described in terms of 'knowledge' or, more dynamically, as 'competencies' and this illustrates a potential source of tension. Tension is also potentially at the heart of different approaches to assessment because of the different purposes it is expected to fulfil. This can be summarised in terms of the contrast between language for learning (placing more emphasis on formative feedback) and assessment of learning (placing more emphasising on gathering summative data). A potential role for a Framework of Reference for Languages of Education might be to make explicit the different orientations in approaches to aims, content and assessment, the potential tensions involved in developing policy and how these might be addressed in practical terms.*

*The studies on national/federal policies for language of education in Switzerland and Norway provided examples of how some of these complex issues are addressed in specific contexts, in countries in which a variety of different languages is spoken. In Switzerland the development of common aims and standards through the Harmos project across twenty six cantons has some parallels with the development of a common framework of reference in Europe. In Norway the latest reform in general education, implemented this year, introduced new curricula for all subjects with language competence aims to develop oral, reading, writing and digital skills. This policy acknowledges the fact that language education does not only take place in specific subjects explicitly defined and reserved for it, but also in each and every subject in school. Again there are common concerns with the present proposed project on the language of education which incorporates a language across the curriculum element. The case studies were also a reminder that individual contexts vary and that a framework of reference would need to be sensitive to particular differences.*

*The summary of questionnaire results lead to the first group work session where participants were asked to identify key issues related to languages of schooling which are of common concern as well as those which are just relevant to specific contexts. Although there were common concerns across the group, each of these had a slightly different emphasis and structure.*

### **Aims and objectives for teaching/learning language(s) of Education (LE): Laila Aase, Nordisk institutt, Universitetet i Bergen, Norway**

Aims for language in schools can be considered in relation to three main perspectives: aims for the individual learner, aims reflecting the needs in society, aims reflecting the needs of the European society. These three perspectives are interrelated; aims for the individual learner are inseparable from aims for society. However it is useful to keep all aspects in mind to emphasise the specific role of education in language learning. Aims of language education can be understood in a practical and utilitarian sense as well as in terms of developing a basis for living a meaningful life in community with others.

A broad perspective of aims for language teaching and learning is necessary. The underlying assumption is that language plays an important part in all areas of human lives and that school has an important role to play in developing language competences in a broad sense. The close connection between language and thought and between language and learning tells us that developing language is more than just learning to communicate with others, although this is an important aspect of language competences. Language development is a prerequisite for learning in all subjects as well as for thinking, understanding and interpreting different text forms and participating in a number of different situations within a society. Thus language development is closely connected to cultural competences as well as to personal growth.

The aims of language of education (LE) include knowledge, skills, abilities to learn and existential competence. Existential competence is the term used in the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) for aims of a non-utilitarian character, closely connected to personal growth and cultural values. We need however to discuss these concepts to examine our various understandings of what they mean and how they can be reached. Aims of LE are closely connected to values and traditions within a community on a local, national and European level. In our pluralistic societies we may not completely agree upon these values, but in educational settings we normally agree on some basic ones. Respect for the tradition of knowledge and scientific thinking, and judgement, tolerance and generosity towards others, critical thinking and the exploration of one's own reasoning, flexibility of mind, the courage to express personal opinions, are some of these values that can hardly be expressed as competences and are not easily assessed. However, we have to include them in language education as part of the general aims. We need to explore possibilities for a common understanding in developing these aims. In that process we need to discuss what language competences are and how such competences might be enhanced.

### **Content considerations for a Framework of Reference for Language(s) of School Education: Florentina Samihaian, National Board for Curriculum, Bucharest, Romania**

When speaking about a curriculum for Language(s) of School Education (LE), it is necessary to integrate the content elements of its three components: Language as a Subject (LS), Foreign Language (FL) and Language across the Curriculum (LAC) both in terms of horizontal correlation and of vertical progression (e.g. from the primary to the upper secondary school). The focus on communication / communicative competences and attitudes is what connects the three components and this is a useful starting point for identifying the other convergence of aims, content and methodology.

One example of possible convergence relates to language and literature; an integrated communicative approach to language and literature could be a curricular option for both LS and FL and also an opportunity for developing plurilingualism. Identifying the way the content of the three components of LE overlap and the specificity of each of them as regards content can offer a basis for such an integrated vision. Various possibilities for structuring content in an LE curriculum, the tension between language and literature in LS or FL, and different ways of defining linguistic or cultural competences also need to be considered.

Progression in aims and content in an LE curriculum are important for coherence and for students' learning and development. Each of the aspects speaking, listening, reading, writing can be viewed from the perspective of the possible distribution of the relevant content elements to primary, lower secondary and upper secondary levels. For example, the lines of oral communication can be: from verbal expression to non-verbal means of communication, from monolotative forms to interaction, from narrative and informative to descriptive and argumentative etc. Of course, there are many differences with respect to each country regarding these three levels of schooling which need to be taken into consideration. In any case, a vertical

distribution may follow more general cycles of education (such as those based on the students' intellectual and psychological profile at certain stages of schooling).

A general problem in education today is that a competence-focused curriculum implies an essential shift in methodology and understanding of teaching and learning in relation to certain well-defined goals. The ways of approaching content in LE need to be based on a common philosophy of learning and this implies a certain continuity and coherence in methodology in all three components of LE as well as in other subjects. Methodological recommendations regarding the translation of a philosophy of 'Bildung'<sup>2</sup> into teacher training and teaching practice may also be considered as necessary steps in developing a framework of reference for LE.

In order to design a coherent LE project it is important to take into consideration the general aims of education formulated within European education policy documents so as to select the content and the methodology that are relevant not only for LS or FL, but also for communication within the curriculum as a whole (LAC).

### **Evaluation and Assessment: *Michael Fleming, University of Durham, United Kingdom***

Assessment often causes tension and disagreement because of the diverse and demanding functions that it is expected to fulfil. Two central tendencies emerge. One places emphasis on the assessment of learning where reliable, objective measures are a high priority. The focus here is on making summative judgements which in practice is likely to involve more formal examinations and tests with marks schemes to ensure that the process is sound. An alternative approach is to change the emphasis from assessment of learning to assessment for learning, implying a more formative approach where there is much more emphasis on feedback to improve performance. These differences can be compounded in the context of language as school subject (LS) because the aims and range of outcomes are particularly complex. It is important that the values which underpin and inform a system of assessment are examined and made explicit, otherwise learners may unwittingly be affected in negative ways.

'Accountability' when used in relation to assessment usually refers to the imposition of systems of assessment external to the learning process as a form of 'policing' of standards to ensure that the education system is functioning effectively. But the term may be employed more broadly than this, referring to the different obligations that are relevant to all. Teachers have a responsibility to the learner but also to the needs of the wider society. Policy makers clearly have a duty to the public and need to ensure that the education system is functioning effectively but they also have responsibilities to the individual learners and need to consider consequences of policies in those terms.

An ideal assessment system would reflect the full complexity of language as school subject (LS) and would motivate learners by giving useful feedback while also providing other stake-holders (e.g. policy makers and employers) with the information they need. An integrated approach to assessment would ensure that the different purposes and approaches are balanced so that no one priority had adverse and undue influence on the system as a whole. The implications for assessment of an integrated approach to language education (LE) also need to be considered. For example a pupil may perform weakly in language as subject (LS) but be fluent in several other languages. A broad assessment profile which takes into account broader competence in language

---

<sup>2</sup> *Bildung* (in German) means developing and bringing out the full potential of a human being, based on his/her nature, but stimulated and structured by education (nurture). This dynamic concept encompasses both the product or relative state reached by a human being as well as the process of becoming educated/becoming one's own self. During this process the mental, cultural and practical capacities as much as the personal and social competencies are being developed and continuously widened in a holistic way.

(without of course diluting the separate assessment of LS for diagnostic purposes) could be highly motivating for pupils.

One of the roles of a Framework of Reference for Languages of Education would be to make explicit the different functions of assessment and demonstrate ways in which these can be integrated in practice to raise standards.

**Switzerland – A case-study: *Olivier Maradan, Swiss Conference of Cantonal Directors of Public Education, Bern, Switzerland***

Switzerland is often seen as a small-scale European testing ground for language education policy. The country has four national languages, 26 cantons responsible for compulsory education, an average of 24% of allophone pupils, a public debate on earlier teaching of languages 2 and 3, and significant national-level reforms relating to teacher training and, above all, the harmonisation of compulsory education.

Following a recent revision of the constitution articles on education, which received almost overwhelming support from the Swiss people and the cantons, the HarmoS project launched by the Swiss Conference of Cantonal Directors of Public Instruction (CDIP) now plays a central role. The cantons have drafted a legal agreement relating to a number of key parameters and certain qualitative instruments with the aim of removing all scholastic obstacles to mobility, harmonising syllabuses and enhancing the overall quality of teaching and the co-ordinated management of the education system. Under the HarmoS project, scientific consortiums are currently developing a reference framework in four school subjects, including the language of schooling. Having reached a decision in 2002 on setting common standards, the 26 cantonal education ministers subsequently accepted the idea of proceeding by way of the prior development of a competence model based on four or five levels of progression which will be validated empirically (at least in part) and within which it will be possible in due course to set minimum competence standards that are valid throughout the country, illustrated and put into practice through reference tests. The scientific work began in 2005 and the first version of the standards should be ready for adoption at the end of 2008.

In other words, the idea of a European framework of reference for languages of schooling is fully in line with Swiss concerns. The presentation will show very briefly, by way of a case study, on the one hand how the strategy and the process are developing from the language teaching standpoint and on the other how the consortia are proceeding, based on the Klieme Report published in Germany in 2004, to build their competence model and levels of progression. The presentation will end with some key issues and practical suggestions.

Such an approach should in fact have effects both on curricula and on evaluation. The cultural differences and historic choices which may be seen in each linguistic region show that reaching a consensus on the foundations of the curriculum is a delicate and useful task which is very time-consuming and calls for dialogue and exploration of underlying educational issues. The competence inventory, seen as a meta-definition of learning objectives, currently appears to be the only possible means of achieving that aim. Three main difficulties emerge, above and beyond regional cultural differences: the creation of a verticality and homogeneous progression criteria spanning the whole of pre-school and compulsory education; reaching a consensus on result expectations between compulsory and post-compulsory education; a deep-seated fear within the teaching profession of what are seen as aberrations due to assessment and monitoring (test-based teaching, ranking etc). However, the utilisation and by-products of the CEFR for foreign languages are an example and proof showing that this challenge can be met.

### **Norway – A case study: *Jorunn Berntzen, Ministry of Education and Research, Norway***

Norway is not the homogeneous society it may seem: 155 different languages are spoken as first languages by students who attend compulsory education in Norway. The languages indigenous to Norway; the two official varieties of written Norwegian, various Sami languages, Kven/Finnish, and Romani are obviously included, but the most frequent used mother tongues of immigrants also deserve attention. English is compulsory from the first grade and throughout the first year of upper secondary education and training. At lower secondary level students can choose between a second foreign language or in-depth study of English or Norwegian. Finnish and Sami, the latter also being the second official language with its own curriculum, are offered as second languages.

Norwegian citizens have strong statutory rights to language education, which acknowledges the multilingual nature of the country. The main goal of the latest reform in general education, implemented this year, is to develop basic skills that will enable students to actively participate in the knowledge society. The new national curricula for all subjects have competence aims clearly indicating what pupils and apprentices are expected to learn.

Language competence aims to develop oral, reading, writing and digital skills have been introduced across the curriculum, to develop and encourage the plurilingualism of the individual student. This acknowledges the fact that language education does not only take place in specific subjects explicitly defined and reserved for it, but also in each and every subject in school. The approach is an integrated communicative approach to language and literature, which is also reflected in the other subject curricula for languages, both Languages of Schooling (LS) and Foreign Languages (FL). Furthermore, the objectives and competence aims of the language subjects emphasize that language acquisition and learning cannot be separated from critical thinking and linguistic awareness and must include knowledge, skills, abilities to learn and existential competence.

A comparison between the subject curricula for English and Norwegian illustrates some points of convergence - and divergence - between FL and LS curricula. These are among the points we will need to further consider as we work towards a more comprehensive view of language education and of language policy.

### **Results of a Preliminary survey on curricula for teaching national/official/school languages in compulsory education: *Jean-Claude Beacco, Adviser to the Language Policy Division***

The preliminary survey was conducted in April 2005 and was designed to provide an overview of the curricula used at national or regional level to teach language as subject or language of instruction. The aim was to identify similarities and differences in approach that might inform the preliminary work on the project.

By 27 June 2005, forty-four replies had been received, including eight from the German Länder and five from the United Kingdom. The reports on the different curricula show that eighteen date from pre-2000 while 16 were introduced after 2000. This suggests that there is a strong desire for change, most likely prompted by the need to address key educational issues (eg literacy, language skills for work). In reply to question 7 'Are any changes to the curricula envisaged?' Twenty-seven respondents mentioned the need for change.

Some form of external certification (i.e. performed by someone other than the class teacher) appears to be the norm. Twenty-nine respondents reported that they have external examinations, although some of the replies are ambiguous on this point.

The scope of these curricula is fairly wide and often includes specific arrangements for particular groups of learners:

- in twenty-four cases, they concern the language of instruction and not just the subject language
- in thirty two member states, special provision (or specific curricula) is (are) available for linguistic minorities
- in twenty eight cases, special provision (or specific curricula) is (are) available for migrants, in particular the children of recent immigrants
- thirty four respondents said that special provision was available for pupils with learning difficulties and eighteen said it was available for children from disadvantaged backgrounds, while forty out of forty-four respondents said that special provision was available for pupils with special needs.

Question 8 ‘In your opinion, what is the question most frequently raised, or the most pressing issue, with regard to the teaching of national or school languages?’ was deliberately open-ended and the replies formed a useful focus for the group work.

One point worth noting is that two of the replies to the questionnaire referred to modern foreign languages. This is indicative of the difficulties involved in taking a holistic approach to language teaching, as *languages* tends to mean *foreign languages*.

### Group work 1

In the first group work session participants were asked to identify key issues related to languages of schooling which are of common concern as well as those which are just relevant to specific contexts. The groups were given the list of eight areas identified in the preliminary survey and invited to consider: whether these issues are relevant in their particular context; what the most usual opinions on these issues are in their own country; whether there are any other important issues regarding the languages of school education.

Although there were common concerns across the group, each of these had a slightly different emphasis and structure. The importance of writing, oral communication and reading were stressed. With regard to writing, key issues emerged related to the development of genre awareness and whether instruction should be systematic and structured or more open and context orientated. There was also some discussion of whether one school level needs to be focused on more than others. Two common challenges are how to develop effective oral communication amongst young people and how to support and improve the performance of poor readers and develop positive reading habits. It was thought to be important to take account of the impact of gender on pupil performance. Also the different needs of particular contexts was stressed e.g. rural/urban. The wide diversity of languages in the classroom is clearly a significant issue in many contexts. In some cases there is more than one national language while in others there are significant numbers of immigrants often of 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> generation. Assessment was also discussed and assessment schemes often imply a particular conception of language. There is clearly a challenge in identifying and testing different kinds of competences.

Literature education was also identified as a key issue with questions related to how it should be taught and assessed. The question of whether an agreed canon was desirable was also addressed. A key challenge in developing a framework will be to take account of the diversity of contexts. One of these is related to language diversity with the classroom, arising either from immigration or when there is more than one national language. This presents particular challenges when designing the curriculum or assessment instruments. The challenges are not just educational in a

narrow sense but include political, and social dimensions. Points which were not included in the eight areas identified included the importance of teacher education and the needs of advanced learners.



## Session II - Addressing the issues

### Introduction

*The presentations on language across the curriculum, socially disadvantaged learners and literature, as well as the specific accounts of language projects in Germany and Switzerland, served to broaden the debate and move discussion towards the potential contents of a framework. The idea of 'language across the curriculum' reinforces the value of having a comprehensive model of language education as the basis for formulating policy and practice. It emphasises the relationship between language as subject and the role of language in learning all subjects. Proficiency in language is an essential prerequisite for access to the curriculum and is therefore an important contribution to social inclusion; a challenge for schools is how to organise the curriculum to allow all children to acquire the language that is needed to function in school and society. As the example from Flanders illustrated, a key practical decision has to be made as to whether pupils with a more limited command of the language of school should be taught within the regular classroom or withdrawn for special help.*

*Specific accounts of language projects in Germany and Switzerland were presented. In Germany the DESI project aims to provide information about the performance level of year 9 pupils in English and Germany. Empirical background investigations have sought to explain some of the differences in performance levels of the students. Further detailed information was presented on the Harmos project in Switzerland in particular the development of competence models used in the project and the methods used for testing them. The presentation on literature drew attention to changing approaches to literature education related for example to choice of texts, teaching approaches and aims. The notion of 'Bildung' which had previously been addressed in the presentation on aims is of particular importance in the field of literature education.*

*In the second group work session participants were asked to consider what type of language framework (or other appropriate instrument) might address the key issues effectively. They were asked to discuss: function (what purposes and audiences the framework might have) content (what priority issues should be addressed) and form (what options might be considered for presenting the document). The group work highlighted the potential complexity of a framework in terms of possible audience and wide-ranging content, reflecting some of the earlier presentations in the conference on key issues. The discussion of a possible format for the framework or instrument sought to address these challenges by considering the idea of an electronic as well as a book format and the potential for having a core publication with 'satellite' or 'module' publications on specific issues for specific audiences.*

### **Language Across the Curriculum: Helmut J. Vollmer, Universität Osnabrück, Germany**

Language across the curriculum (LAC) relates to linking different forms and aspects of language education within the school, particularly emphasising the relationship between the language of the school (LS) as a subject and the role of language in all subject-matter learning, but also the relationship between the different language subjects.

LAC has two meanings: in the narrow sense it is a concept suggesting the importance of language work and language training in all non-linguistic subjects. In the wider sense it is a concept demanding a comprehensive model of language education as the basis of a whole school language policy. The latter includes linking all languages as subjects (mother tongue education, foreign language education, second or third language education) and the language dimension in

all other subjects. LAC in its narrow sense focuses on extending the knowledge and skills acquired through the language of school (LS) into subject-specific language varieties and discourse competencies, leading to a first (internal) or basic form of plurilingualism. A second form of (external) plurilingualism develops, when other languages than the LS and thus new language repertoires are acquired, mainly through foreign language education or CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning). Both types of plurilingualism are indispensable for learners all over Europe in order to become linguistically and culturally sensitive and knowledgeable and to develop the means for participation and democratic citizenship.

LAC as part of such a comprehensive language policy for schools can be considered as a form of initiation into new discourse behaviours and discourse communities by developing and using new language varieties, by extending one's own competences, identities and personality. Introducing LAC requires a radical change in the attitudes and mentality of the teachers involved those already in service as much as those in teacher education. Every teacher has to be confronted with the issues of academic language use, both oral and written, and trained so as to be prepared for teaching it within the subject matter courses later at school. Every student teacher needs to learn how to define minimal goals or what to do with the goals he/she encounters within the school, the province or the national curriculum: Which of those does he/she want to include, which of them can he/she afford not to include within the subject-matter teaching? Which of them are needed by the learners for future development and participation in society?

All of these decisions require a high level of information and of professional competence in theory, in curricular matters and in teaching methodology. However, nobody seems to have responsibility at the moment, neither at school nor in university, for this type of qualification in subject-specific language competence, for conceptualising language learning in this holistic way and for coordinating and supervising the development of a whole school language education policy. These are some of the issues which have to be considered and solved urgently on a local, national and European level.

### **Socially disadvantaged learners in Flanders: Piet van Avermaet, Centre for Diversity and Learning, Ghent University, Belgium**

Differences in school success cannot just be seen as problems of the individual child, who has to follow a remedial programme before (re)entering the regular classroom, but as a difference in codes, a socially instead of an ethnically determined difference. The school has to organise its teaching in such a way that all children can benefit from it. The school has to answer the question of which goals should be central for all children. It needs to find an answer to how it will deal with this diversity of socio-cultural and socio-economic backgrounds. The challenge for the school, then, is to organise teaching in an integrated manner that allows all children to acquire the school language that is needed to be able to function at school and in society.

In this respect Flanders opts for a two-way approach. On the one hand a policy that strives for integration or inclusion instead of withdrawal classes for migrant children. When a difference in language skills can be observed between second or third generation immigrant children compared to so-called native-speakers, this first group participates in the mainstream school curriculum from kindergarten onwards. Extra funding is provided for those schools that have a lot of children coming from lower social background or from families where the home language is not the language of the dominant group.

On the other hand, newly arrived migrants (children), so-called 'newcomers' can follow a separate curriculum and teaching programme. They enter the country with no or hardly any knowledge of the target language. They cannot immediately participate in the regular school programme. An 'adapted' curriculum with specific developmental goals is provided for these

children to give them maximum opportunities to participate at school. The time these children spend in the so-called 'reception classes' is limited to one year. After that one-year programme they go to the mainstream class where further extra 'scaffolding' is provided for those classes or schools where these newcomers are then integrated.

**Central results of the DESI Study: Competences in German as L1 and L2 in the context of the German school system: *Guenter Nold, University of Dortmund, Germany***

DESI (German English Student Assessment International) is a longitudinal study (N=11.000 in Germany) that investigated a range of language competences both in German (L1 and L2 for part of the population) and English (first foreign language) primarily in the German school system (ninth grade). The objectives of the study were to assess achievement in spoken and written German (L1/L2) and English as FL at grade 9 in all types of schools, investigate the causes of the different levels of achievement (cognitive, affective/motivational, social, classroom, home, society) and implement changes based on the results.

The test battery of the German component included reading competence, writing competence, language awareness, orthographic competence, lexical competence and argumentation. A special research design was used to define scales for each of the competences. The procedure to develop these scales involved ratings of test task characteristics and the matching of these characteristics with the empirical data of the tests; multiple linear regression analysis was applied so as to select those test task characteristics that could be used to define cut-off points for the competence scales.

The investigations into background variables took into account the differences between the sexes, the specific situation of students from families with a migration history, the social class background and family culture of the students, and the impact of the different types of schools and their specific school cultures in the German school system as a whole. A key question is whether it is the school types that exert the greatest influence on the competence levels reached by the students. And an answer will be given if variables such as social class, migration and family background are responsible for the choice of school types. Ultimately, the question is whether the findings from PISA 2003 International and National, which point to the fact that the German educational system in the field of maths and science is socially unjust, will be further corroborated by the findings in the field of language education or if they have to be modified.

**HarmoS Project – Language 1: Development of a competence model for the languages of schooling – Progress of work and prospects: *Anne-Marie Broi, Department of Compulsory Education, Neuchâtel, Switzerland***

In June 2002 the Swiss Conference of Cantonal Directors of Public Instruction (CDIP) launched an ambitious project to harmonise compulsory education in the Swiss federal system. This project, known as HarmoS, seeks to harmonise school structures (compulsory schooling in 11 years starting at age 4) and the main teaching objectives. These are to be based on competence models developed in certain subjects (language 1, language 2, maths and natural science), which will in turn be used to set obligatory, measurable standards for basic education at the end of the 4<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> years (ISCED 1 and 3<sup>rd</sup> year of ISCED 2A).

Multilingual scientific consortia have been tasked with developing these competence models, validating the levels by empirical means and proposing national standards on that basis. These standards should be ready for adoption in autumn 2008. They will affect the development of syllabuses, teaching resources and reference tests. Regular monitoring at national level will indicate the degree to which they are being met.

The Language 1 consortium comprises researchers from Switzerland's three linguistic regions (French, German and Italian speaking). Like the other subject consortia, the Language 1 consortium is supported by a methodology group working on the statistical aspects related to the process of developing national standards.

Our presentation will review the progress of work on the competence model for Language 1. Our model not only includes the linguistic system, but also, more broadly, favours a pragmatic approach based on language activities: reading, writing, listening and speaking. We shall outline a comparison between our competence model and the approach adopted in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages of Schooling.

To illustrate our model, we will show the links between the dimensions of the language and the competences and sub-competences which define them. We will focus specifically on reading, presenting descriptors which form a basis for the conceptualisation of tasks.

Following on from this example, we will comment on some findings of a field trial conducted in two linguistic regions in June 2006. We will focus on the methodological aspects involved in transposing the competence model into tasks in connection with a written comprehension test.

**Literature and “Bildung”:** *Irene Pieper, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Germany*

The notion of “Bildung<sup>3</sup>” is especially important in the field of literary education. The concept has been broadened since the 1970s when developments in society, the sciences and the arts led to considerable change in the conception of language, literature and learning: since then, language and literature curricula have often come to include pragmatic texts and other media, and to focus on the learning reader and his/her development. Consequently, criteria of text selection have not only been restricted to the literary canon.

A major aim of dealing with literature in language of education is to encourage students to read and to experience the encounter with literature as personally enriching. Additionally, the teaching often shows traces of literary studies and functions as propaedeutic especially in upper-secondary education. Sometimes this orientation can contradict the focus on the learner. With regard to competences, a much discussed issue is whether a separate area of competences can be defined for reading literature. It is argued that an integrated approach which stresses the link between reading in a general sense and reading literature is especially helpful with learners. Education also needs to offer experiences with literature which allow for “literarische Bildung”. One of the current educational challenges is to initiate processes of “Bildung” which are not limited to specific social milieus. Within a European context cross-cultural experiences might be encouraged.

In the area of literary education in particular, the focus on competences and their assessment has to be put in the context of a broader conception of the purposes of education. A language of education framework should pay special attention to reading literature both within language as subject and within foreign languages. Here, cross-cultural perspectives can be developed which can help to avoid bias with regard to social milieus and mono-cultural perspectives.

---

<sup>3</sup> See note 2

## Group Work 2

*The second group discussions again took place in three groups. A range of different possible approaches to formulating a framework of reference document was highlighted. For example, should the framework be a more practical document aimed at supporting teachers in the classroom or should it be directed more at policy makers? Should it seek to be comprehensive in scope and run the risk of being overwhelming or should it aim to be more focused and accessible? These are not necessarily stark choices to be made because the discussion of possible formats in the groups suggested ideas for addressing a variety of audiences and needs. For example, an electronic format would allow more flexibility and ongoing dialogue. There is also potential for having a core publication with 'satellite' or 'module' publications on specific issues for specific audiences.*

*The discussion about the scope of the document was related to the potential audience (teacher, students, curriculum designers, policy makers, parents, researchers etc) with the view being expressed that by trying to reach all audiences the final product might end up being inappropriate for any particular audience. There was some feeling that the document or framework should be encouraging and inspirational; its format and presentation therefore would need careful thought. One potential value of a framework would be to secure international agreement on what is meant by 'languages of education' and other key terms. It would have a possible role in raising awareness of different conceptions of language and different approaches to language teaching. It also has considerable potential as a 'tool for reflection'. One of its roles, for example, might be to encourage schools to develop a language policy which embodies key elements such as language cross the curriculum, foreign language education and language as subject.*

*There was also some discussion of the possible content, whether for example it should focus primarily on teaching and learning or whether assessment should be a major focus. There was some difference of opinion on where the primary emphasis should lie. Focusing on assessment might involve development of descriptors or competence levels which could imply an empirical research project.*

*The concept of language across the curriculum was thought to be a key element. But a practical decision would need to be made as to whether this theme should be treated separately or incorporated into a language as subject or language of education document. The importance of viewing the project in relation to key values was a theme addressed throughout the conference and emerged again in the group discussion. There would inevitably be a political dimension embracing notions of European identity, linguistic diversity and plurilingualism.*

## Session III - Towards a common framework

### Introduction

*The presentation on the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) described the approach used to measure reading literacy as developed for the 2000 study. Here students were assessed on the degree to which they are able to deal with texts written in the language used in school; the programme therefore has particular relevance to the present project. The PISA study was also part of the final presentation which gave a comparative analysis of three major European developments: PISA, the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) developed within the “Education and Training 2010” work programme of the European Commission, and the Council of Europe Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). The need for closer cooperation on an international level regarding the integration of the various proposals for European reference frameworks was stressed. The final plenary session brought together the results of the second group discussion in a systematic way.*

### **The OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA): John De Jong, Language Testing Services, The Netherlands**

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), as its name suggests, was set up to promote economic goals. Soon after its foundation recognition grew that the prosperity of a nation derives to a large extent from its human capital and the opportunities for its citizens to learn and acquire knowledge on a continuing basis. Subsequently, improving the quality of education became a major policy initiative in the Member countries of the OECD.

Since 1985, the OECD has gathered comparable data on a number of indicators including the human and financial resources invested in education, access to, progression in and completion of education, and the operation of education and learning systems. Since the early nineties the OECD has published these data in annual reports entitled *Education at a Glance*. To complement this information, PISA was set up to measure how well young adults, at age 15, who are at or near the end of compulsory schooling, are prepared to meet the challenges of today's knowledge societies.

The first PISA survey was conducted in the year 2000 in 32 countries (28 OECD and four non-OECD countries). In this initial year reading literacy was the major domain, with mathematics and science as minor domains. In 2003 mathematics became the major domain and in 2006 the study concentrated on science. Already preparations have started for 2009 when reading will again become the major domain.

The PISA approach to the measurement of reading literacy as it was operationalized in the PISA reading literacy framework developed for the 2000 study focused on “language of instruction”: students were assessed on the degree to which they were able to deal with texts written in the language used in school, be it their first language, their second language or a language foreign to them.

The major findings of the PISA study of reading literacy and their social relevance need to be considered. Reading literacy is defined as ‘understanding, using and reflecting on written texts, in order to achieve one's goals, to develop one's knowledge and potential and to participate in society’. There is a difference in emphasis between the PISA construct of reading literacy and the descriptive system of in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEF). It is important not to restrict thinking to an academic model of language use.

**European Frameworks of Reference for Language Competences: *Waldemar Martyniuk, Language Policy Division, Council of Europe / Jagiellonian University, Poland***

Over the last few years, describing language competences has been the subject of several projects, including three major European developments: the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) developed within the “Education and Training 2010” work programme of the European Commission, and the Council of Europe Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). Descriptions of language proficiency have been produced within each of these projects:

- CEFR – descriptive scheme and scales for foreign language use/learning;
- PISA – reading literacy (in “mother tongue”), in addition to literacy in mathematics and science;
- EQF – key competences for lifelong learning (communication in the mother tongue and communication in a foreign language, in addition to mathematical literacy and basic competences in science and technology, digital competence, learning-to-learn, interpersonal and civic competences, entrepreneurship, and cultural expression).

An analysis of the elements of the three frameworks produces the following overarching structure of a framework for language competences: a descriptive scheme; reference levels and scales; tools and instruments for implementation; assessment scheme; guidelines and procedures for quality assurance.

The need for closer cooperation on an international level regarding the integration of the various proposals for European reference frameworks seem to be apparent – not only because of some differences in the use of terminology (competence, domain, situation, content, context, purpose, benchmark, etc.) – but in order to provide stakeholders with a coherent, user-friendly educational concept.

While working on a possible framework of reference for language(s) of school education (LE), the following issues seem to be of importance in this context: to what extent is a competence based approach suitable for LE? which elements of the overarching framework structure might be developed for LE? what other elements might be needed? how should an LE framework be related to the existing frameworks?

**Possible elements and issues for a reference framework: *Plenary session chaired by Mike Byram, Adviser to the Language Policy Division.***

This plenary session returned to the second group discussion but approached the topic now in more systematic and comprehensive way looking specifically at possible audiences, form, function/purposes and content of a framework of reference.

A synthesis of this discussion was sent to delegates after the conference so that they could use it as a basis for providing further feedback on the issues. A copy of the feedback form is presented as an appendix to these proceedings.

Audiences

The potential range of audiences for a document was thought to wide-ranging including: teachers and headteachers; students; curriculum designers and policy makers; parents; University teachers / teacher trainers /researchers, employers and politicians. The potential breadth of the audience provides a challenge because there is the danger that in attempting to reach all audiences it runs the risk of not being sufficiently focused. A key challenge therefore will be finding an appropriate format and style which caters for a wide and diverse audience. The scope of the

project would also need to be determined – whether for example it would be confined primarily to the years of compulsory schooling or would also be extended to include kindergarten and adult education, after all adult literacy is an important issue in many countries. Given that the CFER has been translated into non-European languages (e.g. Japanese and Chinese) it might be worth keeping in mind when developing the framework the potential impact of a document not just in Europe but more internationally.

### Form

It was thought that one way of coping with a wide and diverse audience would be to use different forms of publication and communication. The idea of a ‘framework of reference’ does not necessarily mean the production of just one, final, static product. It is likely that some kind of core publication would be at the heart of the project but there is also the possibility of having different modules or ‘satellite’ publications for specific readers and purposes. Also the framework could be a focus for ongoing dialogue through the creation of a community of practice. The use of electronic media for publication (as well as a more traditional book format) would have the potential to promote dialogue and interaction. It may be that eventually one overarching document on Languages of Education will embody the work on language as subject, language across the curriculum, foreign languages and minority languages.

### Purpose

The purposes of the framework of reference would be related to the different audiences. It would have a political function in that it would support key Council of Europe priorities and values related for example to concepts of European citizenship and inclusion; it would need to address the needs of those learners who are linguistically disadvantaged with respect to the language of instruction, newcomer groups and socially disadvantaged groups. Themes such as plurilingualism and linguistic awareness would be central. To this end it would be important to clarify the relationship of the project with other bodies and existing frameworks in a European context.

Another key purpose would be to support developments in the quality of education throughout all member states. While any form of centralisation would not be an objective, a framework of reference would contribute to the creation of more transparency and coherence across member states. It was felt that the document should be encouraging rather than discouraging; it would be important to anticipate the danger that a major document might create the impression of yet another reform to implement. Good communication about the purpose of the document would help, as would examples of good practice; it would allow countries with similar challenges to share possible solutions.

Another key purpose would be to support teachers and schools in the development of policy and practice. It could for example serve as a ‘guideline’ for the teaching of language as subject and language across the curriculum. It would be important to ensure a balance between focusing on assessment and issues related to teaching and learning; it is important that the former should not dominate and that any substantial recommendation on assessment might need empirical research. The framework would have a key role in raising awareness of different concepts of language and different perspectives on language learning. It would have a role in supporting schools in analysing their own situations and perhaps develop a language policy specific to their own context. For curriculum designers and policy makers the development of ‘benchmarks’, ‘levels’ or ‘thresholds’ could be a valuable aspect of the work.

### Content

A key focus for the framework of reference would be to offer some clarification on the aims of language education which can be conceived in narrow, linguistic terms or which can embrace wider notions of personal growth associated with concept of ‘Bildung’. It would need to clarify



terminology in order to foster transparency and communication. It would be important to address the importance of 'context' and to be aware that generalised statements about language need to be qualified by an awareness of different contextual factors. One of the decisions to be made is whether to focus on a few, core issues or to seek to be more comprehensive covering a wide range of issues in a systematic way. This is where different types of publication may be helpful in avoiding a single document which is overwhelming. The relationship between language and literature would need to be addressed and the links between language and culture.

A decision would need to be made about the issue of defining levels of achievement or providing descriptors for assessment purposes. Much can be learned from the experience of developing the CFER, although the issues with language of education are even more complex. The framework of reference might need to address a number of specific topics such as teaching grammar; theory of language learning/acquisition; social variations in language (dialect, register etc); literature; education for democratic citizenship.

## Conclusions and perspectives: J. Sheils

In his closing address Joe Sheils reminded conference delegates that it was fifteen years ago in Switzerland at a similar gathering that member States agreed their general approach to developing the CFER for modern languages. The brief was to develop a tool that would be comprehensive and dynamic, that would make language teaching, learning and assessment more transparent and more coherent. It rose particularly out of the Swiss initiative pursuing coherence and transparency across the cantons; the resulting outcome has had a significant impact. Fifteen years later the project will not develop in exactly the same way as there are different needs and different constraints. It is important however to remember that the development of the last framework took a period of eight years. Even though some countries require answers quickly, the necessary drafting, consultation, piloting, re-writing and research will take time.

There may be two phases to the present project: the development of a descriptive model followed by research. It is clear from listening to the discussion at this conference that the process will need to be dynamic, not simply an outcome cast in stone. The work on the project so far within the Council of Europe has been undertaken by a small group. Next month on the 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> November this group, along with the chairs and rapporteurs of the group discussions at this conference, will meet and take stock. Feedback from conference delegates will be needed before that meeting.

The steering group will be open-ended and *ad hoc* in nature. A number of issues and possible modules have been identified such as migrant children or the issue of standards and competences. It will be necessary to augment the group and invite in experts on particular topics. It is likely that the working group will need to draft an annotated list of contents based on the feedback from the conference. The project will proceed on the basis of what has been referred to as a 'community of practice' as it goes forward. There will need to be consultation with different audiences across different member states; there will be individuals and institutions from different countries who can contribute on different topics or provide examples of best practice and help will be needed in identifying them.

It will be necessary to have conferences of this kind when the work makes progress. In twelve months or so the member states will meet again in Prague to share more ideas and more possible case studies. In 2009 there will be major Forum in Strasbourg which will bring together the language education community as a whole which includes this one and the foreign language community. The aim will be to promote appropriate convergences and help prepare a new recommendation of the Committee of Ministers on plurilingual education. It will also be possible to have smaller events such as seminars and think tanks to look at specific issues, specific modules, specific areas of education. These can be organised to take place in Strasbourg or they can be hosted by a member state or an international non government organisation. Residential events, as will be organised in Prague next year, have particular value. Member states that host such events are entitled to have extra participants from their country and this is a source of enrichment for the education system of the country.

So far in order to contact delegates for this conference the approach has been through the Steering Committee for Education. However it would help to have from every country a correspondent, a languages of education contact person, who can keep the steering group up to date with the developments in the country and who can follow up meetings and receive reports to disseminate nationally or federally.

The activity of the Language Policy Division known as the Language Education Policy Profiles is relevant to the present project. This is an offer from the Council of Europe to assist member states in looking at their policy for language in education, with the benefit of an external perspective from a team of four or five experts from other European countries. The team acts as a

catalyst to help nations, federations or local authorities to look more closely at their policies. This takes place on a shared financial basis between the Council of Europe and the country. This process has taken place so far for seven countries; there are four others in process at different stages and two are about to begin. The entry point for this process has been through the foreign language community with less attention to language as subject and language across the curriculum. However there is now an opportunity to widen the focus of the language education profiles with a stronger emphasis on the languages of schooling. Interested countries (or local authorities) are invited to contact the Language Policy Division for more information.

Joe Sheils concluded by thanking those countries that have provided particular help. Poland has provided generous support in the form of Waldek Martyniuk who has been seconded to the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe. Norway provided a generous financial contribution to launch the present project. Similar contributions are always welcome. The Czech Republic will host the first residential government conference on this present project next year.

At this point Irena Maskova of the Czech Republic extended a welcome to conference delegates to the next conference in Prague in November (8 – 10) 2007.

Delegates were reminded that the preliminary studies are available on the Division's website in the two official languages and paper copies could be sent on request. Delegates should feel free to translate any of the studies - all that is necessary is to contact the Language Policy Division in writing for permission and translation will then be formally authorised (free of charge). A form has been prepared and distributed to seek feedback on the conference and on some of the specific issues. This will be used to prepare a fuller set of conference conclusions and to build up a data base of contact persons and institutions for the project.

## Appendix 1: Conference programme

### Programme

#### Monday, 16 October 2006

- 12.45 – 14.15 Registration of Participants: Entry Hall, Palais de l'Europe
- 14.30 – 16.00 Plenary  
*Official opening:* [G. Battaini-Dragoni](#), Director General, Directorate General IV  
*Background and aims of the Conference:* J. Sheils, Head of Language Policy Division ([Text](#) and [Powerpoint](#))  
*A Framework for Languages of Education?:* [J.C. Beacco](#) and M. Byram, Advisers to the Language Policy Division  
*Overview of the Conference programme:* M. Fleming, General Rapporteur  
*Aims and Objectives for Teaching/Learning Language(s) of Education (LE):* [L. Aase](#)  
*Content Considerations for a Framework of Reference for Languages of School Education:* [F. Samihaian](#)
- 16.00 – 16.30 Break
- Chair : W. Martyniuk Plenary (ctd.)  
Discussion on aims and contents
- 16.30 – 18.00 *Evaluation and Assessment:* [M. Fleming](#)  
Discussion  
*National policies for Language(s) of Education: Two case studies*  
- Switzerland: [O. Maradan](#)  
- Norway: [J. Berntzen](#)  
Summary of proceedings and of next day's programme: M. Fleming
- 18.15 COCKTAIL – Salon bleu

#### Tuesday, 17 October 2006

- Chair: J.C. Beacco Plenary  
Summary of results of a questionnaire on curricula
- 9.00 – 9.30 Introduction to Group Work 1
- 9.30 – 11.00 *Group work 1: "Exploration of issues"*  
*Group A : Room 5 ; Group B : Room 6 ; Group C : Room 14*
- 11.00 – 11.30 Break

Chair : M. Fleming	<u>Plenary</u> <i>Introduction:</i> M. Fleming
11.30 – 12.30	<i>Languages Across the Curriculum:</i> <a href="#">H. Vollmer</a> <i>Socially disadvantaged learners in Flanders:</i> <a href="#">P. van Avermaet</a> Discussion
12.30 – 14.30	Lunch
Chair : M. Byram	<u>Plenary</u> Reports from Group Work 1
14.30 – 15.00	<i>DESI Project</i> , Germany: G. Nold ( <a href="#">Text</a> and <a href="#">Powerpoint</a> )
15.00 – 16.00	<i>HarmoS Project</i> , Switzerland (Developing a model of competences for the language(s) of education): <a href="#">A.M. Broi</a> <i>Literature and “Bildung”</i> : <a href="#">I. Pieper</a> Introduction to Group Work 2
16.00 – 16.30	Break
16.30 – 18.00	<i>Group work 2: “Towards a framework of reference”</i> <i>Group A</i> : Room 5 ; <i>Group B</i> : Room 6 ; <i>Group C</i> : Room 14

### Wednesday, 18 October 2006

Chair: J. Sheils	<u>Plenary</u>
9.00 – 10.30	Reports from Group Work 2 <i>The OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA):</i> <a href="#">J. De Jong</a> <i>European Frameworks of Reference for Language Competences:</i> <a href="#">W. Martyniuk</a>
10.30 – 11.00	Break (Coffee, tea, juices and pastries offered in front of Room 5)
11.00 - 12.30	<u>Plenary Discussion:</u> <i>Possible elements and issues for a reference framework:</i> M. Byram and J.C. Beacco <i>Conclusions and perspectives:</i> <a href="#">J. Sheils</a> <i>Invitation to next Conference</i> (Prague, 8-10 November 2007): I. Maskova Close of Conference

## Appendix 2: List of preliminary studies

### SECTION 1

AUTHOR	TITLE
1. Helmut VOLLMER	<a href="#"><i>Towards a Common European Instrument for Language(s) of Education</i></a>
2. Laila AASE	<a href="#"><i>Aims in the Teaching/Learning of Language(s) of Education (LE)</i></a>
3. Florentina SAMIHAIAN	<a href="#"><i>Content considerations for a framework of reference for Language(s) of School Education</i></a>
4. Michael FLEMING	<a href="#"><i>Evaluation and Assessment</i></a>
5. Helmut VOLLMER	<a href="#"><i>Languages across the curriculum</i></a>
6. Waldek MARTYNIUK	<a href="#"><i>European Frameworks of Reference for Language Competences</i></a>
7. Irene PIEPER	<a href="#"><i>The teaching of literature</i></a>

### SECTION 2

AUTHOR	TITLE
8. Michael FLEMING	<a href="#"><i>The Teaching of Language as School Subject: Theoretical Influences</i></a>
9. Piet VAN AVERMAET	<a href="#"><i>Socially Disadvantaged Learners and Languages of Education</i></a>
10. Cornelia ROSEBROCK	<a href="#"><i>Socio-economic Background and Reading. Reading attitudes, fluency and literary education in the German Hauptschule</i></a>
11. Werner KNAPP	<a href="#"><i>Language and learning disadvantages of learners with a migrant background in Germany</i></a> <a href="#"><i>Deutsche Originalfassung</i></a>
12. Raimonda JARIENE and Audrone RAZMANTIENE	<a href="#"><i>The influence of pupils' socio-economic background on achievements in reading and writing skills</i></a>
13. Lorraine LEESON	<a href="#"><i>Signed Languages in Education in Europe</i></a>
14. Michael BYRAM	<a href="#"><i>Languages and identities</i></a>

### **Appendix 3: List of participants**

#### NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES / REPRESENTANTS NATIONAUX

##### ALBANIA / ALBANIE

Ms Suzana TABAKU

Curriculum Development Directorate, Albanian Ministry of Education and Science, Rruga e Durrësit No.23, TIRANA

Tel.: + 355 4222707-249 / E-mail: [stabaku@mash.gov.al](mailto:stabaku@mash.gov.al)

WL/LT: E

##### ANDORRA / ANDORRE

Mme Francesca JUNYENT MONTAGNE

Inspectrice, Ministère de l'Education, Jeunesse i Esports, C/ver Bonaventura Armengol 6-8,

ANDORRA LA VELLA

Tel: + 376 866 585 / Fax: + 376 861 229/376 864 341 / Email: [fjunyent.gov@andorra.ad](mailto:fjunyent.gov@andorra.ad)

WL/LT: F/E

Mme Teresa CAIRAT

Directrice du département d'études techniques, Ministeri d'Educacio i Formacio Professional, Av. Rocafort 21-23, Edifici del Moli, Sant Julià de Lòria, Principauté d'Andorre

Tel: + 376 743300 / Email : [teresa\\_cairat@govern.ad](mailto:teresa_cairat@govern.ad)

WL/LT: F

##### ARMENIA / ARMENIE

Mr Nerses GEVORGYAN

Adviser to the Minister of Education and Science of Armenia, 1 Terian Str, Room 24, YEREVAN 375010

Tel.: +3741534464 / E-mail: [nerses.gevorgyan@fulbrightweb.org](mailto:nerses.gevorgyan@fulbrightweb.org)

WL/LT: E

##### AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE

Ms Anna LASSELSBERGER

Bundesrealgymnasium 15 (European High School), Henriettenplatz 6, A - 1150 WIEN

Tel: +43 1 8936743 / Fax: 43 1 8936743 22 / E-mail: [anna.lasselsberger@gmx.at](mailto:anna.lasselsberger@gmx.at)

WL/LT: E

Mr Günther ABUJA  
Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum, Zentrum für  
Schulversuche und Schulentwicklung  
Abt. III, Hans-Sachs-Gasse 3, A - 8010 GRAZ  
Tel. +43 31682415017 / E-mail : [abuja@sprachen.ac.at](mailto:abuja@sprachen.ac.at)  
WL/LT : E

### BELGIQUE

#### French Community / Communauté française

Mme Monique DENYER  
22 Avenue des Bonniers, B - 1180 BRUXELLES  
Tel: +32 2 346 50 62 / E-mail: [monique.denyer@cfwb.be](mailto:monique.denyer@cfwb.be)  
WL/LT: F

#### Flemish Community / Communauté flammande

Ms Hilde Vanderheyden  
Curriculum Department (formerly: Department for Educational  
Development), Advisor,  
Departement Onderwijs, Hendrik Consciencegebouw, Koning Albert II laan  
15 (2 C 05),  
1210 Brussels  
Tel: +32 2 553 88 30 / Fax: +32 2 553 88 35 / e-mail:  
[hilde.vanderheyden@ond.vlaanderen.be](mailto:hilde.vanderheyden@ond.vlaanderen.be)  
WL/LT: E

### BULGARIA / BULGARIE

Ms Neda KRISTANOVA (*Apologised for absence / Excusée*)  
Director of Center for Control and Assessment of Quality in Education  
(CKOKO), 125, Tsarigradsko shosse, Blvd., bl.5, BG - 1113 SOFIA  
Tel: 359 2 970 5615 / E-mail: [n.kristanova@minedu.government.bg](mailto:n.kristanova@minedu.government.bg)  
WL/LT: E

### CROATIA / CROATIE

Mr Srećko LISTEŠ  
Senior Advisor for Croatian language, Institute of Education, Branch office  
Split, Tolstojeva 31, 21 000 SPLIT  
Tel: +385 21 340 995 / E-mail: [srecko.listes@zss.hr](mailto:srecko.listes@zss.hr)  
WL/LT: E



Ms Alida MATKOVIC

Ministry of Education and Sports, Department for Multilateral Co-operation, Strossmayerov trg 4,

10 000 Zagreb / CROATIA

Tel.: +385 1 45 94 552 /451 / Fax: 385 1 48 19 331 / E-mail:

[alida.matkovic@mzos.hr](mailto:alida.matkovic@mzos.hr)

WL/LT: E/F

#### CYPRUS / CHYPRE

Mr Nikos PENTARAS

Department of Elementary Education, Ministry of Education and Culture  
, Kimon and Thucydides Streets, 1434 NICOSIA

Tel: 357 22800929 (office) / Fax: 357 22305126 / E-mail:

[npentaras@cytanet.com.cy](mailto:npentaras@cytanet.com.cy)

WL/LT: E

#### CZECH REPUBLIC

Ms Irena MASKOVA

Department for International Relations, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, 7, Karmelitska,

118 12 PRAHA 1

Tel: 420 257 193 611 / Fax: 420 257 193 397 / E-mail: [maskova@msmt.cz](mailto:maskova@msmt.cz)

WL/LT: E

Ms Kamila SLADKOVSKÁ

Research Institute of Education , Novodvorská 1010/14, 142 01 PRAGUE 4

Tel: 420 261 341 461 / Fax: 420 261 341 480 / E-mail:

[sladkovska@vuppraha.cz](mailto:sladkovska@vuppraha.cz)

WL/LT: E

#### DENMARK / DANEMARK

Apologised for absence / Excusé

#### ESTONIA / ESTONIE

Mr Jaak VILLER

Head of Language Policy Department, Ministry of Education and Research,  
Munga 18, 50088 TARTU

Tel: 372 735221 / Fax: 372 735220 / E-mail: [jaak.viller@hm.ee](mailto:jaak.viller@hm.ee)

WL/LT: E

Ms Auli UDDE

Head of General Education Curriculum and Examination Department,  
National Examination and Qualification Centre, Sakala 21, 10141 TALLINN

Tel: 372 735 0610 / Fax: 372735 0600 / E-mail: [auli.udde@ekk.edu.ee](mailto:auli.udde@ekk.edu.ee)

WL/LT: E

Ms Irene KÄOSAAR

Head of Language Immersion Centre, Non-Estonians' Integration  
Foundation, Kihnu 1, 13913 TALLINN

Tel: 372 605 7253 / Fax: 372 605 7251 / E-mail: [irene@kke.ee](mailto:irene@kke.ee)

WL/LT: E

### FINLAND / FINLANDE

Ms Pirjo SINKO

Counsellor of Education, National Board of Education, P.O. Box 380, FIN -  
00531 HELSINKI

Tel: 358 9 7747 7281 / Fax: 358 9 7747 7823 / E-mail: [pirjo.sinko@oph.fi](mailto:pirjo.sinko@oph.fi)

WL/LT: E

### FRANCE

M. Paul RAUCY

Inspecteur général de l'éducation nationale du groupe des lettres, 107  
rue de Grenelle, 75007 PARIS

Tel: +33 1 55 55 34 54 / Fax: 33 (0)1 55 55 13 73 / E-mail:

[paul.raucy@education.gouv.fr](mailto:paul.raucy@education.gouv.fr)

WL/LT: F

M. Gérard BONNET

Chef du bureau des relations internationales, Direction de l'enseignement  
scolaire du ministère de l'éducation nationale, de l'enseignement  
supérieur et de la recherche, 107 rue de Grenelle, 75007 PARIS

Tel : +33 1 55 55 08 98 / Email : [gerard.bonnet@education.gouv.fr](mailto:gerard.bonnet@education.gouv.fr)

WL/LT: F

M. Jean-Marie GAUTHEROT (Observer / Observateur)

21, rue Jacob Mayer, F 67200 Strasbourg

Tel.: +33 3 88 27 34 71 / E-mail : [jmgautherot@noos.fr](mailto:jmgautherot@noos.fr)

WL/LT: F

### GEORGIA / GEORGIE

Mr Kakha GABUNIA

Georgian language and Literature Curriculum group coordinator, Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia, Vazha-fshavela av., VI distr., 1 a - blok. N33, TBILISI

Tel: +995 77 53 73 11 / Fax: +995 32 77 47 63 / E-mail:

[kaxagabunia@yahoo.com](mailto:kaxagabunia@yahoo.com)

WL/LT: E

### GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Mr Christof K. ARNOLD

Landesinstitut für Schule und Ausbildung (L.I.S.A.), Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Ellerried 5,  
D - 19061 SCHWERIN

Tel: +49 385 / 7601719 / Fax: +49 385 / 711 188 / E-mail: [c.arnold@lisa-](mailto:c.arnold@lisa-mv.de)

[mv.de](mailto:c.arnold@lisa-mv.de)

WL/LT: E

Mr Hermann RUCH

Studiendirektor, Staatsinstitut für Schulqualität und Bildungsforschung, Schellingstraße 155,  
D - 80797 MÜNCHEN

Tel: +49 89 2170 2237 / Fax: +49 89 2170 2205 / E-mail:

[hermann.ruch@isb.bayern.de](mailto:hermann.ruch@isb.bayern.de)

WL/LT: E

### GREECE / GRECE

Ms Stavroula PSALIDAKOU

School Advisor of the Greek Language in Secondary Education, National Inspector of the European Schools in Secondary Education, 63 AB, Kanari Str, 18537 Piraeus, Greece

Tel: +30 210 45 34 968 / Fax: +30 210 45 34 968 / Email:

[nikmakris\\_mld@altecnet.gr](mailto:nikmakris_mld@altecnet.gr)

WL/LT: E

### HUNGARY / HONGRIE

Mme Zsuzsa HORVÁTH

Institut National de l'Enseignement Public, OKI, Dorottya utca 8., H - 1051 BUDAPEST

Tel: +36 1 235 7279 / E-mail: [horvathzs@oki.hu](mailto:horvathzs@oki.hu)

WL/LT: F

#### IRELAND / IRLANDE

Mr Diarmuid DULLAGHAN

Primary Inspector, Department of Education and Science, Regional Development Centre, Dundalk Institute of Technology, Dublin Road, DUNDALK, CO. LOUTH

Tel: +42 9381791 / E-mail: [diarmuidodeall@eircom.net](mailto:diarmuidodeall@eircom.net)

WL/LT: E

#### ITALY / ITALIE

Ms Anna PIPERNO

Ministry Inspector, Via Leonardo Greppi, 57, 00149 Roma

Tel: +39 06 58492845 / Fax: +39 06 58492863 Email:

[anna.piperno@istruzione.it](mailto:anna.piperno@istruzione.it)

WL/LT: E

Mme Marisa CAVALLI (Apologised for absence / Excusée)

Représentant de l'IRRE-VDA, Institut Régional de Recherche Educative pour le Val d'Aoste, Département de la Recherche Educative, 24, Avenue du Bataillon "Aosta", I - 11100 AOSTE

Tel: (standard): 39 0165 367 111 / (appel direct): 39 0165 367 115 / Fax: 39 0165 23 52 23 /

E-mail: [m.cavalli@irre-vda.org](mailto:m.cavalli@irre-vda.org)

WL/LT: F

#### LATVIA / LETTONIE

Ms Zaiga SNEIBE

Ministry of Education and Science, Valnu Street 2, LV- 1050 RIGA

Tel: +371 7047907 / E-mail: [zaiga.sneibe@izm.gov.lv](mailto:zaiga.sneibe@izm.gov.lv)

WL/LT: E

Ms Olita ARKLE

Ministry of Education and Science, Centre for Curriculum Development and Examinations, Valnu Street 2, LV- 1050 RIGA

Telephone: +371 7216500 / Fax: +371 7223801 / E-mail:

[olita.arkle@isec.gov.lv](mailto:olita.arkle@isec.gov.lv)

WL/LT: E

#### LIECHTENSTEIN / LIECHTENSTEIN

Apologised for absence / Excusé

## LITHUANIA / LITUANIE

Ms Audrone RAZMANTIENE

Senior official of the Lower and Upper, Secondary Education Division,  
Ministry of Education and Science,

A.Volano g. 2/7, VILNIUS 2691

Tel: +370 5 2743149 / Fax: 370 5. 2612077 / E-

mail: [audrone.razmantiene@smm.lt](mailto:audrone.razmantiene@smm.lt)

WL/LT: E

## LUXEMBOURG

M. Robi BRACHMOND

Responsable des projets linguistiques de l'enseignement primaire,  
Ministère de l'Education nationale et de la Formation professionnelle, 29,  
rue Aldringen, L - 2926 LUXEMBOURG

Tel: +352 478-5931 / Fax: 352 478-5123 / E-mail:

[robi.brachmond@men.lu](mailto:robi.brachmond@men.lu)

WL/LT: F

M. Marc WEYDERT

Coordinateur des projets linguistiques, Service de coordination de la  
recherche et de l'innovation  
pédagogiques et technologiques, Ministère de l'Education nationale et de  
la Formation professionnelle,

29, rue Aldringen, L - 2926 LUXEMBOURG

Tel: +352 478-5148 / Fax: 352 478-5137 / E-mail: [marc.weydert@men.lu](mailto:marc.weydert@men.lu)

WL/LT: F

Mme Denise BESCH

Professeure-attachée au Ministère de la Culture, Section Littérature,  
Conseil Permanent de la langue luxembourgeoise 20, montée de la  
Pétrusse, L- 2912 Luxembourg

Tél : (352) 478.86.13 / Fax : 29.21.86 / E-mail :

[denise.besch@mcesr.etat.lu](mailto:denise.besch@mcesr.etat.lu)

WL/LT: F

#### MALTA / MALTE

Mr Raymond CAMILLERI

Director Curriculum Management, Education Division, Great Siege Road,  
FLORIANA, MALTA CMR 02

Tel: +356 2598 2480/ 356 21 245178 / Fax: 356 21 220639 / E-mail:

[raymond.j.camilleri@gov.mt](mailto:raymond.j.camilleri@gov.mt)

WL/LT: E

#### MOLDOVA

Ms Nadejda VELISCO

Head of the Pre-university Education Division of the Ministry of  
Education, Youth and Sports , 1 Piata Marii Adunari Nationale, MD-2033  
CHISINAU

Tel: +373 22 232 443 / Fax: 373 22 233 283 / 373 22 233 515 / E-mail:

[preuniversitar@edu.md](mailto:preuniversitar@edu.md)

WL/LT: E

#### MONACO

M. Jean-Pilippe VINCI

8 rue Princesse, 75006 PARIS

E-mail: [jpvmc@wanadoo.fr](mailto:jpvmc@wanadoo.fr)

WL/LT: F

#### NORWAY / NORVEGE

Ms Jorunn BERNTZEN

Senior Adviser, Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, Postboks  
8119 Dep., N - 0032 OSLO

Tel: +47 22 24 73 95 (direct) / Fax: 47 22 24 727 31 / E-mail:

[Jbe@kd.dep.no](mailto:Jbe@kd.dep.no)

WL/LT: E

#### POLAND / POLOGNE

Ms Barbara CZARNECKA-CICHA

Chief of Baccalaureate Division, Central Board of Examinations, ul. Łucka  
11, PL - 00-842 WARSAW

Tel: +48 22 656 37 18 / Fax +48 22 656 37 57 / E-mail [cke05@cke.edu.pl](mailto:cke05@cke.edu.pl)

WL/LT: E

Ms Barbara SKACZKOWSKA

Advisor to the Minister in the Ministry of National Education, al. Szucha  
25, PL -00-918 WARSAW

Tel: +48 22 34.74.629 / Fax: 48 22 34.74 253 / E-mail

[barbara.skaczowska@mein.gov.pl](mailto:barbara.skaczowska@mein.gov.pl)

WL/LT: F

### PORTUGAL

Mme Regina DUARTE

Ministère de l'Education du Portugal, Responsable pédagogique pour le  
curriculum de la langue portugaise Direcção-Geral de Inovação e de  
Desenvolvimento Curricular, Av. 24 de Julho, nº140, 1399-025 Lisboa

Tel : +213934598 / Fax: +213934685 / Mail: [regina.duarte@dgidc.min-edu.pt](mailto:regina.duarte@dgidc.min-edu.pt)

WL/LT : F

Ms Maria Anália GOMES

Direcção Geral de Inovação e de Desenvolvimento Curricular, Av. 24 de  
Julho, 140, P - 1399-025 LISBOA

Tel: +351 21 3934581/ fax: +351 21 3934685 / E-mail :

[analina.gomes@dgidc.min-edu.pt](mailto:analina.gomes@dgidc.min-edu.pt)

WL/LT: E/F

### ROMANIA / ROUMANIE

Ms Florentina SAMIHAIAN

National Board for Curriculum, National Board for Curriculum, str. Carei  
nr. 1, bl. A11, sc. A, et. 6, ap. 38, sector 2, 022201 - BUCURESTI

Tel: 40 255 4799 / Fax: +40 210 8692 / E-mail: [tinasamihaian@gmail.com](mailto:tinasamihaian@gmail.com)

WL/LT: E

Ms Mina RUSU

Ministère de l'Education et de la Recherche

28-30, rue du General Berthelot, secteur 1, 010168 - BUCURESTI

Email : [mina.rusu@mec.edu.ro](mailto:mina.rusu@mec.edu.ro)

WL/LT : E/F

#### RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE RUSSIE

Ms Irina KHALEEVA (Apologised for absence / Excusée)  
Rector, Moscow State Linguistic University (MSLU), Ostozhenka 38, 119  
992 MOSCOW  
Tel: 7 095 245 1821/ 7 095 245 2786 / 7 095 246 8603 / Fax: 7095 246  
2807/8366  
Email: [khaleeva@linguanet.ru](mailto:khaleeva@linguanet.ru)  
WL/LT: E

Mr Vladimir MINKEVICH  
Head of the Division on International Co-operation, Moscow State  
Linguistic University (MSLU),  
Ostozhenka 38, 119 992 MOSCOW  
Tel: 7 095 245 1821/7 095 245 2786 / 7 095 246 8603 / Fax: 7095 246  
2807/8366  
E-mail: [khaleeva@linguanet.ru](mailto:khaleeva@linguanet.ru)  
WL/LT: E

#### SLOVAK REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE

Ms Darina DE JAEGER  
Statny pedagogicky ustav, Pluhova 8, P.O.Box 26, SK - 830 00 BRATISLAVA  
Tel.: +421 2 49276 308 / Fax.: +421 2 49276 195 / E-mail:  
[Jaegher@statpedu.sk](mailto:Jaegher@statpedu.sk) / web: [www.statpedu.sk](http://www.statpedu.sk)  
WL/LT: F

#### SLOVENIA / SLOVENIE

Ms Bronka STRAUS  
Senior Adviser, Department of International Cooperation and European  
Affairs, Ministry of Education and Sport, Department for international co-  
operation in education, Trg. OF 13, 1000 LJUBLJANA  
Tel: +386 1 252 81 88 / Fax: +386 1 42 54 760 / E-mail:  
[bronka.straus@gov.si](mailto:bronka.straus@gov.si)  
WL/LT: E/F

Ms Ljudmila IVŠEK  
Counsellor for the Slovenian Language, National Institute of Education,  
Zavod RS za solstvo,  
Poljanska c. 28, 1000 LJUBLJANA  
Tel: +386 1 300 51 37 / Fax: +386 1 300 51 99 / E-mail:  
[ljudmila.ivsek@zrss.si](mailto:ljudmila.ivsek@zrss.si)  
WL/LT: E



### SPAIN / ESPAGNE

Ms Pilar PÉREZ ESTEVE

Directora de Programa, Dirección General de Cooperación Territorial y Alta Inspección,

Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, Los Madrazo 15-17, Madrid 28071

Tel.: +34 630452019 / E-mail: [pilar.pereze@mec.es](mailto:pilar.pereze@mec.es)

WL/LT: E

### SWEDEN / SUEDE

Mr Tommy LAGERGREN

National Agency for Education, S - 106 20 STOCKHOLM

Tel: +46-8-5273 3212 / Fax: +46 8 24 44 20 / E-mail:

[tommy.lagergren@skolverket.se](mailto:tommy.lagergren@skolverket.se)

WL/LT: E

### SWITZERLAND / SUISSE

M. Olivier MARADAN

Secrétaire général adjoint, Responsable de l'unité de coordination "scolarité obligatoire", CDIP/EDK, Zähringerstrasse 25, Case postale 5975, CH- 3001 BERNE

Tel: 41 31 309 51 11 / Fax: 41 31 309 51 50 / E-mail: [maradan@edk.ch](mailto:maradan@edk.ch) / <http://www.cdip.ch>

WL/LT: F

M. Peter SIEBER

Pädagogische Hochschule Zürich, Prorektorat Fachbereiche, Hirschengraben 28, CH - 8090 Zürich

Tel: +41 43 305 51 46 / Fax: +41 (0)43 305 54 55 / Email: [peter.sieber@phzh.ch](mailto:peter.sieber@phzh.ch)

WL/LT: F

### TURKEY / TURQUIE

Mr. Alp BOYDAK

Member of Board of Education, Ministry of National Education, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı, Teknikokullar 06500, ANKARA

Tel.: +90 312 215 20 56 / Fax: +90 312 213 78 36 / 00 90 312 213 3962 /

E-mail: [aboydak@meb.gov.tr](mailto:aboydak@meb.gov.tr); [aboydak@yahoo.com.tr](mailto:aboydak@yahoo.com.tr)

WL/LT: E

UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Ms Sue HORNER

Head of Curriculum Development, Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 83 Piccadilly, UK - LONDON

W1J 8QA

Tel: +44 207 509 5733 / E-mail: [horners@qca.org.uk](mailto:horners@qca.org.uk)

WL/LT: E

Mr Paul WRIGHT

English Adviser, Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 83 Piccadilly, UK - LONDON W1J 8QA

Tel: +44 207 509 5853 / E-mail: [wrightp@qca.org.uk](mailto:wrightp@qca.org.uk)

WL/LT: E

Scientific Committee / Comité scientifique

Mr Mike FLEMING

General Rapporteur, School of Education, University of Durham, Leazes Road, UK - DURHAM DH1 1TA, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail: [m.p.fleming@durham.ac.uk](mailto:m.p.fleming@durham.ac.uk)

M. Jean-Claude BEACCO

Conseiller de programme auprès de la Division des Politiques linguistiques, Université de la Sorbonne nouvelle-Paris III, 46 rue Saint Jacques, 75230 PARIS Cedex, FRANCE

Tel: 33 (0)1 40 46 29 25/29 28/29 29 / Fax: 33 (0)1 40 46 29 30 /

E-mail: [Jean-Claude.Beacco@univ-paris3.fr](mailto:Jean-Claude.Beacco@univ-paris3.fr)

Mr Michael BYRAM

Programme Adviser for the Language Policy Division, University of Durham, School of Education, Leazes Road, UK - DURHAM DH1 1TA, UNITED KINGDOM

Tel: 44 191 374 35 30/35 05 / Fax: 44 191 374 35 06 / E-mail:

[m.s.byram@durham.ac.uk](mailto:m.s.byram@durham.ac.uk)

Ms Laila AASE

Nordisk institutt, Universitetet i Bergen, Sydnesplassen 7, N - 5007 BERGEN, NORWAY

Tel: 47 55 58 24 39 / E-mail: [Laila.Aase@nor.uib.no](mailto:Laila.Aase@nor.uib.no)

Ms Florentina SAMIHAIAN

National Board for Curriculum, National Board for Curriculum, str. Carei nr. 1, bl. A11, sc. A, et. 6, ap. 38, sector 2, 022201 - BUCURESTI, ROMANIA  
Tel: +40 255 4799 / Fax: 40 210 8692 / E-mail: [tinasamihaian@gmail.com](mailto:tinasamihaian@gmail.com)

Mr Helmut VOLLMER

Universität Osnabrück, FB 7: Sprach-u.Lit.wiss, Leiter der Forschungsstelle, Bilingualismus und Mehrsprachigkeit, Neuer Graben 40, D-49069 OSNABRÜCK, GERMANY

Tel: +49 541 9694260 / Fax: +49 541 969 4886 / E-mail: [hvollmer@uni-osnabrueck.de](mailto:hvollmer@uni-osnabrueck.de)

Invited Experts / Experts invités

Mme Anne-Marie BROI

Rue de l'Ecluse 67, CH - 2000 NEUCHÂTEL, SUISSE, E-mail : [Anne-Marie.Broi@ne.ch](mailto:Anne-Marie.Broi@ne.ch)

M. Daniel COSTE

Professeur émérite de l'Ecole normale supérieure Lettres et Sciences humaines de Lyon, 17 rue Plumet, 75015 PARIS

Tel: +33 (0)1 56 58 18 60 / Fax: +33 (0)1 56 58 18 60 / e-mail:

[dlcoste2@wanadoo.fr](mailto:dlcoste2@wanadoo.fr)

WL/LT: F/E

M. Francis GOULLIER

Inspecteur Général de Langues Vivantes, Président du Comité de validation du Portfolio européen des langues / Chair of the ELP Council of Europe Validation Committee

107 rue de Grenelle, 75005 PARIS, FRANCE

Tel: 33 (0)1 55 55 31 45 / E-mail: [francis.goullier@education.gouv.fr](mailto:francis.goullier@education.gouv.fr)

Mr. John DE JONG

Director, Language Testing Services, Oranjestraat 70, 6881 SG Velp, The Netherlands

Tel: +31 (26) 3639 220 / Fax: +31 26 3639 221 / E-mail :

[john.hal.dejong@wxs.nl](mailto:john.hal.dejong@wxs.nl)

Mr Günther NOLD

Professor of Applied Linguistics and ESL/EFL Education, University of Dortmund, Department of English, 44221 Dortmund, GERMANY

Tel: +49 (0)231-755-2910/2911/2919 / Fax: + 49 (0)231-755-5450 /

E-mail: [guenter.nold@uni-dortmund.de](mailto:guenter.nold@uni-dortmund.de)

Mr Sigmund ONGSTAD

Faculty of Education, Oslo University College, Pb 4, St.Olavs plass, N-0130  
OSLO, NORWAY

Tel: +47 22 45 21 82 / Fax: (47) 22 45 21 35 / E-mail:

[Sigmund.Ongstad@lu.hio.no](mailto:Sigmund.Ongstad@lu.hio.no)

Ms Irene PIEPER

Pädagogische Hochschule Heidelberg; Institut für deutsche Sprache und  
Literatur und ihre Didaktik

Symposion Deutschdidaktik

Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität - Moerfelder Landstr. 215, D-60 598  
FRANKFURT/M

Tel: +49 69 63 30 78 10 / E-mail: [i.pieper@em.uni-frankfurt.de](mailto:i.pieper@em.uni-frankfurt.de)

Mr Rolf SCHÄRER

Gottlieb Binderstrasse 45, CH - 8802 KILCHBERG, SWITZERLAND

Tel: 41 1 715 32 90 / Fax: +41 1 715 32 72 / E-mail: [info@rolfschaerer.ch](mailto:info@rolfschaerer.ch)

Mr Piet VAN AVERMAET

University of Ghent, Centre for Intercultural Education, St.-

Pietersnieuwstraat 49, B-9000 GENT, BELGIUM

Tel: +32 9 2647047 / E-mail: [Piet.VanAvermaet@UGent.be](mailto:Piet.VanAvermaet@UGent.be)

Mr Piet-Hein VAN DE VEN

ILS, Graduate School of Education, Radboud University, NIJMEGEN, THE  
NETHERLANDS

Address for correspondence: Heyendaalseweg 141, N02.142, 6525 AJ

NIJMEGEN, THE NETHERLANDS

E-mail: [P.vandeVen@ils.ru.nl](mailto:P.vandeVen@ils.ru.nl) / [Piethein.vandeVen@han.nl](mailto:Piethein.vandeVen@han.nl)

Non-Governmental International Organisations (NGOs) / Organisations  
internationales non-gouvernementales (ONG)

M. Alain MOUCHOUX

Président du Regroupement Education et Culture (Conseil de l'Europe)

Comité Syndical Européen pour l'Education (CSEE),

11, rue Louis Rolland, F-92120 MONTROUGE

Tel. : (mobile) : 0033 (0)676041705 / Fax : 0033 (0)147352794/ E-mail:

[alain.mouchoux@wanadoo.fr](mailto:alain.mouchoux@wanadoo.fr)

Mr Sigmund ONGSTAD

IMEN: <http://www.lu.hio.no/imen> - <http://home.hio.no/~sigmund/>

Oslo University College, NORWAY

Mr Alexandru CRIȘAN

Executive President, Center Education 2000+

Assoc. Professor - Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest, Str.

Caderea Bastiliei, Nr. 33, SECTOR 1, BUCURESTI, ROMANIA, cod 010613

Tel: 4021 212.07.80 / 4021 212.07.81 / Fax: 4021 212.07.79

E-mail: [cedu2000@cedu.ro](mailto:cedu2000@cedu.ro) / E-mail: [acrisan@cedu.ro](mailto:acrisan@cedu.ro)

COUNCIL OF EUROPE / CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE - [www.coe.int](http://www.coe.int)

DIRECTORATE GENERAL IV - EDUCATION, CULTURE AND HERITAGE, YOUTH AND SPORT /  
DIRECTION GÉNÉRALE IV EDUCATION, CULTURE ET PATRIMOINE, JEUNESSE ET SPORT

Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI  
Director General / Directrice Général

DIRECTORATE OF SCHOOL, OUT-OF-SCHOOL AND HIGHER EDUCATION / DIRECTION DE  
L'ÉDUCATION SCOLAIRE, EXTRA-SCOLAIRE ET DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR

Gabriele MAZZA  
Director / Directeur

LANGUAGE POLICY DIVISION - [www.coe.int/lang](http://www.coe.int/lang)

DIVISION DES POLITIQUES LINGUISTIQUES - [www.coe.int/lang/fr](http://www.coe.int/lang/fr)

Joseph SHEILS  
Head of the Language Policy Division / Chef de la Division des Politiques linguistiques  
Tel: 33 (0)3 88 41 20 79 / E-mail: [joseph.sheils@coe.int](mailto:joseph.sheils@coe.int)

Philia THALGOTT  
Administratrice / Administrator  
Tel: 33 (0)3 88 41 26 25 / E-mail: [philia.thalgott@coe.int](mailto:philia.thalgott@coe.int)

Johanna PANTHIER  
Administratrice / Administrator  
Tel: 33 (0)3 88 41 23 84 / E-mail: [johanna.panthier@coe.int](mailto:johanna.panthier@coe.int)

Waldemar MARTYNIUK  
Seconded by Jagiellonian University, Poland / Mis à disposition par l'Université Jagiellonienne, Pologne  
Tel: 33 (0) 3 90 21 54 80 / E-mail: [waldemar.martyniuk@coe.int](mailto:waldemar.martyniuk@coe.int)

Christopher REYNOLDS  
Administrative Assistant / Assistant Administratif  
Tel: 33 (0) 88 41 46 86 / E-mail: [christopher.reynolds@coe.int](mailto:christopher.reynolds@coe.int)

Corinne COLIN  
Secretariat / Secrétariat  
Tel: 33 (0) 3 88 41 35 33 / E-mail: [corinne.colin@coe.int](mailto:corinne.colin@coe.int)

Jodie CLIFFORD  
Secretariat / Secrétariat  
Tel: 33 (0)3 88 41 32 48 / Email: [jodie.clifford@coe.int](mailto:jodie.clifford@coe.int)

INTERPRÈTES / INTERPRETERS

Mme Amanda BEDDOWS

Mme Isabelle MARCHINI

Mme Elisabetta BASSU

#### **Appendix 4: *Preliminary feedback forms***

1. How helpful were the background papers made available before the Conference ?
2. Did you find the case studies/other presentations helpful in understanding the topic?
3. To what degree did the Conference raise or address issues which are relevant to the situation in your country?
4. Were there issues raised during the Conference which you didn't expect?  
If yes, please specify.
5. What are your national/federal priorities at this time in order of importance?
6. How might your country be actively involved in the LE project?  
e.g. if a seminar, please suggest a theme/issue
7. If you wish to suggest individuals/institutions with special expertise, please give full details of kinds of expertise/functions and contact details
8. The Language Policy Division wishes to establish a list of national correspondents for the LE project. Please indicate who should be contacted in the first instance in your country.