



DG IY/EDU/HIST (2003)16

**THIRD NATIONAL STOCKTAKING CONFERENCE ON
HISTORY TEACHING IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION**

St Petersburg, Russian Federation,

20-22 March 2003

Third National Stocktaking Conference on History
Teaching in the Russian Federation

St Petersburg, Russian Federation,
20 - 22 March 2003

John HAMER
Consultant
United Kingdom

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

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	5
II.	THE PRESENTATIONS	7
III.	PROGRESS SINCE 1999	19
IV.	LOOKING FORWARD – FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	24
V.	CONCLUSIONS	26
 APPENDIX I		
	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	27
 APPENDIX II		
	PROGRAMME OF THE CONFERENCE	34
 APPENDIX III		
	PRESENTATIONS	42
	• Dr Ludmila ALEKSASHKINA	42
	• Mr P.A. BARANOV	47
	• Dr Vladimir BATSYN	50
	• Ms Larisa SOKOLOVA	54
	• Mr Arild THORBJORNSEN	63
	• Regions’ Representatives	71
 APPENDIX IV		
	LIST OF ACTIVITIES	75

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Conference, the third in the series, was organised jointly by the Council of Europe, the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation and the International Institute for Educational Innovation at Herzen State Pedagogical University. That the venue chosen for the Conference was St Petersburg in the year when the city was celebrating the 300th anniversary of its foundation was welcomed by several of the speakers as highly appropriate and symbolic.
2. The three broad aims of the Conference were to:
 - (i) evaluate the work carried out since the Second National Stocktaking Conference held in March 1999;
 - (ii) bring together representatives from different parts of the Russian Federation where the Council of Europe has been active, and also to involve history specialists from Japan who have been involved in series of meetings with history educators from the Russian Federation under the auspices of the Council of Europe;
 - (iii) consider possible opportunities for future co-operation, particularly in the initial training of history teachers.
3. The Conference was chaired by Dr Natalia GOROKHOVATSKAYA. Ms Alison CARDWELL, the Head of the History Education Section of the Council of Europe, stressed that this Stocktaking Conference was an important part of the Council's programme on history education. She welcomed the involvement of colleagues from Japan since the time of the previous Conference, and outlined the various Council initiatives on history education in which the Russian Federation had recently participated. The Council's position on history teaching in 21st Century Europe was now defined in the Recommendation adopted by the Committee of Ministers in October 2001. Ms CARDWELL also thanked Finnish Authorities for their contribution for the organisational costs of the Conference.
4. In his welcome to participants, Dr Sergey SMIRNOV, Vice-Rector, Herzen State Pedagogical University, set the tone of the Conference by raising many of the points that were to form the basis of discussion throughout the three days. He identified what he felt were five positive changes in school history teaching in Russia – particularly in St Petersburg - over the past decade as a result of the joint activities of the Council of Europe and the Ministry of Education.
 - (i) Increasingly, teachers are attempting to create an individually-oriented model of education which takes into account pupils' individual differences.
 - (ii) A recognition of the potential of historical education for developing in pupils a sense of patriotism and civic consciousness.

- (iii) A growth in teachers' understanding and classroom, use of new pedagogical techniques, information technology and research methods of teaching.
- (iv) An approach to history education that takes into account the diverse social and cultural values of Russian society and the world.
- (v) History teaching which has as one of its aims that of preparing pupils to play a meaningful and active role in civic society.

Nevertheless, the modernisation of general education in Russia has raised a number of issues about history teaching have yet to be resolved. For example:

- How can we ensure that a society's perception of the past is based upon objective historical knowledge, rather than on myths and views expressed by the mass media?
- The problems associated with developing textbooks that are methodologically secure and will provide pupils with a systematic and coherent body of historical knowledge.
- There has been a considerable increase in the volume of evidence now available for studying world and Russian history, especially the history of the 20th Century. Teachers need to be aware of this if their teaching is to be up-to-date.

II. THE PRESENTATIONS

Over the course of the Conference, 10 plenary presentations were given, five by experts from the Russian Federation and five by Council of Europe and visiting experts. The presentations were grouped around the five main themes of the Conference:

- aspects of co-operation between the Council of Europe and the Russian Federation over the past three years on the teaching of history in secondary schools;
- history curricula and assessment;
- history textbooks and teaching resources;
- regional co-operation in history teaching;
- initial and in-service teacher training.

1. **Co-operation between the Council of Europe and the Russian Federation in teaching history in secondary schools since the Second Stocktaking Conference in 1999.**

- (i) Ms Tatiana MINKINA-MILKO drew attention to the fact that, during the period 1999-2002, the situation in both the Russian Federation and the Council of Europe had changed. The Council of Europe's action plan for history teaching had evolved and was now based on the Recommendation adopted by the Committee of Ministers in October 2001. This reflected the changing and diverse "political architecture" of Europe. History should help us to understand and appreciate cultural, religious and social diversity, and to regard it as an enriching and supporting factor - not a destructive one. For the 21st Century, we need a set of principles for history teaching that will help to unite people. Approaches that will build bridges between countries and continents, not approaches that will promote disunity and enhance conflicts.

During the last three years, the Council of Europe has based its activity in the Russian Federation on developing:

- bilateral cooperation with the many diverse regions that exist within the Russian Federation. During the period of 1999-2002, in co-operation with the Council of Europe, 14 seminars and meeting of experts were organised covering vast geographical area from the North (Petrozavodsk) up to the Far East (Vladivostok);
- specialised programmes for the regions of the Russian Federation;

A Joint Programme of cooperation between the European Commission and the Council of Europe to strengthen democratic stability in the North Caucasus had allowed the organisation of a series of seminars in

that region particularly with the participation of history specialists from Chechnya.

- cooperation in history teaching between neighbouring states and between Russia and Japan;

The International Society for Educational Information (ISEI) and the Council of Europe had been working together on history education since 1999 and the way in which Russia was presented in Japanese history textbooks and vice-versa. The ISEI had also financed a teaching pack on the history of Japan prepared by authors from the Far East of the Russian Federation as supplementary materials for secondary schools in this region.

- wider regional cooperation, for example in projects such as “The Tbilisi Initiative” and “The Black Sea Initiative”;
- Russia’s participation in wider inter-governmental programmes such as “Learning and Teaching about the history of Europe in the 20th Century” and the new Teering Committee for Education Project on the European Dimension in history teaching.

Ms MINKINA-MILKO identified six main trends in the joint work undertaken by the Council of Europe and the Russian Federation since 1999:

- (a) less priority being given to the specific issue of standards; although it still emerged in discussions on, for example, textbooks and in-service teacher training;
- (b) issues related to in-service teacher training, teachers’ motivation to improve the quality of their teaching and the assessment of teachers’ professional abilities had assumed greater prominence;
- (c) there had been a considerable amount of work on the preparation of new textbooks on world and national history, and on how textbooks might be improved and made more interesting. Some of this work involved pupils from upper-secondary schools taking part in the discussions;
- (d) consideration of the use of new technologies and their potential contribution to history teaching;
- (e) an emphasis on looking at ways of assessing pupils’ knowledge and skills in history effectively;
- (f) work on the content of history teaching in the Russian Federation. Discussions on, for example - how to strengthen democratic stability, tolerance and peacemaking processes through history teaching; how to select and present recent events in history textbooks; how to overcome presenting history in terms of stereotypes.

- (ii) At the 1999 National Stocktaking Conference, Dr Vladimir BATSYN had expressed the hope that, in three years' time, it would be possible to point to significant changes in the quality of history education and to a continuing strengthening of the co-operation with the Council of Europe. Although history teaching in Russia is still going through a period of transition, he felt that much had been achieved. For example, an effective working relationship between the Ministry of Education, the regions and the Council of Europe was now more firmly established. This had created a strong foundation on which to build further joint activities in the future. Since the early 1990s, there had been significant improvements in the style and content of history textbooks – in particular in the way in which the history of the Soviet period is presented and the range of views that are represented.

Nevertheless, history education in Russia still faced three fundamental issues:

- (a) whilst, in some ways, their task had become clearer, Russian history teachers – along with history teachers in other countries – had to tackle the problem of a rapidly changing world. Looked at on a global scale, issues that may once have appeared to be resolved now seemed vague and obscure;
- (b) there is a lack of coherence in school history education. No expert community exists that might provide a more co-ordinated and structured approach. Responsibility for determining standards, producing textbooks and evaluating what is effective and what is not effective is divided amongst a range of specialists and writers;
- (c) although the various Council of Europe seminars that have taken place have been valuable and influential, they alone are insufficient to bring about the re-construction and development that are needed. This re-construction of historical education needs to be undertaken by Russia and its regions as an inter-active and communal effort. It should not, as may have been the case in the past, be a process whereby decisions are taken solely at the top and merely handed down.

Previous seminars had addressed a number of important topics. Looking to the future, what should be the agenda? Dr BATSYN identified:

- how to build a hierarchy of goals of historical education, and how to assess their achievement;
- given that history teaching involves the transmission of values from one generation to the next, what values should a course in history transmit? How are historical values related to other kinds of values, for example ethno-cultural ones?
- How far should history teaching and history examining focus on the history of Russia to the exclusion of the history of the wider world?
- What do the notions of the “European dimension” and the ‘Asian dimension’ signify for the teaching of Russian history?

- How far should we involve pupils in historiographical problems?
- Is it possible to train pupils to think historically without overloading them with factual information?

Dr BATSYN stressed that this was a stocktaking conference – an important stage in the on-going process of development and evaluation. He expressed the hope that, in another three years' time, it would be possible to be confident that further progress had been made towards the goal of improving the quality of history teaching and history textbooks.

2. Curricula on history teaching and the system of assessment of pupils' knowledge and skills

- (i) Dr Ludmila ALEXASHKINA echoed other speakers in acknowledging that the last decade of the 20th Century had seen considerable changes in Russian schools: for example - the transition from a rigid and centralised system of school education, and the introduction of diverse programmes of study and a wide range of textbooks. This had raised issues about maintaining a unified educational environment, and the need to determine what should be the basic and compulsory content of education. Further development of educational standards should help to resolve such issues.

The first version of the standards on general educational subjects, including history, were developed by the Institute of General Secondary Education of the Russian Academy of Education in 1993. The history standards require that pupils:

- have chronological and factual knowledge;
- work with sources;
- describe, analyse and explain the causes and consequences of historical events;
- have a knowledge of historical terms and concepts;
- are able to examine different historical versions and opinions.

The new stage of work on educational standards started in 2001-2002, although this has not involved developing new ideas or methodology. A particular issue for history has been the attempt to include in the content of the standards the names of significant historical figures. This has raised concerns about the criteria for selection. On the whole, the new stage of work has not resulted in any notable achievements.

Dr ALEXASHKINA then outlined the requirements of the unified state exams in history which had been introduced into Russian schools in 2001. The introduction of the examinations had been preceded by a considerable amount of work on identifying common approaches and developing test materials. All the questions on history, as well as other humanities subjects, aroused considerable public interest. They test not only historical knowledge, but also pupils' cognitive capabilities and their ability to work with historical sources and interpretations.

The examination in history is optional. It was first put into practice on an experimental basis in the Chuvash Republic in 2001, and was taken by 94 pupils. In 2002, the examination was carried out in six regions, with 6,594 pupils. For 2003, there have been requests from 48 regions. It was possible to draw a number of conclusions from the 2002 examination. On the whole, the structure and content of the test meet the requirements; but there were several aspects which needed improving – particularly those tasks requiring a detailed and subjective response. These are difficult to mark. For 2003, the structure of one part of the examination was modified.

Dr ALEXASHKINA felt that the work carried out in 2001-2003 on developing testing materials for the united state examination in history marked a considerable step forward towards resolving a whole range of issues connected with the content of school history education.

- (ii) Mr Arild THORBJØRNSSEN began his presentation by noting that, in Norway, the overall aim for the teaching of social studies, including history, was to give students the opportunity to develop what he termed “a broad competence” in order to prepare them to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world. A broad concept of competence implies:

- knowing about alternatives and being able to explain them;
- being able to act with consideration and responsibility;
- being able to reflect about ,and state the reason for, one’s actions;
- being able to act in accordance with one’s intentions

To achieve this, the learning environment must present both subject related and social challenges. Fundamental to the learning process and to the development of a broad competence are - active learning, problem solving and confidence in one’s ability to succeed.

Rather than specifying details of content, the Norwegian curriculum is a framework based on rather wide objectives which identifies the competencies students are expected to gain. It is divided in two main parts - the Core Curriculum and Study Programmes (or subject syllabuses). The Core Curriculum describes the objectives the student is to work towards within a framework of six different “types” of human being – the spiritual, the creative, the working, the liberally educated, the socially and the environmentally aware. Together these lead to the development of an ordered whole – “The Integrated Human Being”.

Mr THORBJØRNSSEN argued, however, that what was important about the curriculum was not the written document, but what takes place in the classrooms in the schools. He stressed that curriculum development is a never-ending process. Both teachers and curriculum planners needed to consider a number of perspectives when decisions about study programmes and guidelines for assessment were being made.

- The ideas behind the curriculum (political, educational, pedagogical);
- The formal curriculum (the official documents);
- The curriculum as it is understood by the teachers;
- The operational curriculum (actual classroom practice);
- The hidden curriculum (messages received by the pupils, content, methods, interaction, teacher attitude, educational practice).

Assessment of pupils' attainment in history is based partly on work done during the year, and partly on an end of year examination which pupils may take individually or as a group. This is an oral examination set by the teacher and marked by the teacher and an external examiner. There are no national standards for history – nor for other subjects. Assessment criteria are related to curricular aims. The most important aspects of assessment on which to focus Mr THORBJØRNSSEN suggested, are not detailed knowledge but rather – enabling pupils to work as part of a group; and encouraging them to have a lifelong interest in history.

3. The preparation and publication of new history textbooks and teaching resources

- (i) In her presentation, Ms Larisa SOKOLOVA noted that the approach to publishing history textbooks had been radically reorganised as a result of the significant changes that had taken place in the system of history education in schools in the last decade. These new approaches were designed to ensure that textbooks met the requirements of a democratic society and helped to improve teaching methodology. History teachers now had far more choice. One textbook had given way to a great variety of textbooks – and the process had not yet finished.

The difficulties involved in editing and publishing textbooks on history had to be addressed in conjunction with two other issues, namely - the standard of school history education and teacher training (including re-training). These three issues had been discussed at the seminars organised by the Council of Europe in 1999-2003; and there was no doubt that these seminars had contributed greatly to the development of the new generation of textbooks and changes in the system of school history education in Russia.

The main features of the new textbooks are:

- attempts to meet the needs of individual learners by, for example, presenting the text at different levels of difficulty;
- the inclusion of documentary, visual and other supplementary materials – including, in many cases, internet resources;
- the provision of additional reading materials;
- accompanying teacher manuals which offer guidance on methodological and other issues.

A similar expansion had taken place in the range of historical atlases now available to teachers.

Ms SOKOLOVA highlighted the need for an on-going process of reviewing and evaluating textbooks. The Federal Expert Council of the Ministry of Education had issued a set of guidelines to publishing houses on the criteria that should govern this process. For example, evaluation should consider whether a book met the current requirements of the education system and reflected the best values of contemporary Russian society; how far it offered a scientific approach and presented differing interpretations of events; and if it was appropriate for the pupils at which it was aimed.

In closing, Ms SOKOLOVA expressed the hope that the changes that had been introduced and the continuing cooperative activity between different countries on history textbook production would lead to a generation of young people that valued peace and tolerance.

- (ii) In her presentation, Ms Joke VAN DER LEEUW-ROORD discussed the experience of Euroclio in the development of new teaching materials in the Russian Federation. She expressed a general concern that recent thinking on history teaching had developed very ambitious aims and objectives – but, for the most part, too little was being done at a practical level to enable teachers to implement them. Through the Matra Project which will last until 2005, Euroclio was attempting to remedy this by disseminating new materials and training teachers in their use. A particular focus was on teaching about the multi-cultural nature of society in Russia.

Ms VAN DER LEEUW-ROORD also presented some of the findings of Euroclio's recent survey on changes in history teaching and learning in Europe since 1989. The aspects she covered related to textbooks and their use – the role of textbooks in the classroom; the degree of choice available to teachers; the extent to which there was a national approval procedure for history textbooks; and who was responsible for buying them.

- (iii) Ms Sirkka AHONEN spoke about the new generation of what she termed “post-ideological” textbooks. Books had become “de-ideologised” and the grand narrative approach to the writing of textbooks, in either the Marxist or the liberal tradition, was no longer with us. The particular characteristics of current textbooks are that they:

- looked at issues from a variety of perspectives;
- presented the histories of ethnic minorities;
- addressed women's history and were no longer totally male centred;
- did not present the story of the past in a series of authoritative and absolute statements, but explained how their judgments had been arrived at;
- took a fresh look at the way in which countries saw their past and their relationships with neighbouring countries – the biggest recent changes in Finnish textbooks, for example, had been the way they

presented the 1939-45 war and the history of relations between Finland and the USSR;

- enabled young people to have encounters with historians;
- stressed the importance of individual human responsibility in shaping the events of the past.

She stressed that multiperspectivity, inclusivity and the power of human agency needed to be reflected in all textbook writing. The study of history was politically sensitive, but one of its great strengths was that it was capable of helping people at times when countries were going through a period of re-orientation. She gave as a particular example of this the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa.

4. Regional co-operation in history teaching

All of the contributors from the regions stressed the importance of history teaching, particularly in the light of the political, social, economic and cultural changes that had taken place in recent years. They valued the contribution of the Council of Europe in helping to bring about reforms in history teaching and expressed the hope that the Council would continue to offer support and guidance. Amongst the particular points made were:

- the importance that needs to be given to the development of competencies as an educational objective. The Council of Europe had rightly focused attention on a competency-based approach to education;
- the significant contribution that history teaching, providing it is properly approached, can make to enabling people to live harmoniously in a multi-national state. Increasingly, history teachers see their role as helping to shape the attitudes, beliefs and moral values of young people;
- the need for history teaching to combat erroneous and simplistic views of the past, and not to avoid dealing with controversial issues;
- the need for regional histories to form part of the national history curriculum.

5. Initial and in-service teacher training

- (i) In his presentation, Dr Vladimir BARABANOV suggested that the dominant characteristic of teacher training in institutions of higher education was the process of reform – or “modernisation” – currently taking place. This was happening against the background, in Russia and elsewhere, of changing cultural and social values, new educational goals and structures, and economic and technological developments. All of these place new demands on teachers.

It is not enough for teachers merely to transmit knowledge, they must develop pupils' ability to transfer skills and apply knowledge in a variety of contexts. They have to establish links between subjects, to develop pupils' capacities for critical thinking, self-evaluation and working as part of a team as well as individually. Above all, they must enable pupils to develop key competencies. This is the kind of teacher that institutions of higher education need to produce.

The inadequacies of the one level system of teacher education that had long existed in Russia were now being recognised. It was being replaced by a more flexible and open multi-level structure. Such a structure better meets the needs both of society and of the individual. It provides greater diversity of training, offers students a choice of educational routes and enables them to realise their expectations more effectively. Alongside this structure should go provision for the continuing professional development of teachers.

One of the most important innovative trends in higher pedagogical education was the move away from passive towards active teaching – to focusing more on the needs of individual students. Dr BARABANOV indicated, however, that there were a number of barriers standing in the way of this move; in particular – teacher conservatism, poor equipment, contradictions in current legislation and uncertainties about the status of some university degrees.

He suggested certain key questions that discussion of teacher training needed to address:

- How are the ideas for modernising school education reflected in professional pedagogical education?
- What factors prevent moving to the new generation of pedagogical educational standards?
- What principles form the basis of the new generation of programmes?
- How should the strategies for realising the existing programmes be changed?
- What is the distinctive feature of history teacher training? How is it realised in the curricula of pedagogical higher educational institutions?
- How should the educational goals be defined? How should the content of education and ways of evaluation be determined in accordance with these goals?
- What are the criteria for selecting teaching strategies in order to realise the goals?
- What are the requirements for a teacher's professional self-development in the light of the modernisation of general education?
- What are the criteria for evaluating students' training at pedagogical higher educational institutions?
- What are the methods and strategies for evaluating students' progress?

- How are students enabled to evaluate their own progress?
- (ii) Dr Petr BARANOV's presentation focused on the importance of the in-service training of teachers. This he saw as especially significant given the ever-increasing pace of social and cultural change, the need for future generations to know more than their predecessors and the introduction of new educational goals and structures. The state system of in-service training currently in place has three main features:
- (a) it is flexible and able to meet the new demands and needs of history education through organising courses of re-training for history teachers;
 - (b) it has created a scientific-methodological community able rapidly to put into practice scientific ideas in the area of history teaching;
 - (c) it has helped those teachers involved both to put into practice recent thinking about the theory and methods of history teaching and to carry out analytical and research work on up-to-date pedagogical experience.

In addition, the work on enabling history teachers to master new subject content has been extremely successful. In recent years, content has expanded beyond looking at history only in terms of class. New materials on the history of religion, customs and traditions have been introduced – materials which, for ideological reasons, were not previously studied in higher education institutions.

The new approaches to education in general require changes in the content and organisation of history teachers' in-service training. Dr BARANOV suggested that more attention needed to be paid in particular to furthering teachers' ability to help pupils to work independently and creatively and to develop an enquiring approach in their study of history. In his view, the way to achieving this was to increase the proportion of practical sessions in in-service training programmes. Such sessions develop professional skills more effectively than lectures.

Practical sessions should:

- promote sharing and discussion of teachers' doubts and difficulties;
- enable teachers to analyse their teaching approaches and methods;
- help teachers to find solutions to controversial tasks;
- identify ways in which innovative approaches might be realised in the classroom;
- encourage teachers to suggest new problems that in-service training could address.

Finally, although there had been many achievements, Dr BARANOV identified four outstanding issues related to in-service training:

- (a) the problem of correlating the educational demands of the state with the new approaches to history teaching;
 - (b) formulating the content of programmes of in-service training to meet the requirements of history teachers at different educational institutions;
 - (c) the lack of any link between in-service training and teachers' salaries and career prospects;
 - (d) the urgent need for rigorous evaluation of the results of history in-service training in order to increase its effectiveness.
- (iii) Ms Maria Luisa DE BIVAR BLACK sketched in some of the background to the training of history teachers in Portugal by explaining that, although the general public regard history as interesting, they no longer view it as a major subject in the school curriculum. This used not to be the case. As in other European countries new to democracy, history had been a popular subject for both pupils and the general public. Following the revolution in the mid 1970s, Portugal had to revise its history in order to come to terms with its own past and understand its position within the European and international communities; and the history that was taught before and after the revolution is very different. In countries such as Russia that have experienced similar political and social change, the training of history teachers is vital to appease the conflicts between the generations and to help the younger ones think with their own minds and form their own opinions. This is not easy when, for many years, teaching history was mostly about transmitting a body of unquestioned knowledge.

Ms DE BIVAR BLACK made three points of general importance in the training of history teachers:

- (a) History teachers add considerable value to a school. As history deals with politics, art, religion, economy, society, literature, music – and so on - history teachers can contribute to almost any school activity and are useful members of the teaching community.
- (b) History is the only subject that allows teachers to promote democratic values and tolerance in a systematic way. If the process of teaching and learning is a challenging one for pupils and if they seek their own interpretations and perspectives, they will be better able to act as free citizens. History teachers need to be alert to the tendency of dictators to distort the past in order to control the minds of future generations.

- (c) Curriculum theory must be linked to social theory. To bring about political change in education, it is not enough to change the curriculum. Schools need, for example, new organisational structures based on democratic principles that provide a propitious climate for discussing ideas.

Future history teachers in Portugal must have obtained a university history degree, which takes four years to achieve. They then have to undertake a further two years of study in order to become a qualified teacher. In the first year, students spend most of the time at the university and usually go into schools once a week, where their work is organised by the university. In the second year, they become student teachers, spending most of their time in the schools and attending sessions at the university only once a week. As student teachers, they have a class to teach and a salary. A school co-ordinator, approved by the Ministry of Education, guides and monitors their work according to specific criteria.

Assessment is against a set of common criteria with which all those involved in the process are familiar. The criteria cover both teaching competence and students' attitudes. The assessments, based largely upon lesson observation, are carried out jointly by the school co-ordinator and the university supervisor.

III. PROGRESS SINCE 1999

1. The report of the 1999 Conference identified various areas for development and put forward a number of recommendations both to colleagues in the Russian Federation and to the Council of Europe. As many of the contributors to this present conference indicated, progress has been made in several of these areas and many of the recommendations have been acted upon. But, as the earlier report warned, the pursuit of progress can be a slow and sometimes frustrating business. Curriculum development and implementation, improving the quality of teaching methodology and materials, introducing more valid and reliable systems of assessment and making the initial and in-service training of teachers more effective – all of these are processes which inevitably take a good deal of time. They are often constrained by factors such as - inadequate financial and human resources; inertia or innate conservatism on the part of policy makers; or resistance on the part of those required to implement the changes. What emerged from the Conference was that progress over the last three years has been uneven and in some areas elusive – but that is a common experience.

The history curriculum and systems of assessment

2. Following the 1999 Conference, the need for further clarification of standards – particularly the relative significance of content and skills in the formulation of standards – was seen as being of paramount importance. It is apparent that thinking about standards has moved on significantly during the past decade to incorporate not only curriculum structures and content but also the skills and values to be acquired by students and the means by which the learning outcomes might be identified and assessed. But progress now appears to have reached something of a plateau.
3. Unlike 1999, relatively little time was given to discussing standards, but it was an issue touched upon in particular by Dr ALEXASHKINA. Her comments were not too encouraging. She suggested that little that was new was emerging from the further work on standards which began in 2001-2002. Attempts to include specific historical personalities in the standards had indicated once again the difficulties in arriving at a consensus about what and who should form a necessary part of the history curriculum. And she concluded that the issue of improving and adopting standards that would define the content and level of education remained open.
4. It is important that the on-going debate on standards in history education should not be conducted in isolation. Dr BATSYN, for example, expressed concern at the lack of a structure that would help to take history education forward in a coherent way. Clearly, there are dangers that progress will be impeded when issues to do with standards, the curriculum, textbooks, assessment and so on are each tackled by separate groups of specialists with little contact between them. In similar vein, Ms MINKINA-MILKO entered a plea for the building of bridges between standards, textbooks and the system of assessment.

5. In addressing issues of curriculum content in history teaching, there are necessarily a number of balances to be struck and compromises to be reached; as, for example, between:

- **An open and a closed approach to determining curriculum content.**

We were given an example of an open approach to content by Arild THOBJORSEN in his description of history education in Norway. Here the curriculum is framed in terms of objectives to be achieved, skills to be learnt and competences to be acquired. Questions of which periods and historical events pupils are to study are decided largely at local level by individual schools and teachers. Against this, a closed approach seeks to specify the particular subject matter that pupils should study and at what age they should study it. Both approaches have their advantages – and attendant pitfalls. An open approach is more likely to encourage teachers, and their pupils, to have a sense of ownership of the curriculum – and hence to increase motivation. On the other hand, pupils may well end their school career with a very idiosyncratic and narrow view of the past. Conversely, the attraction of a closed approach is that it offers a common, structured and seemingly comprehensive account. This appears better suited to meeting some of the social functions of history teaching, notably developing a sense of national or ethnic identity, or helping students to appreciate their heritage. The corresponding danger is of overloading the curriculum with content so that students are simply fed an endless stream of dates, events and personalities.

- **Local, regional and national histories.**

Because it is closer to young people's experience, the study of local and regional history is important in helping both to motivate young people and to develop their sense of identity. The report of the 1999 Conference pointed to a growing recognition of this importance over the previous three years, and this has continued. Much more thought is being given to what to teach students about the history of the region in which they live, and how to teach it. It is clearly undesirable that students should glean their knowledge of their region's past from the mass media or from those who may have an interest in perpetuating long-standing prejudices. But there are also other issues involved here where perhaps rather less progress has so far been made. Mr KAIMOV described how, when asked – "What do you know about the history of the Chechens and their culture?" - soldiers of the federal forces stationed in Chechnya were unable to give an answer. All Chechens were dismissed as bandits and terrorists. Overcoming such entrenched attitudes is by no means easy. Any hope of success depends on constantly re-visiting questions about the proper place of regional history in the national history curriculum, and how to teach national history in the context of a multi-national, multi-ethnic state.

- **National and supra-national history.**

Increasingly, as Dr BATSYN reminded us in his presentation, we – and even more so the generation of students now in schools – are citizens of the world, of the so-called “global village”. And it is a world in which the pace of political, social and technological change is accelerating. History teaching has to play its part in helping young people to understand this global dimension and in equipping them to function effectively within it.

6. Achieving a history curriculum which is balanced in terms of its content is clearly a formidable and daunting task. What is unlikely, if the experience of countries elsewhere is a reliable guide, is that there will be a point at which there is total consensus amongst teachers, politicians, the media and the wider public that the history taught in schools is as it should be. Curriculum development in history is, as we were reminded again at the Conference, a continuous process. What is important, therefore, is that we get the process right – and here there are many indications, both before and since 1999, of considerable progress. Some of the key elements in this process are that:

- debate about the curriculum should be open, transparent and as wide as possible;
- there should be clarity about the principles on which curricular decisions are made;
- it involves recognition of diversity and multiple identities by, for example, allowing for flexibility of choice within a broad framework;
- it emphasises the importance of interpretation and evidence in the study of history and ensures that students have the skills to question, analyse and test statements about the past in an informed way;
- it is concerned with attitudes and values;
- it is cyclical involving development, implementation and evaluation – leading to further development, re-evaluation and so on.

Recognition of the importance of all these elements was apparent in discussions throughout the Conference.

7. Assessment – what to test, how to test it and how to make best use of the results - raises a similar number of thorny issues. I want to pick out three in particular. All three were touched upon at various points in the Conference, but they are issues which I feel warrant further consideration.

- (a) The first emerged in Dr ALEXASHKINA’s presentation when she distinguished between assessing objective knowledge - dates, events, chronological sequence – to which there were “right” answers; and subjective knowledge – analysis of sources, offering interpretations, providing causal explanations – to which there were no such “right” answers. Clearly, as she said, assessment can’t ignore the second group, but it does pose particular problems that are still some way from being resolved.

- (b) Closely linked to this issue is the first item on Dr BATSYN's agenda for the future - building a hierarchy of goals for historical education and assessing their achievement. Unless we have such a hierarchy – unless, in other words, we have a set of criteria which enables us to distinguish between the good, the poor and the indifferent - measuring young people's progress in history becomes very much a hit-and-miss affair. Simple criteria are easy to develop in relation to assessing students' knowledge of factual content. They consist merely of distinguishing between the number of correct responses students produce or the number of facts they are able to recall. But clearly, being a good rather than a bad historian is not just a matter of having more information. It involves being able to make use of that information, to provide explanations, to offer judgments, to refer to the historical record and to weigh up differing interpretations. All of these are skills that we want our students to acquire and we need to have, therefore, a reliable means of assessing whether or not they are making progress in acquiring them. Similarly, if we see history teaching as in part being concerned with developing certain attitudes and values, then as teachers we need to be able to determine how far we are succeeding.
- (c) And, thirdly, we need to recognise that one of the prime purposes of assessment is to inform teaching and improve the quality of learning. That is to see assessment as formative, as assessment for learning, and not just in terms of formal testing and examinations. Assessment needs to be part of the everyday activity of the classroom. Teachers have to be in a position to recognise the level of understanding that students have reached – say in their ability to analyse documentary sources - and to know how to move them to the next level.

Textbooks

- 8. There were indications that, in two of the areas for development suggested by the 1999 Conference some progress had been made. In her presentation, for example, Ms SOKOLOVA, referred to attempts to meet the needs of individual pupils by incorporating, within some textbooks, materials at two levels of difficulty and multi-level methodological instruments, as well as accompanying teaching manuals. Although the 1999 report had suggested that it was unrealistic at this stage to expect publishers to produce textbooks for different ability levels, it does appear that some small steps at least have been taken in this direction. A second issue raised three years ago concerned the critical need for textbook evaluation. Again, although clearly there remains a long way to go, the involvement of young people in textbook evaluation at the Seminar on "Interpretation of historical facts when teaching history in secondary schools" (Elista, Republic of Kalmykiya, October 2002) provided an indication that this issue had not been lost sight of.
- 9. On the important question of achieving a proper balance between the federal and regional elements in textbooks, however, there is still much to debate. Authors of regional history textbooks admitted that inconsistency between these elements often creates confusion among readers.

Teacher Training

10. The report of the 1999 Conference identified three key priorities for development here:
 - (a) The need for greater congruence between the teaching and learning approaches being advocated for use by history teachers in their classrooms and the teaching and learning approaches which are still widely used in teacher training. The monologue lecture is not the best means of developing teachers who are capable of facilitating student-centred, active, enquiry-based learning related to the use of sources and the consideration of evidence.
 - (b) The need for colleagues working in teacher training to engage in action research and self-evaluation strategies to evaluate the impact of their training on their student teachers. This is a way of building up a body of good practice that can be disseminated across the network of teacher-training institutions.
 - (c) All teacher educators need to develop an approach which encourages the further professionalisation of the history teacher's work. That is to say, to help teachers to become reflective practitioners who are skilled at evaluating their own teaching and the resources they use in their classrooms.
11. In his presentation, Dr BARANOV drew attention to a specific type of teacher emerging from the system of in-service training. Such a teacher was a scientist who was able to put into practice advances in the theory and methods of history teaching, and was capable of carrying out analytical and research work on up-to-date pedagogical experience. What was unclear, however, was just how large a group such teachers formed. For the most part, it appears that the teacher training issues identified in the 1999 report still remain to be successfully resolved. Although there have been significant changes in the content and structure of initial teacher training in some institutes of higher education, these are not widespread. Further, external factors – not least the heavy demands placed on teachers – limit the numbers able, or sufficiently motivated, to take part in in-service training programmes.

IV. LOOKING FORWARD – FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As Ms Tatiana Minkina-Milko reminded us in a telling phrase, the purpose of history teaching should be “to build bridges rather than to erect walls”. Moving towards achieving this purpose will require in the future, as it has in the past, constantly re-visiting matters to do with the curriculum, textbooks, teacher training and the nature and use of resources. But, within these broad areas of concern, what are the specific bridges that still need to be built – or more strongly reinforced? I suggest that there are four on which future activities might usefully focus, either jointly or unilaterally, and in all of which national, regional and local administrations have a significant part to play.

(i) Narrowing the gap between thinking and practice – the need for continuing dissemination

Previous reports on Council of Europe conferences and seminars have highlighted the importance of seeking ways of translating innovative thinking into good practice in history classrooms. Amongst the suggestions put forward have been: the establishment of more regional associations of history teachers, the publication of guidance which focuses on teaching and learning strategies and the development of distance learning packages as part of in-service training provision. As well as introducing teachers to new thinking and methodology, on-going dissemination has to address the realities of the classroom. Providing the means – via, for example, workshops, journals or web-based sites – whereby history teachers can exchange ideas and practical examples is an essential part of this.

***Recommendation:** that publishing houses, universities and other bodies should seek to disseminate practical approaches to embodying new thinking in the teaching of history in ways that allow for the interchange of ideas; and that the Council of Europe should consider how it can best support this.*

(ii) Establishing clearer links between assessment and learning

Much of what is involved here has been rehearsed earlier in this report (see Paragraph 3.7). There are two concerns in particular that need to be addressed:

- Because the acquisition of factual information can seemingly be assessed more reliably than the mastery of such skills as source evaluation and interpretation, there is a real danger that this aspect of a pupil’s historical knowledge and understanding will be given undue weight in formal examinations.
- Successful teaching involves asking questions and judging the nature of the responses they provoke to gauge the level of pupils’ historical understanding, determine whether there has

been progression and diagnose problems to improve future performance. But the processes of teaching, learning and assessment can be effectively linked only if the various stages along the road to full understanding are clearly identified and can act as criteria against which to measure pupils' progress.

Recommendation: *that arrangements should be put in place for the pooling of assessment expertise and experience via, for example – small expert working groups with specific remits to develop assessment criteria, skills-based examination tasks and marking schemes, classroom approaches to formative assessment; exchange visits to study alternative approaches to formal examining.*

(iii) Exploring the ways in which young people's perceptions of the past are acquired informally and the implications for history teaching

As some of the contributions to the Conference re-affirmed, young people's views on history – and consequent attitudes – are commonly formed by exposure to a variety of influences, of which history teaching in schools is only one. And its impact may be less powerful than, say, that of the media, literary fiction or community pressure. Such informal learning is particularly significant, for example, in the context of – the teaching of controversial and sensitive issues, history seen as heritage, developing a sense of national identity and values such as patriotism. It is important that history teachers, curriculum developers and resource providers understand and are in a better position to address the problems that attitude formation based upon alternative ways of acquiring a sense of the past may present.

Recommendation: *that the future seminar programme should include some provision for consideration of the issues surrounding the informal learning of history, and access to a range of expertise in disciplines such as sociology, political science, literature and media studies.*

(iv) History teaching's role into helping to build bridges between young people and the future world they will inhabit

Preparing young people for their adult and working life and the part history teaching might play in this was a theme that emerged in a number of different ways during the Conference:

- equipping them to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world;
- providing economic, social and political knowledge and understanding;
- developing personal and inter-personal competencies;
- enabling them to take an active and effective part in civic life.

Without an understanding of history, young people will enter the worlds of work, citizenship and leisure blinkered and partly uncomprehending. But we need to ensure that, in practice, the history we teach and the ways in which we teach it helps rather than hinders this transition.

Recommendation: *that the theme of developing history teaching's role in the preparation of young people for adult and working life is a focus for future programmes and activities.*

V. CONCLUSION

This was a thoroughly stimulating and enjoyable Conference. The presentations were pertinent and the discussion lively and perceptive. The partnership between the Council of Europe and the Russian Federation has clearly been a fruitful one, and its impact upon many aspects of history teaching has been considerable. In some ways change has been dramatic. But, as we were reminded by many of the contributors, the journey towards reaching a consensus about the nature and purposes of history teaching and improving its quality raises issues which we constantly need to re-examine. The success of conferences such as this lies in how far it enables us to continue that journey optimistically. Judged in those terms, this Conference was eminently successful.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CHAIR

Dr Natalia GOROKHOVATSKAYA, Director of the International Institute for Educational Innovation, Herzen State Pedagogical University, Moyka 48, Block 11, RF – 191186 ST PETERSBURG, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 812 311 92 95

Fax: + 7 812 312 40 53

E-mail: natagor@rol.ru

GENERAL RAPPORTEUR

Mr John HAMER, The Banks, Bailing Hill, Warnham, GB - West Sussex RH12 3RT, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 1403 26 50 88

Fax: + 44 1403 25 99 88

E-mail: john.hamer@thebanks-warnham.fsnet.co.uk

SPEAKERS

Ms Sirkka AHONEN, University of Helsinki, Teacher Education Department, Ratakatu 6A, PO Box 38, SF – 00014 HELSINKI, Finland

Tel: + 358 9 191 80 11

Fax: + 358 9 191 80 73

E-mail: siahonen@mappi.helsinki.fi

Dr Ludmila ALEXASHKINA, Head of the Laboratory of History, Russian Academy of Education, Moscow, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 095 246 14 44

Fax: + 7 095 246 21 11

Dr Vladimir BATSYN, Deputy Head of the Department for Regional Policies, Ministry of General and Professional Education, Chistiey Proudny Street, 5, RF-113833 Moscow, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 095 923 87 12

Fax: + 7 095 925 72 75

E-mail: makarenkova@ministry.ru

Ms Luisa DE BIVAR BLACK , Att : ERAZAN, Praca da Carreira 32, loja esquerda 2765 S. JOAO DO ESTORIL, Portugal

Tel: + 351 21 467 20 50

Fax: +351 21 452 24 39

E-mail: luisablack@mail.telepac.pt

Ms Larisa SOKOLOVA, Head of the Department of Publications on History,
Publishing House "Prosveshenie", Moscow, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 095 289 90 76

Fax: + 7 095 200 42 66

Mr Arild THORBJØRNSSEN, Deputy Director General, The Norwegian Board of
Education

P.O. Box 2924 Toyenn N- 0806 OSLO, Norway

Tel: + 47 23 30 12 11

Fax: + 47 23 30 12 99

E-mail: Arild.Thorbjornsen@ls.no

Ms Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD, Executive Director, EUROCLIO, Juliana van
Stolberglaan 41, NL - 2595 CA Den Haag, Netherlands

Tel/fax: + 31 70 385 36 69

E-mail: joke@euroclio.nl

JAPAN

Professor Seiji KIMURA, Department of Occidental History, Faculty of Letters,
Tokyo University, Bunkyo-ku, Hongo, TOKYO, Japan

Fax: + 81 3 5841 26 89

Professor Yasushi TORIUMI, Faculty of Literature, Chuo University, Member of the
ISEI Expert Committee, 742-1 Higashinakano, Hachioji-shi, TOKYO 152-0023, Japan

Fax: +81 4 26 74 37 32

Professor Kazuo ISHIZAKA, Gifu Shotoku Gakuen University, Graduate School,
2098 Takakuwa, Yanaizu-Cho, Hashima-Gun, Gifu, Japan

Fax: + 81 58 219 41 71

Mr Igor MAZUROV, ISEI Specialist, Shinko Ofisomu 5F, 20-3 San'ei-cho, Shinjuku
-ku, 160-0008 TOKYO, Japan

Fax: + 81 3 33 59 71 88

MOSCOW

Dr Yuriy TROITSKIY, Deputy Director of the Institute of Philology and History,
Russian State Humanities University, Moscow, Russian Federation

E-mail: sunson@pt.comcor.ru

Dr Alexander SHEVYREV, Head of the Laboratory of History Education, Moscow
Institute for the Development of Educational Systems, Ostrovityanova str. 26/2,
117321 Moscow, Russian Federation

Tel/fax: + 7 095 915 69 75

KHABAROVSK

Dr Olga STRELOVA, Senior Lecturer, State Pedagogical University, Carla Marksa str. 68, RF – 680030 KHABAROVSK, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 42 12 21 82 04

Fax: + 7 42 12 21 01 00

VLADIVOSTOK

Ms Tatiana ROMANCHENKO, Head of Section, In-service Teacher Training Institute, VLADIVOSTOK, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 4232 51 44 36 (52 55 59 home)

Fax: +7 4232 52 55 59

NIJNIY NOVGOROD

Dr Ludmila SHILOVA, Deputy Rector, Nizny Novgorod Institute for Educational Development, NIJNIY NOVGOROD, Russian Federation

Tel. +7 8312 68 05 37

Fax +& 8312 68 54 35

SAMARA

Dr Efim KOGAN, Head of the Education and Science Department of the Samara region, SAMARA, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 846 2 32 03 40

Fax: + 7 846 2 32 04 59

E-mail: educat@sama.ru

KAZAN

Mr Ildar GALEACHMEDOV, Head of the Education Administration, the Republic of Tatarstan, KAZAN, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 843 2 92 70 50

Fax: + 7 843 2 92 70 50

PETROZAVODSK

Ms Tatiana AGARKOVA, Director, Centre for Educational Innovation, Petrozavodsk State University, Lenin str. 33, RF – 185640 PETROZAVODSK, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 8142 55 05 06

Fax: + 7 8142 77 10 21

VOLGOGRAD

Dr Nikolay BOLOTOV, Dean of the History Faculty, Volgograd State Pedagogical University, Lenin av. 27, 400005 VOLGOGRAD, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 8442 36 63 22

Fax: + 7 8442 36 62 25

YAROSLAVL

Dr Mikhail NOVIKOV, Vice-Rector, Yaroslavl State Pedagogical University,
Respublicanskaya str. 108, 150000 YAROSLAVL, Russian Federation
Tel/fax: + 7 0852 30 55 96/30 51 12

KALUGA

Mr.Petr SIMONENKO, Deputy Director, Department of Education and Science,
KALUGA, Russian Federation
Tel./Fax. +7 0842 74 31 84

EKATERINBURG

Professor Ludmila ANDRUKHINA, Director, Institute of the Development of the
Regional Education System, Studencheskaya str.4, app.15, 620066 EKATERINBURG,
Russian Federation
Tel/fax: + 7 3432 74 13 01

IRKUTSK

Mr Alexander KOSTIN, Deputy Head, the Department of Education of the Irkutsk
Region, IRKUTSK, Russian Federation
Tel: + 7 395 2 34 17 24
Fax: + 7 395 2 24 09 72
E-mail: obraz@guopo.baikal.ru

BURYATIYA

Ms Evgeniya CHIMITOVA, Deputy Minister of Education and Science, ULAN-
UDE, Russian Federation
Tel: + 7 301 2 21 29 21
Fax: + 7 301 2 22 01 55
E-mail: minobr@burnet.ru

THE REPUBLIC OF ADIGEYA

Professor Kazbek ACHMIZ, Rector, Agigeya Pedagogical College, Russian
Federation
Tel: + 7 877 22 2 52 00
Fax: + 7 877 22 2 12 01
E-mail: minobr@adygnet.ru

THE REPUBLIC OF DAGESTAN

Mr Magomedfazil AZYZOV, Minister of Education and Science, MAHACHKALA,
Russian Federation
Tel: + 7 872 2 67 18 48
Fax: + 7 872 2 67 18 17
E-mail: RMLitsey@dgu.ru

THE REPUBLIC OF INGOUSHETIYA

Mr Ismail TANKIEV, Minister of Education and Science, NAZRAN, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 873 22 2 24 57 (58, 59)

Fax: + 7 873 22 2 11 56

THE REPUBLIC OF CHECHNYA

Mr.Abdurakhman KAIMOV, Head of Department for General Education, Ministry of Education, GROZNY, Russian Federation

Tel./Fax. + 7 8712 22 24 86

Ms.Zinaida SERGANOVA, Head of Department, Ministry of Education, GROZNY, Russian Federation

Tel./Fax. +7 8712 22 24 86

KRASNODAR REGION

Dr Svetlana TREHBRATOVA, Rector State Krasnodar In-service Training Institute, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 861 2 32 85 78

Fax: + 7 861 2 32 88 85

E-mail: idppo@kubannet.ru

ROSTOV ON DON REGION

Ms.Elena LUNINA, Chief Specialist, the Ministry of Education of Rostov region, ROSTOV on DON, Russian Federation

Tel. +7 8632 40 96 94

Fax. +7 8632 67 86 44

THE REPUBLIC OF KARACHAEVO-CHERKESSIYA

Ms Alla AFANASYEVA, Minister of Education and Science, Government House, 369000 CHERKESK, Russian Federation

Tel/ fax: + 7 878 22 5 70 07

THE REPUBLIK OF NORTH OSETIYA-ALANIYA

Professor Ruslan BZAROV, Professor, North-Osetiya State University, VLADIKAVKAZ, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 867 2 53 34 32

Fax: + 7 867 2 53 65 64

THE REPUBLIC OF KALMYKIYA

Ms Larisa EFREMOVA, First Deputy Minister of Education and Science, Lenin av.
House of Government, 358000 ELISTA, Russian Federation

Tel: + 7 847 22 5 23 54

Fax: + 7 847 22 6 17 36

PSKOV

Ms.Tatiana PASMAN, Head of the History and Law Department, Pskov In-Service
Teacher Training Institute, PSKOV, Russian Federation

Tel. +7 8112 72 18 00

Fax. +7 8112 15 08 09

VLADIMIR

Dr.Alexandr LAPSHIN, Associate Professor in Ancient and Medieval History,
Vladimir State Pedagogical University, VLADIMIR, Russian Federation

Tel./Fax. +7 0922 33 73 02

NOVGOROD THE GREAT

Dr.Marina ZUKOVA, Associate Professor in History and Archaeology, Novgorod the
Great State University, NOVGOROD, Russian Federation

Tel. +7 81622 3 02 55

Fax. +7 81622 2 41 10

ST.PETERSBURG

Dr Sergey SMIRNOV, Vice-Rector, Herzen State Pedagogical University

Dr Petr BARANOV, Head of the Department for History and Social Sciences, State In-
service Teacher Training University

Tel./Fax.+7 812 314 23 36

Dr Vladimir BARABANOV, Dean of the History and Social Science Faculty, Herzen
State Pedagogical University

Tel. +7 812 312 99 25

Professor Elena KAZAKOVA, Professor, St.Petersburg State University, Director of
Gorchakov Lyceum

Tel. +7 812 311 92 95

Fax.+7 812 312 40 53

Mr.Dmitry BARYSHNIKOV, Director, Council of Europe Information Centre, St.
Petersburg

Tel. +7 812 276 61 16

Fax. +7 812 276 62 29

Ms. Olga SOBOLEVA, Senior Lecturer, Herzen State Pedagogical University

Mr.Oleg IVANOV, Lecturer, Herzen State Pedagogical University

Mr.Sergey SHEVCHENKO, History teacher, school N 227
Tel./Fax. +7 812 269 04 24

Ms.Olga ZURAVLEVA, Lecturer, St. Petersburg In-Service Teacher Training
University
Metodist61@list.ru

Ms.Tatiana ANDREEVSKAYA, Lecturer, St. Petersburg In-Service Teacher Training
University

Ms.Irina SAFONOVA, Teacher, school N 521
Fax.+7 812 544 46 59

Ms.Isabella KURACHENKOVA, History teacher, School N 408
Tel./Fax/ +7 812 466 19 68

Ms.Ludmila KROL, History teacher, School N 260
Fax. +7 812 114 05 51

Mr. Sergey BUKINICH, History teacher, School N 116
Tel. +7 812 246 17 07
Fax. +7 812 246 00 81

Ms.Tatiana SEVASTYANOVA, History teacher, School N 30
Tel. +7 812 355 88 57
Fax. +7 812 323 57 28

Mr.Sergey PETROSHOV, History teacher, School N 75
Tel. +7 812 233 20 72

Ms.Irina DMITROVA, History teacher, School N 423
Fax. +7 812 236 53 60

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Ms Alison CARDWELL, Head of the History Education Section, DGIV, Council of Europe,

F-67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX

Tel: +33 3 88 41 26 17

Fax: +33 3 88 41 27 50 / 56

E-mail: alison.cardwell@coe.int

Ms Tatiana MILKO, Programme Officer, History Education Section, DGIV, Council of Europe,

F-67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX

Tel: +33 3 88 41 36

Fax: +33 3 88 41 27 50 / 56

E-mail: tatiana.milko@coe.int

APPENDIX II

PROGRAMME OF THE CONFERENCE

Thursday 20 March 2003

10.00 - 11.00

Plenary Session

Chair: Dr Natalia GOROKHOVATSKAYA
Director of the International Institute for Educational
Innovation, St. Petersburg

Opening of the Seminar by:

- i. Dr Vladimir BATSYN, Deputy Head, Regional
Educational Policy Directorate, Ministry of
Education of the Russian Federation;
- ii. Dr Sergey SMIRNOV, Vice-Rector, Herzen State
Pedagogical University;
- iii. Ms Alison CARDWELL, Head of the History
Education Section, DGIV, Council of Europe;
- iv. Dr Natalia GOROKHOVATSKAYA, Director
of the International Institute for Educational
Innovation, St. Petersburg.

11.00 - 11.30

Break

11.30 - 13.30

Plenary Session

Chair: Dr Natalia GOROKHOVATSKAYA,
Director of the International Institute for Educational
Innovation, St. Petersburg.

Introductory presentation on:

- i. “Co-operation between the Council of Europe and
the Russian Federation in teaching history in
secondary schools since the Second Stocktaking
Conference in 1999”, by Ms Tatiana MINKINA-
MILKO, DGIV, Programme Officer, History
Education Section, Council of Europe;

- ii. “Co-operation between the Council of Europe and the Russian Federation in teaching history in secondary schools since the Second Stocktaking Conference in 1999” by Dr Vladimir BATSYN, Deputy Head of the Department for Regional Policies, Education, Moscow.

Round Table on “Curricula on history teaching and the system of assessment of pupils’ knowledge and skills”:

- i. “Results since 1999 and future steps in the preparation of new curricula and standards on history for secondary schools in the Russian Federation” by Dr Ludmila ALEXASHKINA, Head of the History Department, Institute of General Secondary Education, Russian Academy of Education, Moscow;
- ii. “How curricula on history teaching for secondary and upper-secondary schools reflect the main aims in teaching history in the 21st Century, criteria for the selection of content, assessment of pupils’ knowledge and skills: the example of Norway” by Mr Arild THORBJØRNSSEN, Deputy Director General, Norwegian Board of Education.

Discussion with all the participants

13.30 - 15.00

Lunch

15.00 - 16.30

Plenary Session

Chair: Dr Natalia GOROKHOVATSKAYA,
Director of the International Institute for Educational
Innovation, St. Petersburg.

Round Table on “The preparation and publication of
new history textbooks and teaching resources”

- i. Presentation on: “The results since 1999 and future steps in the preparation and publication of new history textbooks for secondary schools in the Russian Federation” by Ms Larisa SOKOLOVA, Head of the Department for publications on history, Publishing House “Prosveschenie”, Moscow.

- ii. Presentation on: “The experience of EUROCLIO in the development of new teaching materials in the Russian Federation”, by Ms Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD, Executive Director, EUROCLIO.
- iii. Presentation on: “How history textbooks on world and national history for secondary and upper-secondary schools respond to the new challenges in teaching history in the present-day and how they reflect the history of neighbouring countries: the example of Finland” by Ms Sirkka AHONEN, University of Helsinki, Teacher Education Department.

Discussion with all the participants

16.30 – 17.00

Break

17.00 – 18.00

Round Table on “Regional co-operation in history teaching”

Representatives from the regions should give five minute presentations on their impressions and the results or changes after the activities organised by the Council of Europe in the different regions of the Russian Federation in the last three years and also in Japan.

19.30

Official Dinner

Friday 21 March 2003

10.00 – 11.30

Plenary Session

Chair: Dr Natalia GOROKHOVATSKAYA,
Director of the International Institute for Educational
Innovation, St. Petersburg.

Round Table on “The initial and in-service training of history
teachers”

Presentation on “The initial training of history teachers in the context of modernisation of history teaching in Russian Federation” by Dr Vladimir BARABANOV, Head of the Chair of Teaching History, Herzen State Pedagogical University, St. Petersburg.

Presentation on “The in-service training of history teachers: results and future development” by Dr Petr BARANOV, Head of the Department for History and Social Sciences, Herzen State Pedagogical University, St. Petersburg.

Presentation on : “How are initial and in-service training of history teachers linked to each other and how do they respond to the new challenges in history teaching in present-day schools” by Ms Luisa DE BIVAR BLACK, Portugal.

Discussion with all the participants

11.30 – 12.00

Break

12.00 - 13.00

Three Parallel Working Group Sessions

i. Working Group No. 1

“The initial training of history teachers in the Russian Federation and how it corresponds to the changes in the present-day secondary schools”

Chair: Dr Vladimir BARABANOV

Rapporteur: Ms.Olga SOBOLEVA

Resource person: Ms Luisa DE BIVAR BLACK

ii. Working Group No. 2

“The in-service training of history teachers in the Russian Federation: results and future development”.

Chair: Dr Petr BARANOV

Rapporteur: Professor Ludmila ANDRUKHINA

Resource persons: Ms Joke VAN DER LEEUW-ROORD

Mr John HAMER

iii. Working Group No. 3

“The preparation and publication of new history textbooks and teaching materials in the Russian Federation and how they correspond to the changes in curricula and to the new system of assessment of pupils’ knowledge and skills”

Chair: Dr Ludmila ALEXASHKINA

Rapporteur: Mr.Oleg IVANOV

Resource persons: Mr Arild THORBJØRNSEN

Ms Sirkka AHONEN

13.00 - 14.30	Lunch
14.30 - 16.00	Continuation of the parallel working group sessions
16.00 - 16.30	Break
16.30 – 17.30	Continuation of the parallel working group sessions
17.30 – 18.30	The rapporteurs should report to the General Rapporteur and the Secretariat on the conclusions and recommendations of their working group. They should prepare their texts in writing and submit a copy to the Secretariat.
18.30	Dinner

Saturday 22 March 2003

10.00 - 11.30 Plenary Session

Chair: Dr Natalia GOROKHOVATSKAYA,
Director of the International Institute for Educational
Innovation, St. Petersburg

- i. Presentation of the conclusions and recommendations of the rapporteurs of the working groups

Comments by the participants

- ii. Presentation by the General Rapporteur of the overall conclusions and recommendations of the Conference.

Comments by the participants

11.30 - 12.00 Break

12.00 - 13.00 **Closing speeches of the Conference by:**

- i. Ms Alison CARDWELL, Head of the History Education Section, Council of Europe;
- iii. Dr Vladimir BATSYN, Deputy Head of the Department for Regional Policies, Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation, Moscow;
- iv. Dr Natalia GOROKHOVATSKAYA, Director of the International Institute for Educational Innovation, Herzen State Pedagogical University.

13.00 – 14.30 Lunch

Departure of the participants

LIST OF QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION BY THE WORKING GROUPS

Working Group 1

“The initial training of history teachers in the Russian Federation and how it corresponds to the changes in the present-day secondary schools”

Chair: Dr Vladimir BARABANOV, St.Petersburg

Rapporteur: Ms.Olga SOBOLEVA, St.Petersburg

Resource persons: Ms Luisa DE BIVAR BLACK, Portugal

1. What is the present-day situation in the initial training of history teachers in the Russian Federation?
2. Does the initial training of history teachers correspond to challenges in history teaching in secondary schools in the 21st Century?
3. What has already been changed and what should be improved and developed in the initial training of history teachers in the coming years in the Russian Federation?
4. What role could co-operation with the Council of Europe play in this process?

Working Group 2

“The in-service training of history teachers in the Russian Federation: the results achieved and the future development”

Chair: Dr Petr BARANOV, St.Petersburg

Rapporteur: Professor Ludmila ANDRUKHINA, Ekaterinburg

Resource person: Ms Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD, Netherlands; Mr John HAMER, United Kingdom

1. What progress has been made in the Russian Federation over the last three years in terms of:
 - developing new initial training programmes for history education?
 - changing the balance between academic, pedagogical, methodological and practical training for future history teachers?
 - developing new in-service training programmes for re-training history teachers?
 - developing professional development programmes for those working in teacher training?
 - introducing new pedagogical approaches into teacher education?
 - improving links between teacher educators, curriculum developers and history teachers?
 - developing effective networks of teacher educators?

- evaluating the effectiveness of existing teacher education programmes?
- 2. What are the main priorities for further development?
- 3. How could activities of the Council of Europe be included into this process?

Working Group 3

"The preparation and publication of new history textbooks and teaching materials in the Russian Federation and how do they correspond to the changes in curricula and to the new system of assessment of pupils' knowledge and skills"

Chair: Dr Ludmila ALEXASHKINA, Moscow

Rapporteur: Mr.Oleg IVANOV, St.Petersburg

Resource persons: Mr Arild THORBJØRNSSEN, Norway,

Ms Sirkka AHONEN, Finland.

1. How do present-day textbooks correspond to the new curricula and standards in history teaching?
2. What are the links between the new curricula and standards on history, history textbooks published during the last three years in the Russian Federation and the new system of assessment of pupils' knowledge and skills?
3. What should be done to improve this situation?
4. How should new textbooks and teaching materials on history teaching be developed and what could be the role of co-operation with the Council of Europe in this area?

APPENDIX III

REPORTS OF THE WORKING GROUPS

Working group N° 1

“The initial training of history teachers in the Russian Federation and how it corresponds to the changes in the present-day secondary schools”

In the discussions the participants from Moscow, Volgograd, Khabarovsk, St. Petersburg, Nyjniy Novgorod, Petrozavodsk as well as from Portugal and Japan took part. All the participants were of the same opinion that the initial training of history teachers in the Russian Federation is now one of the arrears where radical changes should be done. It is important area as a lot of success of the reform in history teaching depends on teachers which should be properly trained.

During the discussions the participants share their experiences and received a lot of interesting information on the initial training of history teachers in Japan and Portugal.

In the Russian Federation two types of higher educational establishments are responsible for teacher training: universities and pedagogical institutes. There are two systems in the initial training of history teachers which are supported by the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation- moonlike based on the unique programme applied for all students and multilevel, in which students have freedom to chose subjects to study and create their own programme of studies.

Monolevel system exists since 1930s, it is the most conservative and does not react on the new challenges of present-day secondary schools. This system is not democratic at all, it does not allow students to make their own choice of the programmes during their studies, it does not correspond to the world standards as well. In some of the regions of the Russian Federation there are attempts to change this system and include additional specialised courses but they are quite exceptional. The participants came up to the conclusion that monolevel system could not be modified and was considered as old fashioned.

It was pointed out that gradually higher educational establishments started to move from monolevel system to the multilevel which corresponds to the conditions reflected in the Bologna Process. As the same time it was emphasised that it is important not only to integrate in the European educational space but also to keep the best traditions of the national education. The present-day situation in the initial training in the Russian Federation was characterised as a transition period. It explains partly why there is still a lot of contradictions between standards worked out for the initial training of history teachers and the real practice.

At the same time the participants underlined the following changes which have been already done: inclusion of the information on regional history in the initial training;

development of specialised courses on new interactive methods in teaching history. But still the whole system needs radical changes as it does not correspond to the challenges which present-day secondary schools are facing. This fact was also reflected in the documents of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation and, in particular, in the “Programme of modernisation of pedagogical education”.

The present-day secondary schools in Russia now are more advanced in their development in comparison with higher educational establishments.

One of the most vital problem now is a lack of history teachers in schools and this situation can be partly explained by the economic factor, and also by conservative systems which are still used when training future teachers. The prestige of a teacher is low and when training student quite often their professors stress that it is more interesting to become a researcher after universities then to work as a teacher. Even when training students in pedagogical institutes professors using old methods are not able to motivate young teachers to go further on their professional development.

Unfortunately badly organised practice in schools for young teachers also does not help to motivate them to continue their work as teachers. The participants were of the same opinion that it is vital now to develop creative methods in the initial training and to build good relations with schools enabling students to start practicing as early as possible. During this practice students should be helped to use their knowledge and skills in their classroom work.

As the further steps in the improvement of the initial training of history teachers in the Russian Federation the participants of the working group proposed to:

1. analyse present-day standards for the initial training;
2. look at textbooks which are used when training history teachers;
3. analyse which skills and competences should be obtained by students during the initial training;
4. improve teaching methods in universities and pedagogical institutes giving more attention to interactive methods;
5. analyse the experiences in using of the new teaching methods accumulated in different regions of the Russian Federation and determine the most effective approaches;
6. improve pedagogical practice of students in schools.;
7. organise seminars and meeting of experts to discuss and share the experiences and good practice involving specialists from the European countries.

The participants of the working group emphasised that the Council of Europe could play an important role in this process, in particular, in the development of the new approaches to the initial training of history teachers. The working group proposed the Secretariat of the Council of Europe to pay special attention to the development of the co-operation programme in this particular area.

The participants pointed out the fact that now in the Russian Federation different regions are trying to improve the initial training in higher educational establishments but the weak point is that there is no co-ordination and exchange of the information

between the regions. Therefore, it was proposed to organise a Conference on this subject and invite representatives of all the regions. This Conference will permit to collect and analyse different models used in the initial training in the Russian Federation, to choose and develop the most effective ones. The involvement of the Council of Europe in such activities will give an opportunity to present the European experiences and to implement the examples of good practice in the Russian educational space.

Working group N° 2

“The in-service training of history teachers in the Russian Federation: the results achieved and the future development”

The in-service training of history teachers has been chosen as a priority in the co-operation programmes between the Russian Federation and the Council of Europe already at the Seminar in Suzdal in 1996 when it was pointed out that a teacher plays one of the key roles in the education process.

The participants of the Working group N°2 from Pskov, Nijniy Novgorod, Kazan, Irkutsk, St. Petersburg, Moscow, Ekaterinbourg and Kaluga came up to the conclusion that the certain changes were made in the in-service training during the last three years.

It was pointed out that :

1. the functions of in-service training institutes were extended, now they are not only responsible for the dissemination of additional information on history teaching but also should provide methodological training of teachers;
2. new programmes for in-service training of history teachers were prepared. Some of them include the additional information on such new areas as the use of new technologies when teaching history, the development of skills and, in particular, critical thinking, new approaches in using historical sources. The content of the programmes is also changing;
3. new programmes for in-service training of history teachers differ greatly from the old ones as they are more practice oriented, they are more aimed at development contacts between higher educational establishments responsible for initial teacher training and schools. It was pointer out as a new feature that teachers were widely involved in the preparation of the new programmes for in-service training;
4. new programmes include rich information on new interactive methods in teaching history and become a mean of dissemination of new approaches and methods among teachers. New methodological aspects included on the new programmes for history teachers could be used when training specialist in other subjects such as geography, literature and etc.

5. changes in the in-service training of history teachers accumulate the experiences in the national pedagogic as well as examples of good practice introduced by the experts of the Council of Europe during seminars organised in the Russian Federation since 1996;
6. more attention is now paid to the effectiveness of teachers' work. Individual working plans for teachers started to be used more widely;
7. special attention is given to evaluation of in-service teacher training . A series of publications were prepared on this topic. The most advanced in this area is Nijniy Novgorod region where the starting point in the development of in-service teacher training was the seminar organised in co-operation with the Council of Europe on this particular issue. Similar development can be found in Ekaterinburg Region where the Seminar on the in-service training issues was organised with the help of the Council of Europe in 1998.

The participants of the working group pointed out that in-service training now in the Russian Federation is more advanced than other areas and first of all the initial training. The development of the new programmes help teachers to develop their creative innovative work on the basis of the integrated approaches.

It was also noticed that the extension of the use of the new technologies in the in-service training made this work more effective. At the same time it was emphasised that the present-day in-service training system should take more into account regional peculiarities as well as different types of specialist for the retraining. For example young teachers during the in-service training will need more information on pedagogic, for more experienced teachers the methodological information is more needed.

When discussing the priorities for the future development the following points were highlighted:

1. the work on the development of the new programmes for the in-service training of history teachers should be continued and extended. Programmes should be prepared taking into account different categories of teachers (rural area teachers, those who work in small and big towns, etc.). Principle of differentiation of the programmes for in-service training will permit to make training more effective and to provide teachers with practical knowledge which could be used in their every-day practice;
2. special programmes should be prepared for training history teachers who work in different types of specialised schools (linguistic, mathematics schools, sportive schools, etc.);
3. new technologies should be more widely used during in-service training. Different forms of distance in-service training should be developed to help teachers especially from rural and far-away areas to get access to training;

4. new programmes should be more practice oriented to enable teachers to be well prepared for all kind of challenges which secondary schools are facing now. Schools and museums should be more involved in the training system;
5. international co-operation plays an important role in the development of new approaches in the in-service training system in Russia, in particular, with such international organisations as the Council of Europe and Euroclio.

The participants of the working group suggested to the Council of Europe to:

1. organise seminars within co-operation programme with the Russian Federation on the in-service training issues and, in particular, on how to develop links and information exchanges between schools, in-service training institutes and academic research institutions;
2. organise a European teacher Conference to exchange views on the in-service teacher training issues;
3. provide an expertise of new programmes for the in-service training of history teachers in the Russian Federation which will help to chose the most effective approaches and reform the whole system;
4. prepare publications comparing systems of the in-service training in different European countries at both levels: content and management.

All the participants were of the same opinion that co-operation with the Council of Europe should be developed and extended as it has already started to give visible results.

Working group N° 3

“The preparation and publication of new history textbooks and teaching materials in the Russian Federation and how do they correspond to the changes in curricula and to the new system of assessment of pupils’ knowledge and skills”

21 specialist took part in the working group from the Republic of Karachaevo-Cherkessiya, the Republic of Chechnya, the Republic of Northern Ossetia-Alaniya, the Republic of Adygeya, the Republic of Daguestan, the Republic of Tatarstan, Rostov-on Don, Vladivostok, Moscow, St.Petersburg as well as from Finland and Norway.

During the sessions the participants analysed the results achieved in the preparation of new history textbooks since 1999. A series of seminars were organised in-so-operation with the Council of Europe to analyse :

- the use of new history textbooks when teaching history in secondary schools;
- the preparation of teaching materials on history for rural schools;
- criteria of evaluation of history textbook;

The participants agreed that during the last three years there were changes in the development of history textbooks. They became more rich in sources, a balance between text, illustrations, sources and tasks for pupils improved dramatically. But at the same time it was underlined that still there are problems which should be sougheed out.

Among the elements which should be improved when preparing future textbooks the following were underlined:

- in the most part of textbooks on the national history texts about the state still dominate over the history of peoples, social movements, etc.;
- history textbook are still overloaded by facts and additional information;
- rather often school history textbooks have factological mistakes;
- history textbooks still contain the certain interpretation of facts which could provoke a lack of respect for other peoples, and, in particular, for neighbours;
- the language of history textbooks should be adapted to pupils' age;
- history textbooks should be more skills development oriented.

The main discussion in the group was based on the following questions :

- do new textbook correspond to the new standards on history and to the new system of evaluation of pupils' knowledge and skills ?
- how do federal and regional components correspond to each other?

During the discussion it was pointed out that the new system of evaluation of pupils knowledge and skills should be improved as now it is still mainly based on the evaluation of the quantity of facts learnt by hart. Standards on history also should be developed and more oriented on the skills than on the information obtained.

Ms Sirkka AHONEN suggested to improve the standards first and only then to start the development of the new system of evaluation of knowledge and skills. Mr Arild THORBJORNSSEN pointed out that when preparing textbooks the attention should not only be paid on the content but on the composition of a textbook as well.

During the discussion on the regional component in history teaching representatives from different regions shared their experiences in the preparation of regional textbooks.

The participants came up to the following conclusions :

- when preparing regional textbooks authors should use common methotodological and didactical approaches;
- it is important to unite effort of historians and specialists in methodology when preparing regional textbooks ;
- regional textbooks should be based on general standards on history teaching;

- regional textbooks should be written in the way when they could be used not only in a class room but during the independent analytical work of pupils;
- it is important to work out evaluation criteria for regional textbooks;
- the variety of regional textbooks should be preserved ;
- the present-day regional textbooks should be analysed to be able to work out the most effective approaches;
- to find the ways in which the most important events of the regional histories could be included in federal textbooks;
- to organise a series of seminars of the key issues on the preparation of regional textbooks.

APPENDIX IV

PRESENTATIONS

- I. **The report of Ms Sirkka Ahonen, University of Helsinki**
“How history textbooks on world and national history for secondary and upper secondary schools respond to the new challenges in teaching history in present-day time and how they reflect the history of neighbouring countries; the example of Finland”

A textbook is a pedagogical tool for students and teachers. Like any other tools, the textbooks change with the time. While the textbooks one or two generations ago were expected to convey a grand narrative of a civilization, today they should be multiperspective and transparent. They should approach the historical events and developments from various points of view, and they should provoke critical questions about the reliability of the accounts they provide.

Why the change of the presentations of history, while the past itself remains the same? History is not the same as the past. The past is irrevocable, but people still want to ponder on it and make histories. A couple of generations ago, people constructed grand narratives of the past. No more today, The grand narratives are dead. One after another, they lost their credibility. First, nationalism died in the horrors of World War II. Then, the Marxist-Leinist grand narrative lost its credibility, in the failure of the so called actual socialism. At the same time the story of Progress, that appeared as Liberalism, was made questionable by the postmodern sociologues. They pointed out, that history as a story of freedom was just fiction. Freedom had not expanded. The political freedom was eroded by the rule of market forces, and the individual freedom was threatened by mass culture, compulsive consumerism and media manipulation.

The different narratives implied different representations of single events and episodes. What meant liberation in a Liberalist story, was represented as a class conflict in a Marxist story.

The Liberalist story

Reformation in the 16th century

American war of independence

French Revolution and the subsequent reforms

The uprising of the war-weary German marines in 1918

The independence of Estonia 1918

The liberal reforms in Czechoslovakia 1968

The Marxist story

An early bourgeois revolution in Germany

The first bourgeois revolution in America

The bourgeois revolution

The socialist november revolution

A bourgeois dictatorship in Estonia

Counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia

While the stories of the past no more were grand narratives, people still needed history. The narratives were now small stories. Communities and groups still wanted to know, where they came from and where they were going to, and shared their special understanding of the past. History was now constituted of stories of local communities, professional groups, genders, ethnic minorities and revived historical communities. Historical consciousness was still pursued and used for identity and empowerment for people. The new history was constructed in terms of multiperspectivity, transparency and human agency.

1. Multiperspectivity

Multiperspectivity in history requires a change of the point of view from one group to another. The events and developments seldom look the same to different groups. What was progress to one group, could be a setback to another. In Finland, the making of the young nation state in the 1920s and 1930s was a stimulating experience to independent farmers and to the bourgeoisie. The independence provided them with new opportunities and a sense of recognition, while at the other side, the landless labourers and urban workers were the losers and sensed a non-recognition. The cherished democracy did not apply to them; the far left lost its vote in 1930.

Similar examples are numerous all over Europe and other continents. In Germany of the 30s, many people suffered fatal losses, but for some the Third Reich was full of promises of future. In order to understand the support of Nazism, one has to take the standpoint of those whom the Weimar democracy left unemployed and bankrupted. In the colonised world, millions were exploited both economically and culturally, but, e.g. in India, the emergent middle class gained in education and economic opportunity. One has to recognise the two faces of colonialism in order to properly understand both development and underdevelopment.

In Russia of the last fifteen years one has observed, that the Tsarist empire has gained another face, in comparison to how it was portrayed in the Marxist-leninist history. The economic promises and the emergence of national entrepreneurship of the early 20th century have been recognised in history. The craze for the last Tsar in the early

1990s certainly was overemphatic, but still a necessary exercise in varying the point of view. If only one point of view is present, the story loses its credibility.

National minorities are a source of the variation of history stories. Every nation-state has its national minorities. In the period of nationalism an official advocacy of the story of the mainstream ethnic group was considered to be the right thing to do. In the post-nationalist era, however, the minorities started to construct and mediate their alternative narratives. Therefore it is at present necessary to introduce the minority aspect to the textbooks. In the US the black and Indian histories are already established in the textbooks, but the Latino history is not. In Finland, the history of Saami population is passingly referred to, even if it means an accusation of economic and cultural repression, conducted by the mainstream population. In Germany, references to the contribution of the Jews to the German history are made in the textbooks. Some books also deal with the Slavic minority of Sorbs, who were repressed during the Third Reich.

Minority can be defined as a group with reduced social and cultural opportunity and power. In that respect women have long been a minority. Women's history has for a couple of generations been an established field of study, and makes a feasible alternative point of view in school textbooks, too. So far, they mostly appear as passive bystanders, instead of being portrayed as active agents of historical change. In this respect there is scope for more attention to the gender perspective in textbooks.

Multiperspectivity is the essence of history. It is necessary in pointing out, that events in the past always resulted from choices, and that avenues towards alternative choices were left under the surface. History of the minorities and losers is as vital for understanding why historical change eventually went on. Multiperspectivity also contributes to an open dialogue in a society. If one side of the historical experience is hidden, like it often is in a totalitarian, conformist education, history with two faces tends to appear. One example is provided by the Baltic country of Estonia. In Estonia, while the official history texts attempted to contribute to the making of an all-Soviet historical identity, on the cost of indigenous ethnic Estonian identity, the families kept transmitting unofficial authentic stories of the past. The result was two faces: in the public a person spoke of the great motherland the Soviet Union, while in privacy a sense of Estonian patriotism was maintained by him. A citizen with two faces does not belong to a democratic society.

2. Transparency

A history text is transparent, if a reader can ask and check, how the facts of the texts were established and who on what premises made the interpretations. In school textbooks systematic references and documentation are not made, as the text is expected to be easy to read and attractive to its layout. However, in the name of intellectual honesty, a student is always entitled to ask: how do we know X. He has the right to be critical and suspicious and to judge the argumentation by the author. Otherwise he is being manipulated and may refuse the lesson.

In practical terms, the level of documentation and references can be present only now and then in a textbook. For every big theme, there should be a unit with documents for the students to do individual, active and critical work on them. The documents and

references should include contradictory evidence, in order to let the students to judge the reliability of the sources and to realise the multiperspectivity of the issue. In most cases, however, it is the teacher who provides the evidence. It is his or her duty to make it clear to the students that both the facts and the judgments are founded on evidence and are open to new interpretations. A textbook should at least be sufficient transparent, i.e. referential, to provoke and encourage critical historical thinking.

An example: what would be a better way to provoke a critical thinking about the nature of French Revolution than to present *The law of suspects* from 1793. The law lists paragraph by paragraph, who were the suspects of being public enemies. Among them are 'those who are acquainted with the members of nobility', 'those accused of crimes even if freed of accusations' and 'those who cannot present a testimony of their patriotism'. The paragraphs make a student to think of the role of terror in a revolution.

The study of documents and contradictory evidence belongs to every stage of history studies. Already a 10-11 year-old, if given exciting and linguistically not too demanding documents – preferably also picture documents – will be able to compare, interpret and make conclusions. After having been a historian himself or herself, his or her way of reading a textbook will be different from how it was before. He or she will not forget to ask: who wrote this; is this a fact or an interpretation.

In the upper secondary school, an effective way of making texts transparent is to introduce contradictory historians to the students. To read what a Marxist and a liberal historian wrote about the role of the mob in the French revolution, or what they wrote of the industrial revolution, makes a student to approach a historical episode as a problem, instead as a bulk of information as such. A use of historical research illuminates the history as an inquiry to the students. In some history textbooks, especially in Britain, a new theme is introduced through quoting a couple of contradictory historians on the theme. The quotations create a fruitful tension in a students mind: what was the real meaning of this historical event?

For a citizen of an information age the critical skills are a more important outcome of history studies than a bulk of information as such. An encounter with the present information flood requires a skill to judge what is essential and what is trivial, what is from a reliable source and what written for purposes of propaganda and what is a well argued judgement and what is only bias. History made transparent is a good teacher of a critical citizenship.

3. Human agency

In the ideological age of historiography, the historical change was attributed to abstract forces of history. In nationalism it was the primordial nations, in the Marxist history it was the class conflict, in liberalist history the principle of freedom that made things happen and society change. In the post-ideological history the human agency is in focus. We ask: who as a group or as a person intended a change and acted for it. In fact, we see happenings and events as action and developments as projects. There are different views of the nature of history; some schools of historiography still emphasise structural explanations like 'social divisions caused the revolution' and there is the linguistic turn of social sciences that makes history look like an aesthetic

craft where language determines the truth. Still, at least the monolithic ideas that made historical change into rigid linear structures gave way for human intentions and agents. They act with the social structures and collective beliefs as their background, but they are still attributed a remarkable amount of free choice.

Moreover, the free choice is bound to the human responsibility. A war does not just break, like a thunderstorm, but it is intended and started by some people who then carry a responsibility for it. Still in the 19th century, e.g. Otto von Bismarck exempted political leaders from a responsibility as he considered a war as a necessary test of a nation. A nation required a war. It was after World War I that a government first was declared guilty of war and made responsible for the reparations. After World War II the responsibility was defined judicially and people were sentenced for crimes against peace and humanity.

In Finland, in the textbooks of today there are more persons and groups than before. Persons make good stories, but that is not the only reason. History is today considered to be rather a field of humanities than a social science. People want to learn what it in reality means to be a human being, with good and bad intentions and an agency with a true responsibility. The movement of micro history, history that digs stories of ordinary people out from the evidence, has affected school books. The books offer patches from personal diaries and local sources to show, how ordinary people took risks, survived and made the best of their lives. History of ordinary people with everyday settings is expected to develop in young people a sense that everybody is somebody, everybody is an actor in history.

4. No periods in parentheses

As all the different groups in a society should have an opportunity to construct his or her history from the material provided by the school history, school history should comprise elements of the collective memory of the all substantial groups. Apart from pursuing social cohesion through the main stream history, and mediating the high points and core experiences of the dominant social and ethnic groups, history education should be inclusive of minority and even marginal experience. This is pedagogical challenge, as the inclusion of a big variety of stories might mess up a syllabus. Still, it is necessary for history not to be socially exclusive.

There are examples of syllabi, where a whole period has not been properly dealt with, as it did not suit a mainstream story. One example is from Estonia during the Soviet era. The short history of Estonian independence in the 1920s and 1930s, with its cultural and social achievements, was barely shortly characterised as a nationalist bourgeois dictatorship. Still, it was a period of pride in the collective memory of the Estonian middle classes. The omission caused in many families a dualism of a private and public history. Another example is from the unified Germany of the 1990s. In the textbooks of the 1990s the forty years of the GDR were labelled as a non-democratic, non-free period. The culture, economy and life of nearly two generations 1949-1989 was not properly made sense of. That made it impossible to the people of the new Länder to face up to their past. Some felt defensive, as the collective memory comprised also positive sides of the period. Some simply felt unable to think of the past. Their historical consciousness lacked in depth and balance. They could not match their future expectations with an understanding of the past.

5. Thematic or problem-based organisation of the content

Study problems, not periods, declared an Oxford scholar, J. Bury c. hundred years ago. He meant themes like war and peace, power and resistance, decline and rise. He was accused of being a positivist, instead of a true man of humanities.

In the present day there are certainly problems that deserve systematic attention and historical illumination. There is the very acute problem of war, a problem of growing gap in the living standards of the world, and the problem of sustainable lifestyle, and many other problems that have historical roots or historical analogies. Therefore a history curriculum organised around problems instead periods has strong arguments supporting it.

In many European countries history in the upper secondary school is thematically organised. In Finland we have four broad themes: (1) Man, environment and culture through ages, (2) European culture through ages, (3) International affairs in the 20th century and (4) The turning points in the Finnish history of the 20th century. Two first themes are linear surveys of developments and the two last ones are meant to allow deep, multiperspective studies of a few chosen topics within one century.

The thematic or a problem-centred curriculum is expected to enable training of critical and communicative skills in history. If the time-span is sufficiently short, a variation of study perspective can take place. That way the requirements of multiperspectivity and transparency can be materialised in the teaching material and processes.

Conclusive remarks about Russia in Finnish textbooks

The political change in Eastern and Central Europe affected Finland, too. Also the history textbooks changed, especially the presentations of the Finnish-Russian relations.

For four decades since World War II the Finnish-Soviet relations were stagnantly dominated by the existence of the Agreement of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance. The agreement was forced to Finland as one of the loser of the World War II. Therefore the friendship was not altogether spontaneous. It was further harmed by some Western, NATO-linked commentators, who in the 1960s characterised the Finnish position as "Finlandisation". It meant a voluntary submission to the expectations of a big power. Moreover, it meant self-censorship: the Finns did not express any offensive criticisms of the Soviet union.

The Finns rejected the claim of Finlandisation as inadequate. The friendship that in the beginning, just after the war, was not very genuine, gradually grew and developed into a certain amount of trust. All the time, however, a certain caution and defensiveness prevailed among the Finns.

The self-censorship affected the history schoolbooks, too. The writers obeyed the code of presentation that ruled in the Soviet Union itself. No open criticism of politics or the conditions of life was expressed. Even Soviet terms were used. The political system of the USSR was not called totalitarianism but 'democratic centralism'. An

American educationist Larry Shaw in 1980 in the yearbook of the German schoolbook research institut, Georg-Eckert-Institut, pointed his attention to the difference in the presentations of Russian and American histories in the Finnish textbooks and considered them Finlandised. Shaw's study was not very reliable, and was refuted in public by Finnish history educators.

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s a Finnish-Soviet schoolbook committee regularly convened and discussed history books. Only one crisis happened. In 1977, the Soviet part of the committee suggested that the secret protocol of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact from 1939 ought to be omitted from the Finnish textbooks, as its existence was not recognised by the Soviet historians. The Finns refused and Russians did not insist on the measure. This shows that Finlandisation was at least not unconditional.

What has happened after the end of the Soviet union on the level of school books?

Some changes in the ethos and presentations have taken place. Again, one could suggest that the changes are in accordance with the code which is used in Russian historiography and is critical and revisionist. Biggest changes concern the representation of the wars 1939. In the case of the winter war the Finnish textbook writers regard the Soviet Union as the aggressor, while before the Finnish foreign policy had been appointed some criticism, too. The resistance of the Finnish army is being praised like not before. The alliance with Germany in 1941 is today excused, through a reference to the Soviet threat, while before it was criticised.

In regard to the history of the Soviet Union itself, the Finnish textbooks could be even less revisionist than the Russian textbooks. At least they do not go as far as e.g. the Estonian schoolbooks in their condemnation of the October revolution. The events of 1917 are in the Finnish textbooks still portrayed as a true revolution, instead of being called 'just a coup'. Lenin is not portrayed as a power greedy dictator, as in the Estonian schoolbooks, but as a revolutionary leader. However, he is appointed the guilt of the murder of the Tsar family. In one Finnish textbook Stalin is only mentioned, without an account of his politics. The reason, according to the author, was that an account of Hitler was enough to portray a dictator.

The number of the pages dedicated to Russia/the Soviet Union is slightly smaller than in the 1970s. Still, Russia makes the dominant neighbour of Finland in the textbooks, in comparison e.g. to the Scandinavian countries with their peaceful histories. Russia is not the arch enemy, as it was in the 1930s, neither is an object of obligatory tribute, as it was in the 1970s. It is a big neighbour with a troubled past and unknown future.

History is a politically sensitive subject. It is affected by political changes, which causes questions about its reliability, but history can also help people in a reorientation to the changed situation. A certain coherence of orientation is always required to make a tolerable society, and history can contribute to it through an open, critical approach to change.

II. The report of Dr Ludmila Aleksashkhina

“The urgent problems of school historical education in Russia in XX - XXI centuries: from the standards to the system of certifying pupils”

The last decade of the XXth century has shown considerable changes in Russian school: the transition from the rigid centralized, united system of school education to the varied education at the senior school, diverse programmes and textbooks, etc. In this context the issue of preserving a united educational environment has risen along with the need to define basic and compulsory content of education, requirements to pupils' training. The educational standards should assist in resolving the issues.

The first standards on general educational subjects including history were created on a competitive basis. The standards which were developed by the Institute of General Secondary Education of the Russian Academy of Education in 1993 were acknowledged to be the best. The main components of the standards:

- a) a basic curriculum;
- b) a compulsory minimum of educational content;
- c) requirements to the level of graduates' training.

The first and second parts are traditional. The main problem when developing their content is the selection of the content according to the time given by the curriculum and the age of pupils. The last part – the requirements to the level of graduates' training. To formulate them it was necessary to define the structure and content of cognitive activity which are specific for each subject (scientific discipline) and mastered by pupils at different stages of education. That was a new task and its solution was a considerable step towards active approach to education. The following elements of pupils training in the context of the history were defined:

1. Chronological knowledge, the ability to work with dates.
2. Factual knowledge (places, circumstances, participants, the results of events), work with facts.
3. The work with sources.
4. Description of historical events.
5. Analysis, explaining (the correlation between separate facts and common phenomena; defining essential characteristics of events; the systematization of facts; the knowledge of historical terms and concepts; explaining causes and consequences of events).
6. The examination of historical versions and opinions.

As the ratification of the projects of educational standards is being delayed by the State Duma, the Ministry of Education adopted them as working legislative documents in 1998-1999, and so they operate till now.

The problem of improving and approving educational standards.

The new stage of work on the educational standards started in 2001-2002. The materials of the previous standards lay in the basis of the new ones, the work was carried out by the same authors. The new project directors didn't put out new ideas or methodology. There were just several attempts to expand the active components of the standards, to unify the requirements to pupils' training on different subjects. The desire to include pupils' competences along with the skills into the number of the main components was met sceptically. The attempt to include into the content of the standards on history the names of separate historical figures also arouse issues concerning the criteria of the selection. On the whole, the new stage of work hasn't resulted in any considerable achievements. The issue of improving and adopting standards which would define the content and the level of education at contemporary Russian school is open. By the way, another group of problems that touches upon the basis of the educational system is being resolved quite successfully. This is the final certification of pupils.

The united state exam on history: the tasks, content and forms of certification.

The united state exams on general educational subjects including history have been carried out in Russian schools since 2001. They aim at defining the levels of pupils' training in order to certify them at the end of their school education and select for enrolment at higher educational institutions. The exams were preceded by a huge work on defining the common approaches and developing testing materials. Today the first results and perspectives of the work are open for discussion. All the questions concerning the history as well as other humanitarian subjects arouse considerable public interest.

The main legislative documents of the final certification of the secondary school graduates are the compulsory minimum of the content of historical education in senior school (10-11 grades) and the requirements to the level of the senior pupils' training (the documents were adopted by the Ministry of Education in 1998-1999). Not only is the knowledge of pupils tested but also their cognitive capabilities and skills of work with historical material.

The test of pupils' training is carried out in accordance with the specificity of the subject. On the one hand, it includes information about certain events – the dates, places, participants, results – which is fixed by historians “impartially”. It's an objective part of historical knowledge. On the other hand, the historical events are explained by their contemporaries and descendants who look at them subjectively and explain them in the context of individual and social values. This sort of knowledge includes indefinite opinions. Unlike other subjects the history deals not with real objects but with their reconstructions. Therefore the study of history requires different cognitive skills and actions. These are critical thinking and synthesis of sources' information, reproducing (reconstruction) events, their understanding and formulating opinion, modeling situations, imagination and empathy, justifying one's own opinion, etc.

All the elements mentioned above can be divided into two groups. The first one

contains objective knowledge and cognitive actions which suppose: 1. the knowledge of dates, facts, names, etc.; 2. chronological sequence of events, their stages; 3. comparing events and situations, identifying the common and specific. These elements of training can be tested by questions having single meaning, the answers to which are easily estimated as “right” or “wrong”. Consequently, the tests bear algorithmic character and can be checked with the help of technical devices.

The second group is more difficult to check. The elements are connected with subjective historical knowledge, diverse variants of historical description and explanation: a) interpretation of historical sources; b) sorting out material in order to describe, analyze and formulate common statements; c) making conclusions as the result of analysis; d) different approaches to estimating historical events and personalities, reasoning why this or that version or conception is more preferable. In such cases there are no “right” answers. Only common frames are set which help to evaluate pupils’ works. The answer must be precise and full if it contains facts and terms, it must be logical, all the conclusions must be justified, etc. The content of the works is compared with the requirements of the curricula and textbooks.

The structure and content of written exam paper on history (the experience of 2001-2003).

The history at school is often defined as an “oral” descriptive subject. Therefore such an approach requires more serious attitude to the selection of the content and forms of the written test on this discipline. The most important requirement to the united state exam (USE) on the history is its representativeness, that is it must test all the aspects and elements of secondary school graduates’ training. Therefore the written test contains a wide range of tested objects and forms of tasks.

The exam paper on history was composed according to the following principles:

- to test all the types of knowledge: objective, evaluative, different versions;
- short and detailed answers are combined;
- several tasks require only to choose the right answer while others need a thorough historical description or analysis;
- there are tasks which involve working with historical sources (practical tasks).

The content of the exam paper includes the material on Russian history from ancient till modern times. It correlates with the requirements to the entry examinations at higher educational institutions. The examination material is studied at school for 2 years (10 and 11 grades), therefore the number of tasks on each part of the course increases starting from the ancient history towards the modern times. For example the exam tests of 2001-2002 adopted the following proportions: Russian history from the ancient times till the beginning of the 17th century – 6 tasks (10% of the test), the history of the 17-18th centuries – 8 tasks (14%), 19th century – 11 tasks (20%), the 20th century – 25 tasks (39%). The vast tasks which involve working with a document (a series of questions to one document) and tasks which suppose a detailed answer on a certain issue refer to different periods in each variant. Each variant of the exam paper combines tasks which touch upon different historical aspects – economics and social

relations, domestic and foreign policy, public movements, material and spiritual culture, etc.

The exam test on history consists of three parts including three types of tasks:

- **the part A** contains 40 tasks to choose the right variant of answer (4 variants are given, one is the right one);
- **the part B** – 10 tasks which suppose a short answer, that is a name, date, or their combination;
- **the part C** – 7 tasks which suppose detailed answers; they are divided into two groups: 1. tasks to analyze a historical document; 2. tasks to consider a certain historical issue.

Such a structure, in authors' opinion, embraces all the content and types of activity and, therefore meets the requirements of the final and entry examinations. They took into consideration the experience of several higher educational institutions the entry exams on the history of which contained oral tasks and written tests.

The exam on history is optional. It was put into practice on an experimental basis in the Chuvash Republic in 2001. 10 variants were used, 94 pupils were attracted. The number is too small to make any conclusions based on the statistic data. In 2002 the written exam was carried out in 6 regions (the Yakutija Republic, Chuvash Republic, Novgorod region, Novosibirsk region, Orenburg region, Samara region), it was passed by 6594 graduates. In 2003 we've got requests for the exam on history from 48 regions.

The results obtained in 2002 enabled us to make several conclusions. Firstly, on the whole the structure and content of the test meet the requirements. Secondly, several aspects which need improving have appeared. Special attention is paid to the tasks that involve a detailed answer. They are rather complicated, partly because they are given in written form. The answers are rather subjective and it's difficult to check them. However, this group of tasks mustn't be avoided as they more than other tasks meet the requirements of the entry exams at higher educational institutions.

The exam paper of 2003 adopted new structure of the part C.

The module which involved working with a source (a part of a historical document) included 3 tasks (the tests of 2001-2002 contained 5 tasks). But the tasks suggested a certain sequence of cognitive actions: C 1 – the pupils have to attribute a document, define the events and personalities; C 2 – they need to explain the problem in the historical context (for that pupils should use their knowledge of history); C 3 – the analysis of the author's opinion, interpreting, evaluating events (including pupils' own opinions and their justifying). Therefore the tasks become more and more complicated. On the whole the tasks suppose a complex analysis of a source.

The second group of the tasks of the part C supposes describing, analysis and explaining historical events. They are the most expansive and, at the same time, the most difficult. The exam papers of 2001-2002 contained two similar tasks which involved giving a detailed answer to a certain topic (C 6 and C7). The first one

referred to the period from the 8th to the 19th centuries, the second one – 20th c. The results of the exams showed that only a small proportion of pupils managed to accomplish the tasks successfully. Therefore the content of the tasks was completely changed.

The part C of the exam paper of 2003 included a series of tasks which envisaged undertaking certain actions characteristic of historical study (they can be called aspect tasks according to the aspect cognitive issues formulated by I.J.Lerner). Each variant of the test contains the following tasks:

C 4 – generalized characteristic, systematization of historical material

C 5 – the comparative analysis of historical events

C 6 – the analysis of a historical situation

C 7 – the analysis of historical versions and opinions.

Thus the group of tasks enables to test diverse elements of pupils' historical training. It's also supposed that the tasks, which are more concrete than, for example, an essay, would help pupils reveal their skills and knowledge more successfully.

Testing several variants of the exam paper of 2003 at Moscow schools showed pupils' interest to the new part C. In the answers the pupils didn't limit themselves to a mere reproducing dates and facts, on the contrary, they tried to give their own opinion and justify it. On the other hand, the analysis of their works showed that quite often the senior pupils do not read the tasks attentively and understand their meaning properly; they do not have some important skills (e.g., they do not know how to compare things).

An important part of work on introducing the united state exam is the explanation of its goals, structure as well as publishing demonstrative and training materials. Such materials are published by the Ministry of Education, methodological magazines ("The Teaching of History and Social Sciences at School"), in the form of booklets edited by the publishing houses "Enlightenment", "Intellect-Center", "Dropha" and others.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the work carried out in 2001-2003 on developing testing materials for the united state exam on history is a considerable step forward to resolving a whole range of issues which are connected with the content of school historical education.

III. The report of Dr Vladimir BARABANOV **“History Teacher Training at the Higher Educational Institutions of the Russian Federation in the context of Modernizing Teaching at School ”**

The characteristic of our contemporary higher pedagogical education is deep reforming of all the levels of the educational system (school and vocational training, the structure of pedagogical education, its content, teaching technologies, ways of evaluating results). More and more often the term “modernization” has been used to denote the changes in this sphere. It all takes place under the circumstances of global, scaled changes of goals and values in the system of education, the types of cultures and economical development. We must face the fact that teacher’s orientation on giving just knowledge, using verbal and reproducing forms of education leads to breakdowns, the lack of motivation, inability to use the knowledge in practice and orientate in the informational environment; it doesn’t develop pupils intellectually. It results in low social activity of a person, increasing inner contradictions and discontent with the world. It’s necessary to mention that the seminars which have been organized by the Council of Europe for history teachers and methodologists enabled us to realize the problems as well as achievements in the field of history teaching, study the world practice and evaluate our own one.

The change of paradigms in the educational sphere, the fall of values, obsolescence of all the components of social practice put out new demands to a modern specialist in the field of education. He/she must be flexible enough in order to sort out the content, to organize cognitive activity, to foresee the ways of intellectual and emotional development of pupils. Along with a perfect knowledge of his/her subject, a contemporary teacher is able to understand the universal character of the knowledge and skills he/she forms; to make them multifunctional and to establish links with other subjects; and, what is more important, to form key competences. The competent approach guarantees a universal content of education which can be used under most conditions and develop continuously. Such an education stands above all the subjects and links them all as it contains diverse forms of activities: critical thinking, self-evaluation, individual and group work, etc.

In this regard the task of pedagogical and university education is to integrate into the world educational system. It’s especially important in connection with the so-called “Bolognese” process. At the same time we must not just reproduce the western practice but preserve the positive achievements of our own higher education.

For many decades a one-level system of pedagogical education has existed in our country. Nevertheless today its potential is considered to be exhausted. The system is conservative and doesn’t face the modern demands, it doesn’t give the students any choice of educational routes, it has exhausted its ability to self-develop; it doesn’t ensures diverse types of training and, at last, it doesn’t blend with the existing world standards of higher education.

Nowadays we are searching for theoretical-methodological grounds and principles of new educational systems of pedagogical education which would create necessary conditions for realizing all the ideas. A perspective study in this direction is the research work of the Herzen State University on the new generation of educational standards within the framework of a multi-level system of teacher training. The

different levels of the educational process suggest forming a more complex educational potential of students in several stages and expanding potential zone for the practical use of knowledge. Such a system of education enables students to realize their expectations and interests within the framework of several educational ways (Bachelor and Master's degrees, specializing in a definite field) of getting higher pedagogical education.

The open system of pedagogical education supposes that it's flexible and ready to face social changes. Today it means considerable expanding the range of services which are aimed at the diverse society's needs and individual demands. Nowadays the graded higher professional education is realized through the multi-level model of higher pedagogical education, which is fixed by the Law of the RF "On Higher and Post-Graduate Professional Education". It is supposed to single out three stages: incomplete higher pedagogical education (2 years), basic higher pedagogical education – Bachelor's degree (2 years), complete higher pedagogical education – Master's degree (2 more years). The succession of these stages will be secured by the move from forming personal characteristics which are needed to perform successfully any kind of activity to forming characteristics which are necessary for a specific pedagogical profession (a history teacher, for example). Consequently, the integrated system of pedagogical education stands for the inner unity of all its aspects which results in the new quality of the system. The integrity means that general educational and professional, theoretical and practical trainings are joined together. The unity is based on the orientation to form personal professional characteristics of a teacher who is able to use his/her subject to develop pupils of different ages, their capabilities and social experience. The educational standard, curricula and programmes contain an important cultural module which includes a philosophical component so that pupils could understand the basic grounds of the being, an evaluative component, natural scientific, communicative components, etc. A considerable place is taken by the subject knowledge, which is the main mechanism of the culture dissemination.

Undoubtedly, this system of education, which has been partly borrowed from the West, has its problems. They become vividly apparent in Russia where it is difficult to speak about its deep roots.

The dynamic social life demands continuous teacher training. The fundamental knowledge has become more important. Traditionally thorough knowledge meant specialist's competence, but a contemporary higher educational institution shouldn't reduce the term. One of the ways to secure fundamental pedagogical education is to introduce integrative courses into the structure of the educational programme as the process of education is being more and more intensified and expects that a student would learn interdisciplinary general concepts, principles, laws and rules. Another way is to pay more attention to the methods which generalize and transfer skills and knowledge. Students' education shouldn't be restricted to learning ready practical recommendations, he/she must be able to use the existing methods and innovative technologies of teaching creatively.

The contemporary standards of the multi-level pedagogical education have humanitarian basis – it involves orienting to another person, continuous professional self-development.

One of the most important trends of higher pedagogical education is the trend towards innovative education. It's a remarkable step on the way from passive teaching to an active one which supposes spending more time on independent students' activities. However, we have to acknowledge that the innovations in this field bear a demonstrative character; their active use is impeded by poor equipment of the educational process and teachers' conservatism. Other negative factors are the contradictions existing in our legislation (for example, the absence of a contemporary tariff scale), the vague status of those who get Master's degree (are they scientists in the field of education, teachers at profile schools or someone else?).

The questions for discussion in the working group:

How are the ideas of modernizing school education reflected in professional pedagogical education?

What factors prevent from moving to the new generation of the pedagogical educational standards?

What principles are in the basis of the new generation of the programmes? How should the technologies of realizing the existing programmes be changed?

What's the distinctive feature of history teacher training? How is it realized in the curricula of pedagogical higher educational institutions?

How should the educational goals be defined? How should the content of education and ways of evaluation be sorted out in accordance with the goals?

What are the criteria for selecting teaching technologies in order to realize the goals?

What's the specificity of teacher's professional self-actualization under the conditions of modernizing general education?

What are the criteria for estimating students' training at pedagogical higher educational institutions?

What are the methods and technologies of estimating students' progress?

How are the students made to evaluate their own progress?

IV. The report of Baranov P.A.

“In-service training of history teachers: results and perspectives”

The importance of in-service training was marked by the famous Russian teacher K.D.Ushinsky who admitted that “a teacher lives until he learns”. It is especially true today when the social life is developing faster and faster which makes the future generations learn more and more than the previous ones. Consequently, the role of in-service training is rising.

The goal of the article is to consider the most important aspects of history teachers re-training.

The analysis of Russian education reveals in our country a state system of in-service training. We'll single out its most important features.

Firstly, it's the most flexible structure of training for adults as it is ready to meet new demands and needs of historical education through organizing courses of re-training for history teachers.

Secondly, within the framework of the system a scientific-methodological community has formed. Its characteristic is quick putting scientific ideas in the field of history teaching into practice.

Thirdly, a specific type of the teacher who was formed through the system of in-service training. He/she is a scientist who is able to put into practice contemporary achievements in the field of theory and methods of history teaching as well as to carry through analytical and research work on mastering up-to-date pedagogical experience.

Nowadays the system of post-graduate education supplements the basic professional teacher training and carries out compensative and adapting functions. In particular, the work on history teachers' mastering the new content of the subject has proved to be extremely successful over the last years. They have neglected the use of the only class approach to the history; they've introduced new materials on the history of religion, customs and traditions – the materials which were not studied at their higher educational institutions due to the ideological pressing. Besides, the traditional functions of the system of in-service training are supplemented the function of developing teacher's personality, his/her conceptual ego, understanding social, cultural and educational conditions. It's explained by the modernization of general education which makes Russian school define new goals. Therefore the system of post-graduate education must prepare history teachers to realize them. Naturally, in the context of reforming general education and, in particular, historical, the function of developing teacher's personality, that is his/her readiness to innovative activity, ability to transform his/her own activity as well as the surrounding cultural environment, has become extremely important.

The content of teacher in-service training largely depends on the main approaches to the contemporary general education. The key point of education is to define not what a pupil should learn but what a pupil should know. Therefore it supposes individual studying the content of historical education which is possible only in the process of pupil's independent work. Such an education bears individual and active character. As

the educational priorities are the results of history teaching, a teacher is free to choose the ways and methods of their achievement.

The new approaches to the general education require changes in the content and organization of history teachers' in-service training. It is supposed that the post-graduate education should pay more attention to forming teacher's skills to project educational ways of pupils' progress, in particular, to organize pupils independent creative searching work within the framework of the history. That's why, in our opinion, the proportion of practical lessons in the content of educational programmes of in-service training should be increased as such lessons develop the professional skills more effectively than lectures.

In this connection we'll touch upon several key problems of conducting practical lessons within the framework of history teachers' in-service training.

Firstly, in our opinion, the main role at practical lessons should play doubts of the teacher of the system of in-service training. Sharing the doubts stirs audience's minds and creates the atmosphere of joint thinking. The teacher should use a dialogue actively in order to identify and overcome the problems.

Secondly, a history teacher should be taught to see the sense of his/her pedagogical activity. In this regard M.Voloshin's metaphor can be used: "They create not understanding their mission". Quite often teachers can't explain their own interesting methodological findings, analyze their lessons, define cause-and-effect relations in teaching. Thus the practical lessons in the system of post-graduate education should be aimed at teachers' analysis of their own pedagogical achievements. It's especially important today when teachers work under the conditions of a wide choice of concepts, curricula, textbooks, etc. which requires analytical skills.

Thirdly, it's important not just to encourage a teacher to find solutions of controversial tasks which are given at the practical lessons, but also to formulate the demands to the system of in-service training which is a necessary condition of its further development.

At last, the teacher of the system of in-service training represents the ideal of a contemporary history teacher and gives the necessary information in the course of a lecture, but he/she can't be sure that his/her advice and recommendations are assimilated by the audience. As the practice shows, the mere understanding of new approaches to the general education by a teacher doesn't necessarily mean that he/she is ready to realize them. The mechanisms of their realizing should be defined and mastered at the practical lessons which create prerequisites for the differentiation of the process of re-training and individual approach.

The criteria of evaluating history teachers' in-service training must be checked experimentally. We'll enlist some of them, but still they do not have scientific grounds. This is just a scheme:

- the achievement of professional self-development by a history teacher;
- are they satisfied by the process of in-service training?

- do the history teachers recognize the usefulness of further contacts with the teachers of the system of in-service training after finishing the course of re-training? What's the number of the contacts, their character?

Along with the achievements of history teachers' re-training, which has already been mentioned above, we have to touch upon a number of problems which are still unresolved by the system of post-graduate education.

Firstly, under the conditions of the transition from the instructive-informational, impersonal interaction with the audience to satisfying its educational demands, which is a characteristic of the new educational policy aimed at decentralization and humanization, a problem of correlating educational demands of the state and history teachers has appeared. It becomes obvious while constructing the educational programmes of in-service training.

Secondly, another problem hasn't been resolved yet, It's connected with formulating requirements to the content of the programmes of in-service training of history teachers at different educational institutions, especially the profile education.

Thirdly, the link between the in-service training, teachers' salaries and career prospects is non-existent.

The recognition of the results and perspectives of history teachers' re-training is an urgent scientific-research task as raising its efficiency is an important prerequisite of modernizing educational system.

Bibliography:

1. Baranov P.A. The Problems of history Teaching at School. Practical manual for the system of post-graduate education. Moscow, 2002.
2. Baranov P.A. On the Problems of History Methodologists' In-Service Training//Teaching of history and Social Sciences. 2002. – No 2.
3. Vorontsova V.G. Humanitarian and Value Basis for the Post-Graduate Education of a Teacher. – Pskov, 1997.
4. Dneprov E.D. Educational Standards: Their Sources, Sense and Meaning. – Moscow, 2002.
5. History for Tomorrow (the contemporary reform of school historical education in Russia)/Ed. By E.E.Vyazemsky. – Moscow, 1999.
6. Kritchevsky V.Y. Creative Interaction with a Teacher – the Basis of the Methodological Service // Methodological service of Saint-Petersburg education: searches and problems. – SPb., 1999.

V. The report of Batsyn V.K.

“The cooperation of the Council of Europe and the Russian Federation in the field of teaching history at secondary schools after the Second All-Russian Conference in 1999”

My Russian origin gives me a hope that there is an adequate view in the Ministry of Education, as well as our long cooperation with the Council of Europe shows that Tatiana and I are not antagonists and not in opposition. On the contrary, I'd like to say that for all these long years our cooperation has been built on a deep mutual understanding, understanding of the situation in Russia and the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation, understanding of the subtle state, state of affairs (there is such a term), which is difficult to catch. The state of affairs which sometimes is difficult to formulate, but which exists objectively and it should be fixed and taken into account.

On the one hand, the speech made by Tatiana makes my task easier as I don't have to reproduce the sequence of the seminars, their topics. On the other hand, it makes my goal more difficult: I should try to explain the version of the Ministry of Education taking into account the large mutually accumulated experience. If to put the idea into one sentence, it will sound like this: the main outcome of the three-year cooperation (almost six-year cooperation) is the deep understanding of the necessity to start the work seriously. I don't mean that till now the work has not been serious, I mean that it should be based on more fundamental principles. It shouldn't be just a work with the Ministry of Education or the regions. Our work ought to be built on the strong foundation of the joint activity of the Ministry and the regions on the one hand and the Council of Europe on the other, the activity aimed at resolving common issues. The understanding of the new common tasks which unite Russia and the Council of Europe are principal, common tasks.

It was not easy to get acquainted to correlating the values proposed by the Council of Europe with the values of our own experience of Soviet historical education and, partly, post-soviet. It wasn't a contradiction, it was a kind of inconsistency which created difficulties in understanding and formulating the tasks. But we have overcome it and the documents that I had confirm it. A working atmosphere, psychologically and ideologically friendly has been set up. It allows resolving the issues which I am going to analyze.

What happens in Russian historical education and how does it correlate with our activity, with the Council of Europe? Russian historical education is still in the period of transition. Of course, many problems have been resolved. If we compare the textbooks of the first half of the 90-s and the contemporary ones, we'll see considerable changes. The main change is the renewal, rewriting the history of the previous centuries, especially the 20th c., especially the Soviet period. Many people thought that if the work was accomplished, the main task would be completed. They've rewritten it, rewritten it in different ways; there are textbooks, numerous textbooks written from different angles of view. We do have them, but are we satisfied with these textbooks?

Have the teacher's tasks become more clear, have the tasks of the whole school historical education in today's Russia become clear? Yes and no. Moreover, with the

course of time the “no” becomes more considerable. The matter is that along with the changes in historical school education the world changes, the whole world. In fact, today we’re again, as 12 years ago, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, in a situation, from which not only Russia but the whole world, including Europe, have to find its way, to overcome something. The global processes, global understanding of the humanity as a united organism are the concern of all people. And if we have a look from this global point of view at Russian history, then many issues that seemed to have been well formulated and understood turn out to be vague and obscure again.

My goal is not to analyze textbooks from the point of their efficiency, my goal is another one. We still do not have, and this is perhaps the most important, an expert community that deals with the questions of school historical education. We are still not united, while there are numerous specialists who deal with different aspects of this big issue. Someone works out standards, someone writes new textbooks in different Publishing Houses, different authors have different approaches, views, schools. As a matter of fact, everybody here has his/her own opinion on what is good and what is bad, but the mechanism that would structure all these opinions, makes them correlate with each other, helps to understand the logic of the school historical education do not exist yet.

The time passes and the mechanism doesn’t appear, therefore the issue becomes more and more urgent. And in our amorphous expert-pedagogical community the Council of Europe plays the role of a powerful magnet. This magnet tries to structure the space on absolutely clear basis proposed to us. Let’s imagine the amorphous substance on the one hand and the initiative of the Council of Europe, on the other. What’s the result. The result is very interesting. Each separate seminar is a celebration for all who takes part in it (directly as experts or teachers or the workers of the educational field). Each of the seminars has an extended and prolonged after-effect amplitude. It is clearly seen from the reports, practical actions which take place after each seminar.

But imagine huge Russia and several dozens of seminars like dots on it and you will see that the impulses that each seminar emits do not transfer into one mighty impulse. Who should we reproach? To the Ministry of Education, of course. It must have people who are able to organize the work. And here we’re approaching one delicate aspect, it’s not a secret, but it should be made public. I even don’t remember, but, perhaps, somebody remembers when the national discussion of the issues concerning the school historical education in Russia took place. Perhaps it was in the 70-s, may be in the second part of the 80-s (not later), but not in our days. The practice has established, mostly due to economical reasons, within the framework of which all the intellectual efforts are made on the top and the real life happens below. And the historical education is carried out there, beyond the outer force.

Our dissatisfaction with the textbooks, with the state of affairs is largely explained by these factors. In this respect, our cooperation with the Council of Europe is a unique phenomenon as at least interregional seminars are organized. They are organized with enviable regularity. They emphasize the most important problems which are of crucial importance for us. But these seminars are not those seminars about which I’m speaking now.

We need to use the conference in order to develop at least initial project, the project of reconstructing our inner, Russian system of interaction in the field of school educational policy in order to join the genuine interest which wonderfully corresponds with the interests and goals of the Council of Europe and our system of interaction. Instead of the bipolar structure – the Council of Europe – the Ministry of Education with the way out to the regions – we'll have another structure. Not just the Ministry of Education but the community that can be presented by the Ministry of Education, but indeed it should be larger, vaster than it. Perhaps the fact that the representatives from the administrations of the regions have taken part in this conference gives the chance to formulate the task here. Perhaps we'll manage to do it. The success of the seminars is the most important result of our cooperation. Our cooperation presents a real value, it mustn't be lost, on the contrary, we must use it as a starting point of the growth, inner growth, inner development.

If we try to formulate the tasks of all the seminars, our joint activity with the Council of Europe may be divided into several directions. The conference is called "Stocktaking Conference", not final or current. Thus it's very important to carry out inventory, to evaluate what we have, what we have acquired during this period, what we should do now. A final conference supposes summing up, congratulations to each other, and that's all. But Stocktaking is something different. From this point of view I'm continuing my speech.

Till now we have touched upon the problems of the previous seminars: methodological problems of history teaching at schools, interpretation of historical facts (the seminars in Elista, Samara, Kislovodsk), methodological problems of teaching history (Volgograd, Kislovodsk), the issues of developing and publishing new textbooks (a series of seminars), training and in-service training of history teachers (very important issue), and it was mentioned that the seminar in Irkutsk is apart of all the seminars. Now if we look into the future, what for do we do it? It would be useful to concentrate on how we build the hierarchy of the goals of school historical education and how we evaluate their achievement by teachers and pupils. How do we measure these achievements and competences? Here we mustn't forget about such a category as a value. We often say that education is a transmission of values from one generation to another. What do we mean? What values do we transmit? We should answer to the question, what values the school course of history bears, how the dialogue between the history and close but not historical values, e.g. ethnocultural ones, is built. It's clear that these things are inseparable. But they are not the same. Confessional values, and we understand that the confessional values present in the traditional cultures and mentalities of the peoples.

The next question might provoke emotional reaction: is it right to preserve the tradition of exam on only the history of Russia. On the one hand we proclaim the unity of historical development, but on the other, we train people for the exam on the history of Russia which is separated from the outer history. But what we should take from the world history for the examination, what events and processes. To what extent does or should the school course of history resolve the today's issues? What for do we teach history? To know the past or to foresee the future? What competences does the school history form?

A special topic: computer technologies.

What does European measurement of history mean for us in Russia. If European measurement of history is actual for Europe and us, because we are Europeans, does Asian measurement of history exist? Especially in the view of the events that started today at 4 a.m. Is it Asian measurement of history or European one? Or it is the clash of Asian and European measurements? Should the history teach a pupil to model historical processes, that is to analyze in conjunctive mood: what, if... Any event that took place in history has a certain degree of probability. There were events, the probability of which equaled 0, but nevertheless they happened. Should we teach children to look at history with the eyes of a man who makes decisions, a man in the state of choice. The history happened, next time it won't happen, but there was a choice, who chose and why, what would have been if the choice had been another.

At last, is it possible to formulate of form a competence not overloading a child with factual information; is it possible to train historical thinking with the minimum of historical information? There is a funny cartoon. I like it very much. A sitting boy is swamped with textbooks, his remark: the worst thing about history is that it's too large. Is it possible to give less history?

And my last thesis. In Russia the problem of concentric teaching history hasn't been resolved yet. Perhaps much of what I've said contains the key to the move from the concentric teaching but not to the linear one, perhaps there is a third way. If we imagine that there is an integral mind (here are its elements, we are its constituents) which formulates a task, hierarchy of values, and there are seminars which we'll plan for the next three years. The seminars may be held as usual in concrete places of the Russian Federation, but they will gather people who apart from the seminars carry out their own work on different directions or subprojects under the title "further endless reforming of school historical education in Russia.

It seems to me that I'm moving towards the final part of my speech. Summing up the huge experience, positive experience (there are even no negative aspects of our cooperation, because everything that was done, was done on a high level, especially if we take into account the number of experts invited by the Council of Europe to the seminars), I'll repeat once more that our task is to create a mechanism which will enable us to resolve problems on a higher level.

Due to the fact that still the new quality of history teachers and school textbooks hasn't been reached, the problems of testing still exist the efficiency of our activity means that we must look at this efficiency in a new way. It would be great if today we could answer the question what and how we're going to evaluate in three years. With God's help we'll gather here to celebrate the 303 anniversary and it would be good if we could say that we've made a step forward in this direction.

I'd say that a certain stage has been accomplished, very important stage, which enables us today to carry out the stocktaking. The next stocktaking conference should answer the question, whether we were real stock takers. Thank you.

VI. The report of Ms Tatiana MILKO, Council of Europe
“Cooperation between the Council of Europe and the Russian Federation
in teaching history in secondary schools since 1999”

In my short presentation I would like to introduce to you the main aims of our work elaborated in the three-year programme of cooperation with the Russian Federation as well as the main trends, which were defined as the most important ones. The previous presentations, starting from Dr Vladimir Batsyn, and the presentations which will be dedicated to special issues of our cooperation will enable us to analyse the results achieved up till now and the goals which we could set for the next period of our work.

As you know, our cooperation with the Russian Federation was launched in 1996. Since that time Russia started to be involved in the main programmes on history teaching with the Council of Europe, as it became a full member of the Organisation. In December 1996 the Council of Europe conducted a big Conference in Suzdal. In spite of the cold weather all the participants arrived. I am pleased that today we can see the witnesses of the first Conference on history teaching in Suzdal, here in St. Petersburg. As it has already been mentioned, in spring 1999 we organised the Second National Stocktaking Conference in St-Petersburg, in the Herzen State Pedagogical University, where we analysed the results achieved during the period of 1996-1999.

I would like to give you a rough view on what the Council of Europe had been doing during that period. All the main meetings of the Organisation were aimed at analysing general categories and elements connected with the reform of history teaching. The main attention was concentrated on the preparation of the new programmes and standards on history for secondary schools. At that time we organised meetings dedicated to this important issue to discuss the structure and philosophy of standards. Besides that we also touched upon textbooks on national and world history as well as on in-service training of history teachers.

If we look at that period, we will notice immediately its distinctive feature: cooperation between the Council of Europe and Russia had general character. The main issues were discussed without going into details. The second peculiarity was that cooperation between the Council of Europe and Russia in history teaching at that time was mainly bilateral. Though beginning from 1997 and especially in 1998 Russia started to take part in regional projects as well, such as “The Tbilisi Initiative” and “The Black Sea Initiative”. But it was only the early stage in the development of these projects.

I would like to stress that when developing our activities in the Russian Federation, we always discuss them at the Federal level with representatives of the Ministry of Education trying to combine the necessity of the Russian Federation in history teaching and the experiences provided by the Council of Europe.

As it has already been mentioned today, the situation in Russia changes very quickly. Similarly the philosophy of the activities of the Council of Europe is evaluating corresponding to the changes in the whole world. I would like to draw your attention to the documents of the Council of Europe, which are regarded to be the main for

history teaching. This is the Recommendation of the Parliamentary Assembly which was adopted in 1996. It reflected the main approaches of the Council of Europe to history teaching at that period. They were the following. History should stand beyond politics, it should be depoliticised, not subordinated to an ideology. It should not be used for any kind of political or ideological manipulations.

Now let us analyse the period from 1999 - 2002. We will see that the situation has changed both in the Russian Federation and in the Council of Europe. Now the action plan of our Organisation is based on the another document – the Recommendation which was adopted by the Committee of Ministers in October 2001. You have the text of this document on your tables in Russian. Europe has changed its “political architecture”, therefore, the main elements which are reflected in the document are the European dimension, the diversity of cultures, religions and mentalities. History should help us to understand, appreciate the diversity, and, first of all, consider it as an enriching, supporting factor but not as a destructive one. Regarding it the Council of Europe questions whether we should teach history in the 21st Century based on the same principles as in the 20th Century or we should elaborate new approaches? The things I am going to tell you about may seem to you romantic and naïve, unrealisable today, but we all know that a lot of present-day discoveries are coming from science fiction. In spite of all difficult political situations which exist between countries nowadays, we suppose that in the 21st Century history teaching should unite peoples. It should help to build bridges between countries and continents, but not disunite and enhance conflicts.

During the last three years the Council of Europe based its activity in the Russian Federation along the following guidelines.

The first peculiarity of the new period of our work in the Russian Federation was multi-level character of cooperation. I would like to point out the five main levels in our activities.

1. Bilateral cooperation which still plays an important role in our work. It is interesting to admit that bilateral contacts during this period has acquired a new character, as the main emphasis was on the regional diversity which the Russian Federation presents most vividly. If you have a look at our reports on all the seminars we conducted beginning from 1999, and especially on their geography, you will see that we embraced almost all Russia starting from the North-West, including the Central Russia, Volga region, Urals, the North Caucasus and the Far East. The lists of participants also show that practically all the regions of the Russian Federation were involved in our programmes.
2. The second trend in our work, which was important, is the development of specialised programmes for the prior regions of the Russian Federation. I would like to draw your attention to the Joint Programme between the European Commission and the Council of Europe to strengthen democratic stability in the North Caucasus. As you know the situation in this region is very complicated. I am pleased that the Minister of Karachaevo-Cherkessiya where we launched the programme is today in St. Petersburg. When we were together for the first time in Dombay – a picturesque place – to discuss history teaching, Alison and I were not sure if anybody would come as the situation

was extremely difficult. But at the Seminar we felt that participants were really interested in the discussions. Within the programme (it was completed in the autumn 2002, in Kislovodsk) we had Seminars also in Nalchik and Elista. When two last seminars were conducted in Kislovodsk, special attention was given to the Republic of Chechnya. We had a special Seminar for Chechen history educators, some of the participants of that Seminar are with us today. Similarly, when we were going to the Seminar, Ms Louisa de Bivar Black asked me: "Will anybody arrive?" "We will see", - I answered. The political situation was complicated and it was difficult for people to come. We were really pleased that Chechen specialists came from all the parts of their Republic, including the mountain regions the most touched during the conflict, as well as from the refugees' camps in Ingushetiya.

3. The third trend in our cooperation was connected with our activities in the regional context, in particular with cooperation in history teaching between the neighbouring states. Our two main projects "The Tbilisi Initiative" and "The Black Sea Initiative" should be mentioned here. The special attention was paid to cooperation between Russia and Japan with the help of the Council of Europe. The both parties showed a vivid interest in it. The specialists from two neighbouring countries looked through their textbooks to see how Russia is presented in the Japanese textbooks on history and Japan – in the Russian textbooks. The first meeting took place in St. Petersburg in 1999 and in 2000 the Russian specialists were invited to Japan. It was the important element in our cooperation as it gave a possibility to the specialists from both countries to look at their histories not only from their own point of view but also from the perspective of their neighbour.
4. The fourth level is the level of a wider regional cooperation, within the framework of which Russia was involved into such projects as "The Tbilisi Initiative" and "The Black Sea Initiative".
5. The fifth level supposes Russia's participation in the wide intergovernmental programmes such as " Learning the history of the 20th Century".

Speaking about the trends along which we have worked for the last three years the following peculiarities can be identified. First of all, the issue of standards and programmes was not prior any more, therefore, we had only one Seminar dedicated to this problem which took place in Irkutsk in 1999. The Seminar summed up the discussions of the previous years, but still the issue of standards was touched somehow during the discussions practically at all our meetings on textbooks and on in-service teacher training. I would like to define two aspects which are in the centre of our discussions today. First of all, it is necessary to build bridges between standards, textbooks and the system of assessment of pupils' knowledge and skills. Secondly, a balance between the Federal and regional elements in curricula and textbooks should be provided. Authors of regional history textbooks admitted that the inconsistency between these elements often creates confusion among readers.

Another element which occupied a large part of our cooperation was the in-service teacher training and the system of assessment of their professional level.

All the trends along which we worked during this period were connected with more deep discussions than it used to be earlier. For example, our Seminars in the Volga Region, in Kazan and in Nizhniy Novgorod, were closely connected with the following issues: how to develop the system of in-service teacher training, how to strengthen teachers' motivation to develop their qualification. We had also several seminars on the in-service teacher training in Volgograd and Kislovodsk. I would like to draw your attention to our document which we prepared after the Volgograd Seminar. It is quite different from the traditional bureaucratic reports and it presents methodological recommendations on how to use the oral history in history teaching, how to work on the basis of projects when teaching history, how to develop different types of pupils' individual activities. This Report could be used by teachers in a classroom.

During the last three years we worked a lot on the preparation of new textbooks on world and national history. We tried to discuss all the aspects connected with this issue: how to select and present information, how to choose and integrate illustrations, documents, how to adapt language to the certain age group of pupils, etc. I would like to admit that when we had the Seminar in Kalmykiya, we involved pupils from upper-secondary schools in our discussions. It was the first time when we have done this. During the discussions pupils expressed their own point of view on textbooks which was quite different from the point of view of the adult participants. This experience showed that we should involve the young generation more actively as their perspective could be of a great use for authors of textbooks. Among the numerous comments of pupils there were phrases like: "I do not like this textbook, because it is too boring", "I do not like history, because it is a boring subject".

We also worked a lot with Russian history educators on the use of the new technologies in history teaching. We had a Seminar in Moscow where we analysed how the new technologies could be used in history teaching, whether they could replace textbooks, or they should be used as supplementary teaching materials. During the discussions history educators were warned against unreasonable enthusiasm for the use of the new technologies in secondary schools. It was also pointed out that one should not use the same principles of presentation of historical information on CD-ROMs and in textbooks.

A lot of attention in our work was also paid to the system of assessment of pupils' knowledge and skills in history. Last year in June we conducted a Seminar in Samara, where the experience of the five Russian regions in the development of the new examination test system was analysed. During the debates different points of view were expressed. In the report of the Seminar we presented European experiences in the exams test system, reflecting both its advantages and disadvantages.

I would like also to stress that during the last three years we started to work on the content in history teaching in the Russian Federation. We have already started the discussions on how to strengthen democratic stability, tolerance and peacemaking processes through history teaching, how to select and present recent events in history textbooks, what does it mean stereotypes in history and how to overcome them.

I gave a brief review of the goals, trends and the results achieved during the last three years of our joint work with history educators from the Russian Federation seen from the perspective of the Council of Europe. I hope that the analysis of the real outcomes will be presented by specialist from the Russian Federation.

**VII. The report of Ms Larisa Sokolova, Publishing House «Prosvesheniye»
“The results achieved in the preparation and publication of history
textbooks for secondary schools in the Russian Federation during the
period 1999 – 2003”**

The last decade has shown significant changes in the system of school historical education. As a result, the approach to publishing historical textbooks has been reorganized: one textbook gave way to a great variety of textbooks; the “anarchy” – to a sort of stability. The way which European countries overcame gradually we have to pass with rapid strides. The process is not finished yet. It is headed by the Ministry of Education, and it faces a great number of difficulties.

The problem of editing and publishing textbooks on history can't be solved apart from two other issues which make up the system of school historical education: the standard of school historical education and teacher training (including re-training).

The three issues were discussed at the seminars which were organized by the Council of Europe in 1999-2003. There is no doubt that they have contributed greatly into the system of school historical education in Russia. We were enabled to get acquainted with the experience of our colleagues from Germany, Poland, Austria, Norway, Great Britain, Japan and other countries. We discussed our common problems with our colleagues from different parts of the Russian Federation (from Moscow till Vladivostok) as well. The publishing house “Enlightenment” took part in the seminars in Arkhangelsk, Petrozavodsk, Yaroslavl, Saint-Petersburg, Vladivostok, Kishiniov. The experts of the Council of Europe from Germany and Poland examined our textbooks on contemporary history. As a result of our meetings we exchanged textbooks with our foreign colleagues that helped us in our work on the new generation of textbooks.

At the seminar in Arkhangelsk I told about “Enlightenment's” plans to create new textbooks on Russian and world history which could be called the textbooks of the new generation.

We've created such textbooks jointly with our leading institutions: the Institute of World History of the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Russian History of the RAS. These are not separate school-books, but teaching lines which enable a teacher to resolve the educational tasks step by step.

The line of the world history includes:

Ukolova V.I., Marinovich L.P. “The History of Ancient World”, 5th form.

Vedjushkin V.A. “The History of Middle Ages”, 6th form.

Revjakin A.V., Chernykh A.P. “The Modern History”, 7th form.

Revjakin A.V. “The Modern History”, 8th form.

Sergejev E.J. “The Contemporary History of Foreign Countries”, 9th form.

Ulunjan A.A., Sergejev E.J. “The Contemporary History of Foreign Countries”, 11th form.

Soon the textbook by Ukolova V.I., Revjakin A.V. "The World History" for the 10th form will be published. Thus the line for the basic school is completed and it is kept in the senior school.

The textbooks meet the requirements of the democratic society, and the temporary standard of historical education. In accordance with individually-oriented approach the content includes texts of two levels of difficulty (compulsory and additional), multi-level methodological instruments, documentary and supplementary materials, glossaries, and in several cases, Internet-resources.

Each textbook is accompanied by teaching materials and manuals: working book, methodological manual for a teacher, books for reading, the atlas on foreign history. We are going to issue visual aids.

The books for reading are published by the Publishing House "Rosmen" which is known for its perfect polygraphic quality.

The Publishing House "Rosmen" is preparing to issue a series of books for historical readings to add the set of textbooks published by the "Enlightenment".

The History of Ancient World. Ukolova V.I.

The History of Middle Ages. Vedjushkin V.A.

The Modern History, 16th-18th centuries. Revjakin A.V.

The Modern History, 18th – beginning of the 20th centuries. Revjakin A.V.

The Contemporary History. Shatsyllo. V.K.

The History of Russia from the Ancient Times till the End of the 16th c. Sakharov A.V.

The History of Russia, 17-18 centuries. Sakharov A.N.

The History of Russia, 19 c. Levandovsky A.A.

The History of Russia, 20 c. Gorinov M.M., Pushkova L.L.

The History of Russian Culture. Ryabtsev J.S.

The books for reading have always been a compulsory part of the teaching set. A teacher could find here the material that expanded and supplemented the main topics of the school programme. Teachers used the books for reading at their lessons as well as out of its boundaries.

The new books follow the tradition. The authors of the textbooks worked out books which supplement the programme with an interesting and useful material. The texts of the books are accompanied by a large number of colorful illustrations which are usually absent at teacher's lessons. The illustrated and interesting texts are interesting to pupils make the historical material of the school programme comprehensive and vivid.

The publishing house "Enlightenment" has prepared and issued a new series of textbooks on Russian history for the basic school.

The series starts with the textbook written by the Director of the Institute of Russian History, Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Sakharov A.N. "The History of Russia from the Ancient Times till the End of the 16th c." The textbook for the 7th form is written by Sakharov A.N., too.

The textbook "The History of Russia, 19 c" is written by the assistant professor of the Moscow State University, Levandovsky A.A., who is already known for his textbooks to schools. The last textbook of the series is "The History of Motherland. 20 – the beg. 21 c." by V.A.Shestakov, M.M.Gorinov, E.E.Vyazemsky, edited by Sakharov A.N. The textbook is one of the winners of the All-Russian competition of textbooks on Russian history of the XXth c.

The Publishing House resolves the task of not a separate textbook, but a teaching-methodological set for each form. For example, in addition to the textbook "The History of Russia" by Sakharov A.N. for the 6th form we propose:

Recommendations to each lesson, working book by Sokolova L.A. and visual aids in the form of posters which are sealed up from both sides.

The creation of a good textbook is not restricted by issuing only the first edition. A textbook must be tested at schools, it is needed to be improved, etc.

The textbook by Sakharov A.N. has already been tested in a number of schools of Petrazovodsk, Cheljabinsk, Moscow and other cities, it has got positive recommendations.

I would like to mention the fact that many textbooks issued by the Publishing House "Enlightenment" take into account the experience of elaborating textbooks in Western and Eastern Europe. It became possible thanks to the Programme of the Council of Europe in the field of historical education.

The textbooks are reviewed and tested by the teachers and methodologists from different regions of Russia. The contacts with them were set at the seminars of the Council of Europe. For example, the Director of the Center of Innovations from Petrozavodsk helped us to organize testing a number of new textbooks in Karelia. She is also one of the authors of the Methodological recommendations to the textbooks of Sakharov A.N. An active reviewer of the publishing house is the leading expert in history of the Pskov In-service Teacher Training Institute, Tatyana Pasman. The author of the publishing house is the professor of the Khabarovsk Pedagogical University, O.J.Strelova.

We appreciate the review of our new textbooks given by the Ministry of Education. All of them are included into the Federal List for 2003-2004 academic year.

The Federal list includes 5 series of textbooks for the basic school. Two of them are the "Enlightenment's" series. The second line contains classical textbooks, the golden fund of the "Enlightenment", which are altered according to the new requirements.

All the textbooks have the stamp “Recommended”. In particular, the textbook by E.V.Agibalova, G.M.Donskoy “The History of Middle Ages” was modified considerably. The work was done by the editor, Doctor of historical sciences, the head of the department of the Institute of the World history of the RAS, Svanidze A.A. As a result the textbook took its place in the Federal list again. I’d like to draw your attention to the teaching-methodological set on the modern history elaborated by Saint-Petersburg authors A.J.Judovskaya, P.A.Baranova, L.M.Vanjushkina. It includes a textbook, methodological manual, workbooks and books for reading. At the moment the authors are working on the didactic materials.

The Federal list of 2003-2004 includes the textbooks on history for the basic school created by the publishing houses “Dropha”, “the Center of Humanitarian Education” and “Russian word”. Thus a teacher is given a vast choice.

The “Enlightenment” sends its novelties to many Institutes of In-Service Training. Unfortunately some teachers do not know the new textbooks, they prefer the old ones.

The creation of the series of textbooks, the succession between them, methodological and conceptual unity is a great advantage of the recent days.

For the first time during “perestrojka” when a huge number of textbooks appeared, the authors expressed contrary points of views. For a teacher and a pupil it was difficult to choose what they needed. Sometimes the secondary school proposed material given at higher educational institutions, but these were not textbooks – just books for reading.

Another important issue refers to the methodological unity and the vertical succession of textbooks (between the textbooks on different subjects for one form) and horizontal one (between several historical courses).

Trying to change the existing situation and taking into account the situation with the textbooks in 2000 the Federal Expert Council of the Ministry of Education has sent out to the publishing houses the “Instruction on the requirements to a school textbook”.

When examining textbooks and manuals the FEC pays attention to the following aspects:

1. GENERAL EVALUATION

What features must a textbook have in contemporary conditions?

For instance:

Does the book meet the contemporary requirements of the system of education?

How does it reflect the best values of the contemporary Russian society?

Is the proposed approach scientific?

Does it present different points of views to the events?

2. THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CURRICULUM

3. THE ACCORDANCE WITH THE AGE OF PUPILS

4. METHODOLOGICAL VALUE

5. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE MATERIAL. THE BOOK'S DESIGN

6. AMORTIZATION.

For how long will the book serve? (binding, paper, etc.)

7. BOOK'S VALUE

Does a book cost the money spent on it?

8. ADDITIONAL CRITERIA

What place does the material take in the context of the existing textbooks?

How to use the textbook along with the already existing? etc.

Of course such a strict analysis influences favourably on the selection of textbooks that are recommended for use at schools.

I'd like to emphasize that the goals of the editors of the publishing house "Enlightenment" under the contemporary conditions are:

- working out contemporary textbooks on history for the general educational school which correspond to the modern Russian and world historical science and teaching practice, the requirements to the system of school education of new Russia.

- modernizing the existing textbooks: in order to make the teaching material easier, to improve methodological instruments and update the content.

- creating teaching-methodological sets with the use of the modern technologies – CD and Internet.

The modernization of education supposes using new technologies in history teaching at school. It's remarkable that the seminar on the issue was conducted by the Council of Europe jointly with the Institute of Educational Development, UNESCO in Moscow, in 2001. The representatives at the seminar were not just from European countries but also from the former republics of CIS. The exchange with experience was very fruitful and interesting and has already brought its result. At the moment the publishing house "Enlightenment" has its site in Internet where all the materials are available. A new department "Enlightenment-Media" has been set up. It issues electronic textbooks. It has already issued textbook on ancient history. Its authors used the Pole variant as a basis. At the time jointly with the ИФПН we are preparing a textbook on Russian history from the ancient times till the 20th c.

In future we are planning similar textbooks on all historical courses.

The publishing house "Enlightenment" jointly with the cartographical publishing houses has started to elaborate and issue cartographical didactic aids which, in our opinion, should become a necessary part of the teaching-methodological sets on history and ensure the use of visual methods in the process of education. The combination of the scientific-methodological principles with the fundamental cartography enables the publishing house "Enlightenment" to edit textbooks in

accordance with requirements of schools to their quality.

By 2002/03 academic year the Publishing House "Enlightenment" jointly with the "Cartography" had issued full sets of teaching atlases with contour maps on history. They were prepared on the basis of the atlases which had been developed by the "Cartography", the materials were updated and supplemented, partly they were reorganized in accordance with the new structure of school courses.

In 2003/05 the Publishing House "Enlightenment" is preparing a set of atlases and contour maps according to the new concept of historical education.

The atlases are highly informative and include cartographical and illustrative materials on all the new school courses. It allows using them along with any existing textbook. At that the content of the materials agrees with the content of the new series of textbooks.

The new atlases enable a teacher to select cartographical information in accordance with the level of training of a class or individual pupils and to train their skills of work with maps step by step. It is achieved due to the combination of different ways of presenting information: integrated maps, skeleton maps and additional materials (diagrams, charts, schedules). The atlases are adapted to the age of pupils: they use different means of cartographical imprint and contemporary designing methods.

The contour maps together with the atlases represent cartographical workbooks containing tasks of different levels.

In 2003-2004 we are going to issue the following atlases and contour maps:

The History of Ancient World; the History of Middle Ages; the Modern History, XVI-XVIII; the Modern History, XIX – the beginning XX; the Contemporary History.

Russia from Ancient Times till the end of the XVI c.; Russia in the Modern Times, XVII-XVIII c.; Russia in the Modern Times, XIX - the beginning XX c.

The wall papers which have been prepared for issuing are in accordance with the traditions of Russian cartography. They're a valuable source of cartographical information necessary for demonstration at lessons and corresponding to the standards of education. Scientists, teachers and methodologists of Russia, authors of school textbooks take part in the development of the maps' content.

By today jointly with the cartographical firm “DMB” a set of 25 maps (13 pages) have been issued.

1	The world. Political map. / the World. Forms of the government. (double-sided)	1 : 20 000 000	156x108 cm
2	Europe. Political map. / Europe. Physical map (double-sided)	1 : 4 250 000	135x116 cm
a	The Northern America. Political map. / The Northern America. Physical map (double-sided)	1 : 7 000 000	116x156 cm
4	The Southern America. Political map. / The Southern America. Physical map (double-sided) (двусторонняя)	1 : 5 700 000	116x156 cm
5	Africa. Political map. / Africa. Physical map (double-sided)	1 : 8 000 000	135x116 cm
6	Australia and Oceania. Political map. / Australia and Oceania. Physical map (double-sided)	1 : 5 500 000	116x156 cm
7.	Eurasia. Political map. / Eurasia. Physical map (double-sided)	1 : 10000000	116x156 cm
8	The Russian Federation. Political-administrative map. / Russia. Physical map (double-sided)	1 : 5 500 000	156x108 cm

The maps are approved by the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation and recommended as visual teaching aids.

Soon new integrated maps of Russian regions will be ready as well as subject maps of Russia and the world.

Regional teaching atlases and wall maps.

Today the publishing house “Enlightenment” has all the necessary resources in order to start work on creating regional teaching atlases and wall maps on the order of the board of education. The publishing house plans to carry this work out with the help of the authors – representatives of regions and in accordance with the school programs on local history.

An atlas of Kemerovskaya region is being prepared, the cartographical basis for the maps of Krasnodarsk, Stavropol, Moscow, Rostov and other regions is being developed.

The editorial of history and social sciences of the publishing house “Enlightenment” pays a great deal of attention to the textbooks for the senior school. At present the work is carried out on developing a set of textbooks for senior school:

Borisov N.S., Levandovsky A.A. the History of Russia. 10 form.

Chubarjan A.O. and others.

- “The History of Motherland. XX – the beginning of the XXI century” 11 form. The winner of a competition.

- Methodological manual for teachers on the problems of history teaching (the winner of the competition of НФПК)

- Reading-book

- V.I.Ukolova, A.V.Revjakin. The World History. 10 form (ancient times, middle ages, modern time)

- A.A. Danilov. Russia and the World. 10-11 forms.

At the editorial the Public Council on the issues of school textbooks operates. It includes not only representatives of the capital institutions and boards, but of other regions as well (the heads of educational boards, scientists). The Council deals with the issues of improving the content of education, succession between the secondary and higher educations, modernizing the systems of evaluating knowledge, etc.

At present the “Enlightenment” publishes manuals on the united state exam. It is supposed to issue training materials on the united state exam.

Since January, 1 2003 the Ministry of Education handed over the rights to publish “Educational Bulletin” to the Federal state unitary enterprise “The Publishing House “Enlightenment””. This edition is the only official edition of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation. The editor-in-chief of the magazine is the first deputy of the Minister of Education of the Russian Federation, V.A.Bolotov, the assistant of the editor-in-chief – the counsellor of the Minister, A.A.Pinsky. The manager of the editorial board – M.A.Zhuchkov.

The main task of the magazine – to publish legislative acts and instructions which refer to the field of education, to inform pedagogical community regularly about most important events in Russian educational policy, the content and process of the educational modernization. The main legislative materials are accompanied by the commentaries of the leading experts of the Ministry of Education, representatives of the Committee on Education and Science of the State Duma, the Central Committee of the Trade Union of the workers in the field of education and science.

Besides the regular issues (the magazine is released at least twice a month) the subscribers will get subject issues quarterly. They will be dedicated to the main directions of the educational modernization. In 2002 the pilot variant presented two subject issues: “Everything about the united state exam” and “Profile Education”. It is planned to publish subject issues on the informatization of education, state educational standards, etc.

It is also envisaged to start a new column “Discussion” where everybody will have a chance to take part in discussing educational problems. On the pages of the magazine letters, ideas, constructive offers of readers will be published.

Thus during the period from 1999 to 2003 there were essential changes in preparing and publishing textbooks on history in the Russian Federation. Summing up the results of our joint work I'd like to wish further creative cooperation. Perhaps the discussion of textbooks' content in different countries will help to bring up the generation of the XXI c. in the traditions of peace and tolerance (e.g. the materials on World War II). It's very interesting to get information from the former republics of the CIS about the history teaching. In this question we still have many blank spots. Our textbooks on history are just making an effort to show the latest history of the former republics of the CIS (the textbook of A.O.Chubarjan).

The topic “New technologies in education” deserves attention.

**VIII. The report of Mr Arild Thorbjørnsen, Deputy Director General
Norwegian Board of Education**

How curricula on history teaching for secondary schools reflects main aims in teaching history in the 21st Century, criteria for the selection of the content, the ways of the assesment of pupils' knowledge and skills: the example of Norway”

It is a pleasure and an honour for me to be invited and to have an opportunity to participate in this seminar and give my contribution to a very important issue. My views are based on my experience as a teacher, as a head of an upper secondary school and also as an author of textbooks. I have, in co-operation with other writers, written several textbooks on Norwegian language, literature and social science for upper secondary education. Nowadays I am director of the Department for the national curriculum planning for upper and lower secondary and primary education at The Norwegian Board of Education.

Competence – more than knowledge and skills

The overall aim for the teaching of social studies, including history, in my country is to give the students the opportunity to develop **broad competence**, so our younger generations are prepared to meet the challenges of a fast changing world. When the students leave school they will meet challenges and have to fulfil obligations in their private live, during their work and in their social life. This includes knowledge, skills and attitudes or values.

I have a very simple definition of knowledge and competence:

- Knowledge is what you have.
- Competence is what you show.

In my opinion – and I share this with many other educators - competence is associated with man's capacity to cope with circumstances in private life, in working life, in social life and in other situations. To my mind, competence is more than applied knowledge, it is development and application of skills – but also the delivering of attitudes and the learning of new ones. Competence is the sum of knowledge, skills, abilities, attitudes, will, courage and possibilities.

A broad concept of competence imply the ability of:

- knowing about alternatives and being able to explain these
- being able to act with consideration and responsibility
- being able to reflect about and state the reason for ones actions
- being able to act in accordance with ones intentions

Then, to be a competent person, you must have:

1. **Subject related competence** e.g. certain topics or subjects, both content and methods
2. **Basic competence** e.g. speaking, reading, writing, mathematics, ICT

3. **Social competence** e.g. the ability to cooperate, to solve conflicts, to take responsibility for others. Teamwork
4. **Learning competence** e.g. the ability to develop new knowledge, to analyse a situation or a problem and being able to solve new and unexpected tasks. Being creative and innovative.

To obtain this the learning environment must present subject related and social challenges, and active learning and problem solving are fundamental in the learning process. Self confidence and confidence in ones ability to succeed is a vital condition for effective learning and the developing of broad competence.

The framework

The curriculum in Norway is divided in two main parts; The Core Curriculum and Study Programmes (subject syllabuses):

1 The Core Curriculum – the overall framework

The Core Curriculum covers primary, lower secondary, upper secondary and adult education. The Core Curriculum describes the objectives the student is supposed to work towards in a frame of six different "types of human beings" which creates an ordered whole called *The Integrated Human Being*.

The six "types of human beings" are:

- The Spiritual Human Being,
- The Creative Human Being,
- The Working Human Being,
- The Liberally Educated Human Being,
- The Social Human Being
- The Environmentally Aware Human Being.

In practice this means that for example The Creative Human Being - as a student - is to be taught to develop creative abilities and critical sense, and to learn to find solutions to problems, to practice scientific thinking and methods, to learn the ability to wonder, to pose new questions, to invent possible explanations and to test ones explanations. In other words, to develop a competence both for the challenges in the present and the future.

2 Study programmes (subject syllabuses)

The basic elements of the study programmes are:

- The purpose of the subject
- Broad aims based on competence
- Assessment

The purpose of the study programme is to enhance the cumulative learning effect of the teaching, based on the elements of:

- **Continuity**, which refers to the vertical repetition of important elements of the subject
- **Sequence**, which refers to the progression of the teaching and learning
- **Integration**, which refers to the horizontal dimension between different study programmes, in order to strengthen the development of broad competence of the students

The Norwegian Curriculum is a framework based on rather wide objectives. Instead of outlining specific details concerning the content of the teaching, the curriculum states what competencies the students are expected to have obtained.

The curriculum in practice

The importance of the curriculum is not the written document, but what takes place in the classrooms in the schools. And I want to underline that curriculum development is a never- ending process. Therefore, I think it is very important for both teachers and curriculum planners to take the following six perspectives into consideration in their work when study programmes and guidelines for assessment are made.

- 1 The ideas behind the curriculum
(political, educational, pedagogical)
- 2 The formal curriculum
(The official documents)
- 3 The curriculum as it is understood by the teachers
- 4 The operational curriculum
(The actual classroom practice)
- 5 The curriculum as it is experienced by the pupils
- 6 The hidden curriculum
(Message received by the pupils, content, methods, interaction, teacher attitude; the educational practice)

Principles for the selection of content

History is a cultural subject which forms basis for a common cultural frame of reference and supplies a basis for the choices we make. Through the subject history one can develop ones own identity and sense of interdependence. Through working with the subject we may also meet different cultures and traditions which will provide us with new impulses and a sound basis for critical reflection.

History is a humanistic subject which provides insight in people's way of thinking and actions of the past. It also provides consciousness about how the present is determined by people's choices in earlier times. The present is placed in a historical context and gives people the opportunity to understand themselves and our times better.

History is a social science that gives us the opportunity to understand the frameworks of people's lives. Through knowledge about how people create and are parts of

structures and processes, we become conscious of the different contexts we and others are placed in.

History is a subject that focuses on development of skills. It provides knowledge about the global diversity and riches of cultures, social conditions and different ways people have organized their lives through history. Knowledge about this diversity provides a sound basis for tolerance and respect. The subject provides us with the opportunity to develop empathy when confronted with difficult choices of actions and ethical dilemmas through historical studies of causes to wars, conflicts and genocide, at the same time as it provides knowledge about how people through times have fought for and against democracy, constitutional government, peace and non-violent solutions to conflicts.

Examples from the study programme of history

To give you an impression of the aims of the study programme in history, let me show you some examples:

The students shall:

- be able to assess how groups and societies understand and use history in different ways
- know about sources for knowledge about the past and be able to assess sources in their historical context
- have knowledge about important definitions of concepts and methods used in the subject history, which means that the student shall:
- know about methods that are used for collection, study and analysis of historical material and be able to use this material in their own work
- be able to assess historical accounts and the use of history in an inquisitive and critical manner

These examples are meant to give you an impression of how our curriculum presents the aims and main topics. The main goal is how to develop a democratic way of thinking and a deeper understanding of what the national feeling matters to a people. It is at the same time a goal to develop respect for other societies and cultures.

The question is: How are we going to reach this goal? The most obvious answer is that the pupils shall understand what happened. But “understanding” can cover up different opinions of what pupils should learn because of different approaches to history. Roughly we can define two simplified models, and many – both historians and teachers - waver between the two of them without being aware of that:

- 1 *History defined as facts and figures*, which means that the task of the historians is to bring forward the correct facts, and the task of the teachers is to pass on those fact to the pupils. The task of the pupils is to absorb this knowledge. Consequently, the main focus of the teaching will be the on the content and the pupils will have problems when they have to reproduce all the facts for example at the final examination.
- 2 *History as a way of thinking*, which means that the information about historical events is a kind of raw material that must be collected and worked up before

conclusions are made. It is important to be aware of that any conclusion in fact is an interpretation and you have to have an open mind for different interpretations. That does not mean that every answer has a high quality, but we have to accept that any conclusion given by a person is influenced by his or hers pattern of values and fundamental political attitude.

Based on this I would present the selection of content on 5 vital criterias. The content must give the students the opportunity to:

- Raise questions – develop the ability to do this
- Collect and make a selection of historical facts and figures
- Use historical sources in a critical way, make historical reconstructions and argue for these
- Show empathy
- Understand human values and use ideologies
- Use historical methods and the teaching of history in school should be based on this second model. The pupils ought to learn how to think logically, rationally and analytically. But by several reasons there is a tendency to move towards the first model, which might be an obstacle when you want to give your pupils a deeper understanding of which values the study of history is based on.

II The system of assessment of pupils knowledge and skills

The pupils in Norway are assessed in two ways in history.

1 Grades set by the teachers

The assessment is based on the aims in the curriculum and the individual achievements in relation to that. Each pupil will have a grade set by the teacher at the end of the year. This grade is based on a combination of written tests, the individual achievements in the classroom, the result of project work etc.

2 Exam (end of year) with final achievement tests

This exam is a locally set oral exam, consisting of two different models:

- An individually exam, which takes about ½ hour
- A so-called “classroom model” exam, which takes longer time according to the number of pupils in the group.

Together with the pupils, each teacher is free to decide which model he wants to use. For both models, there is a preparation section of 48 hours, and two examiners, the pupils’ teacher and one external examiner from another school. Not every pupil will be tested in history, each school choose the number of pupils who are going to be tested in this subject. In the preparation period the pupils can choose how to prepare themselves. They might work alone or they might work together with other pupils. Some of them choose to stay at school and use the facilities there, and some stay at home and study their textbooks.

The individually exam is the traditional model and still the most common model for the moment.

The “classroom model” implies that the pupils prepare for the test in groups and sit for the exam together. To be able to succeed with the “classroom model” the pupils will have to co-operate throughout the whole school year. Although this is a group exam, the pupils are assessed individually. This means that the pupils must learn how to be active and eager, how to practice coherence and interaction. This model is more and more favoured by both teachers and pupils because it is regarded as a better way of assessing a pupils overall competence.

III An example of the “classroom model”

I will now give you an example of how the “classroom model” is carried out in practice in upper secondary education.

This example is based on the following aims in the study programme of contemporary history:

The pupils shall

- *Be able to place important events and developments in different parts of the world in a historical context and be able to see contemporary events and relations in association with people’s actions and choices both in ancient and modern history*
- *Be able to assess what shapes people’s identities in a historical perspective*
- *Know about sources for knowledge about the past and be able to assessed sources in their historical context*
- *Be able to take responsibility for their own learning and be able to co-operate with others*

The examiners give the following task to a group of 4 pupils:

Choose a historical person and place this person in his or hers historical context. The pupils are free to choose a person; dead or alive, famous or unknown, for example, a relative. Two of the pupils have to choose a Norwegian person. The others have to choose a foreign person.

Comments and instructions:

- Everyone’s personality is based on certain **values** and **attitudes**. To some extent, this will be a result of the historical period under which the person grew up.
- Historical **phenomena** will have an impact on the life of a person, for example centralisation, education system, equality between the sexes, the development of modern technology
- Historical **events** like economical recession, wars, catastrophes will also have an impact on a person life
- When people make decisions and act, all these elements will play a role. They will have consequences on a persons private life, his education and profession, if he decides to settle down or move to new places, his political preferences etc.

The pupils will not have sufficient time to work with all the suggestions here. A main challenge is to choose some and turn down the other suggestions.

About the exam

Each pupil is going to give a 10 – 15 minutes presentation. They are not allowed to read from a prepared manuscript – like I do - , but they can bring with them notes containing the main points of their presentation. They can prepare foils. It is very important that they are able to make references to their main sources and how they have used them in the preparatory period.

After the presentations are finished, there is a conversation where the pupils compare the life of each person that has been presented. This Discussion will go on for 20 minutes. The members of the group are supposed to inform each other on beforehand about their presentation. The group is advised to arrange a kind of “rehearsal” the evening before the exam and help each other with the presentations.

About the preparation and use of sources

The school will be open and the computer rooms and library will be available. The teacher will also be present at certain times. The pupils are free to use all kinds of sources like interviews, diaries, encyclopaedia or Internet, personal notes from the lessons, textbooks or history books.

About the assessment

In Norway, we do not have **national standards** in each subject. We relate both the teaching and the assessment to the aims in the curriculum. In this case the task is related to:

- the understanding of historical developments and the impact of historical phenomena and events on persons life
- the ability to use sources and construct and present ones own knowledge
- the ability to take responsibility for ones own learning
- the ability to co-operate with others in a constructive way

I have referred to a real case. After the exam the pupils said that they especially enjoyed using different sources, and they were greatly relieved to have the opportunity to plan the presentation together with their fellow pupils. The examiners also find the situation more satisfying, because the situation is more normal to the relaxed atmosphere in the classroom. They also say that this model gives each pupil the opportunity to show his or hers competence, instead of looking for lacks in their knowledge.

Conclusion

In my opinion, the most important thing about assessment of the pupils knowledge and skills of history is not the details they have to learn when they are in school. Most of it will be forgotten after some time. We should concentrate:

- to organize the assessment so the pupils have the opportunity to experience the advantage of working together. We know that of all we learn, only 5% comes from lecturing, while 90% comes from teaching others
- to stimulate and inspire the pupils to take an interest in history not only when they are 17 or 18 years old, but also when they are 60, 70 or 80. We must take that into consideration when we make assessment systems. The important thing is not to test, but to assess, which means to estimate the quality of the pupils' competence. Thus the school may contribute to develop democratic processes and sustain democracy. The perspective of lifelong learning is, in my opinion, more important for history than any other subject taught in school.

Thank you very much for your attention.

IX. Presentations of the Regions' Representatives

1. Mr Efim Kogan Samara

Dear colleagues, last year the Council of Europe held a conference like that in Samara where we were studying, examining and discussing the issue of the history training quality. I think that the major outcome of this meeting is that we realized once again that on the educational modernization level the mastering the considerably different educational paradigm, if not a completely new, but still a parallel one related to the competence approach in education, is of vital importance. I'd like to thank Arild for his yesterday's brilliant report on the competence education.

When we talk about modernization we should bear in mind that modernization is bringing in correspondence with the current challenges. The present situation requires another approach to education since the moment the values have changed, so have the human's qualities that enable him/her to fit in the modern life in an effective way. And as a way of developing these considerably new qualities the Council of Europe as well as the countries from the other continent declared a set of competencies the educational system has to form.

I like the following definition of the competence: it is the ability for mobilizing one's resources, both outer and inner ones, in order to solve the task set. Obviously, the qualities like that can't be developed solely within the system of classes and lessons. This requires considerably different technologies, other methodological support, quite a different role of a teacher, another type of school. The present situation will demand different human qualities, and these are to be developed. We aren't engaged in it, instead we put our citizen in a situation where he/she has to acquire these qualities on his/her own. However it takes time, effort, resources, that's why in this country people become mature very slowly. We do not provide them with the conditions for the rapid beginning of their own career. I think that it is the awareness of this issue that is one of the crucial results of the Council of Europe's visit to the Samara region. I'd like to wish that the Council of Europe focused its attention on the competence aspect of education in this country, but not only on the sphere of historical education.

The scheme of the educational paradigm is the painful change in teachers' training as well. Today we are ready to co-finance the solution of this task in our region. Why do we need it? The matter is that 98% of the regional industry is privatized and the liberal economy demanded the considerably different approach to the personnel provision. The old ways don't work and we have sheer problems concerning the specialists' training base. Without modifying this training we can't make progress. Pedagogical institute is a specific educational establishment in terms of the feedback; and it is necessary to take this opportunity for realizing how we should change the training of the student – that is the future teacher, in order to prepare the future school-leaver for perceiving the university programs. In this area we've made the following steps: in some experimental schools (about 30) we've introduced the project method as a way of the competence development. Jointly with the Cambridge University we are working through the ways of assessing the competence mastering level. In Great Britain they have been studying it for 7-8 years. We intend to work through the appropriate procedures in terms of our school and then to extend this experiment. It is very important for us to be able to change the curricula structure so

as to transfer some of the program materials to the project activity and thus free the teacher from the routine, the student – from the necessity of being present in class for 7-8 hours a day. To our mind, the educational system should be taken away from the school, since the educational resource outside the school is much more serious than that inside the school. One should learn from life and not from the blackboard.

I hope to extend our experimental base and if the Council of Europe is interested, we are ready for the closest cooperation. It'd be interesting and important to unite under the umbrella of the Council of Europe the effort of other funds too, such as the British Council, Alliance Française etc. in order to concentrate the purpose activity on introducing the competence element into the education. We can't get away from it all the same. This is the future of education; otherwise we are unable to fit in the contemporary situation. Therefore the earlier we begin the earlier we fit in it.

2. Ms Alla Aphanasjeva, Karachaevo-Cherkesskaja Republic

Today I remember about an event which happened almost two years ago in our Republic. It was really an event for us as not only because the pedagogical community knew about it, but all the population did as well. That was an event of public importance. The Karachaevo-Cherkesskaja Republic is a multinational republic where around 100 nationalities live, the main are the Russians, Karachais, Nagais, Abasins and Circassians. Under such circumstances we realize, that only objective studying history and developing a long-term program of the education of our Republic can help us bring up the person with new way of thinking, new attitude to the history and culture of all the peoples of our multinational state.

The seminar of the Council of Europe was held during difficult times for our Republic, when the main task was to stabilize the situation. We think that the seminar proved to be efficient and streamlined some guidelines of improving the situation. Besides, the seminar identified new directions within the framework of which it was possible to resolve the tasks of contemporary education: to develop pupils' historical thinking in multinational regions. It was very useful to analyze the local experience of history teaching at schools for the teachers of Karachajevo-Cherkessk. The reports of the leading scientists and history teachers were presented, methodological manuals were published in our Republic. The seminar resulted in issuing a magazine on history teaching at school, it was dedicated to the seminar materials.

I'd like to share our experience of organizing seminars. Perhaps it will help somebody to avoid mistakes. When the issue of the magazine was being prepared, it became obvious that not all the materials could be published. The editors said it was very difficult to choose the best as most reports deserved attention. All the rest reports were issued in the form of bulletins.

What is done within the framework of regional education? It should be acknowledged that the scientific study of the peoples of the Republic is far ahead of the teaching at school. The historical science is more than 50 years old, our Republic has brought up lots of scientists studying the history of the peoples, dozens of monographs and articles on history, archeology as well as archive materials have been issued. The interest of population to its history and ethnic culture is great and it's still growing. However the time has shown that people's knowledge is not systematic. We need to

create conditions for forming systematic knowledge and developing historical thinking. Nowadays we more and more realize that the organized knowledge in the field of history in a multinational republic can be formed only through school teaching of local history. The goal is not to give our pupils just a sum of historical facts about different peoples and their cultures. The main objective is to form structured knowledge and right ideas about objective processes, political and economical relations, and human values.

I'd like to present a large textbook which includes 540 pages for 8-11 forms, the teaching is in Russian language. The task was new and difficult as earlier such books were non-existent. The lessons were based on individual teachers' plans and were mainly organized in the form of lectures. In 1998 the teachers got the first textbook "the Peoples of Karachajevo-Cherkessk, the History of Culture". We carried on working on it even after it had been published. Today we've prepared new edition taking into account the new directions and notes that had been made.

Today we have to resolve numerous tasks, and I believe the teachers of Karachajevo-Cherkessk are able to resolve them, but if someone helps us, we'll be grateful. The schools of Karachajevo-Cherkessk keep abreast with the times, the teachers and social science scientists react on the social need to develop. They always knew and know that the history plays an important role in forming future generations. Today they feel themselves responsible for the morals, views and ideas of their pupils.

Many schools have chosen patriotic education as the main direction of their activity. They use not only traditional forms of military-patriotic education (military and historical museums), but also they try to find new forms. We emphasize the word "patriotism" which we started to forget or are even afraid to use it, consider it to be pompous. Nevertheless this word is the essence of our education. Therefore in our activity we make accent on real patriotism.

And a few words about what the school expects from the methodological science, especially under the conditions of polycultural regions, particularly, Karachajevo-Cherkessk. We'd like to have several issues worked out, at the same time they need to be reflected more clearly in specialized literature. It's known that Karachajevo-Cherkessk as all the Northern Caucasus is a polyconfessional republic. Here one can find paganism, Christianity and Islam. The religions have deep roots in the material and spiritual culture of our peoples. It is also known that the revival of religions is very active today. Our Republic is a colourful picture in this respect: churches and mosques are erected, and the schools are not beyond these processes. Now we know that we mustn't bring up atheists. So the question is the same: "What must the school do?" The teachers need a clear answer, but today nobody can answer to it.

It's necessary to take into account and improve the mistakes which were made during in the organization of seminars. Despite the fact that we invited more than 100 people, we were reproached for the small number of participants. What does it mean? It means, that almost all history teachers would like to take part in similar meetings. The seminar was held in April, in May we organized similar seminars in 10 regions of our Republic and so we corrected our mistake.

In conclusion I'd like to say that on the day when the seminar finished. We started our work on systemizing materials. A comprehensive plan was composed, it has been operating till now. I'd like to thank the organizers for the business approach, attention paid to our Republic. I believe that today's conference is the starting point of the next stage. Karachajevo-Cherkessk is always glad to its guests, we are also ready for good cooperation. Thank you.

3. Tankijev I.A., Ingushetija

When we speak about the Caucasus region, the issues of borders arise at once. There is no full understanding about any Caucasus issue. Suffice it to say about the border between Ingushetija and Chechnja, refugees from there, the forgotten conflict between the Northern Osetija and Ingushetija. I'm not going to judge who is right and who is wrong, it's another question. But concealing the issue leads to a dead-end situation. The work, which is done by the seminars of the Council of Europe is huge, but it seems to me, that the problem of history teaching in Yaroslavl'skaya and Kostromskaja regions is different from that in the Caucasus region. Their problems are just how to teach this or that subject or the lack of something, etc. But we have to survive. Therefore I'd like to ask the leaders of the Soviet of Europe to conduct a similar conference in our Republic. The new administration (our President is a historian; he worked at school, then he became a general, and now he is a President) allows organizing conference under the auspices of the Soviet of Europe jointly with the authorities of the Southern Federal okrug (region), the representatives of all the subjects of the okrug and other interested people. I'm one of the heads of the Republic and I'm pleased to invite you.

Perhaps we should set up a competent expert council under the direction of one, two or three famous specialists and it would contain the representatives from each subject. They could write history that wouldn't sharpen contradictions because of the borders. You see, each subject writes that our grandfathers lived here and until the Black Sea, we bring up children who become warriors. Ingushetija is one of the youngest subjects of the Russian Federation. We've got economical problems, but nevertheless one teacher-enthusiast has written a teaching manual, it can't be called a textbook yet. I've presented it here. It would be good if we created not a separate textbook on the history of the Ingushetija Republic or our neighbors, but on the history of the whole Southern Federal okrug, in which each nationality would present. In our opinion, it would be much better and more efficient. If we reach understanding on this question, we'll be glad to organize the meeting of experts and specialists.

Thank you for your attention, thank you that you've invited me. Yesterday I told that if even small embryonic conflict was resolved by the work of the Soviet of council, it would be a considerable step forward for the history. The teaching of mathematics can't resolve the issue unlike the history teaching, Thank you very much.

4. Abdurakhman Kaimov, the head of the secondary education department of the Ministry of Education of the Chechen Republic

Dear colleagues, first of all, let me thank the organizers of the conference, for their proposal to take part in its work. We're grateful to the Soviet of Europe for the two seminars which were organized for the history teachers of the Chechen Republic in

Kislovodsk. Frankly speaking, if I exceed the limits of the issue I'm supposed to talk about, I'll tell you what we're doing as the today's topic is not close to us. I'll explain you why.

You know, history teaching in the Chechen Republic has become of crucial importance to us. To my mind, it's the most important our teachers' task. Why is it so? In fact, when you talk to the militaries of the Federal forces who are stationed in Chechnya and ask them: "What do you know about the history of the Chechens and their culture?", none of them is able to answer anything. In their opinion, we're bandits, terrorists, etc. While bringing up our pupils we ought to change at least their attitude to other peoples of the RF.

How can we do that? We're trying to find the answer to the question. By the way, in 2001 at the August conference we addressed the Ministry of Education of the RF and asked them to form a group which would start explaining the population across the country who we are. I always tell about one example. It took place in Piatigorsk, after a seminar. We, teachers, were walking out of the school and the pupils told about us: "The terrorists have walked out!"

Therefore I'll quote from our teachers' annotation to a textbook. It is a review of the textbook "The History of Russia, 17-18 centuries" by Chernikov. It is worth admitting that if the previous textbooks proclaimed the Communist party the creator of the history of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the new generation of textbooks gives this right to the Russians which our children do not hesitate to notice. Our teachers ask to pay the problem more attention and suppose that this is the cause of our Russian youth's aggressive attitude to other peoples. What does any textbook say about the problem of the Northern Caucasus? For example, the issue of the border between Ingushetija and Northern Osetija or the events that take place in Chechnya? You see, we have several truths: the truth of the mass media, our politicians and our textbooks. Therefore our teachers have to combine all of them and explain the pupils that we are all people and there are good and bad ones.

In my opinion, the future of our State largely depends on how we formulate the strategy of our school historical education development today. I think that today recommendations, which we are to work out today, will touch upon the issue. And if the Soviet of Europe is going to organize a seminar for the teachers of the Chechen Republic, I'd like to ask you to invite the representatives of Srbija, Chernogorija, Khorvatija, Abkhazija and other countries who are closely interested in resolving such problems. I regret that the representatives of Tatarstan are not present here today. For the regional textbooks of the Republic interpret some events in a different way. The Federal textbook say one thing, and they – another. On the whole, I think the Ministry of Education of the RF should be more attentive to the authors of these textbooks..

I'll give you one more example. There are history textbooks written by Zurianov and Liaschenko. Liaschenko in his textbook on page 23 says that Borodino battle started on September, 7 in 1812, the council in Fili took place on September, 13 in 1812. Zurianov, in his turn, writes on page 25 of his textbook that Borodino battle started on August, 26 at 6 a.m., and the military council in Fili – on September, 1 in 1812. I don't know who is right, and who is wrong. You are all specialists, but there is a

teacher who may not know all the details. And at the same time he has to explain this to his pupils. We must be very attentive in such questions. It is not by hearsay that I know how a separate fact can be interpreted and this may lead to the tragedy like we had in Chechnya. This is a tragedy of not only the Chechens, but all Russia. To remove all the consequences of these events we need not a year or two, but several decades. When the militaries take a senior pupil from his lesson without any explanations or a history teacher is found dead, we can't persuade our pupils that the grown-ups are innocent, it's impossible..

I believe, that we, historians and textbooks' authors, who are responsible for the development of the historical education, are in great debt. The future of the State depends on what direction of historical education development we choose. Vladimir Konstantinovich has said that today we've given the first impulses to the changes that are to take place in this respect. I believe that if we use the chance and help our youth choose their own way, we'll deserve a monument to ourselves. There are lots of things to talk about. Once more I'd like to thank you for letting me participate in the work of the conference and for your attention. Using this chance I'd like to ask you about one thing. Almost all the library stock of our Republic has been destroyed. Certainly, the Ministry of Education of the RF helps us to restore it, but we wouldn't deny any help offered by other regions and organizations. Thank you for your attention.

Questions:

Tatiana Romanchenko

Newspapers wrote about teachers directed to you. Please, a few words.

Reply:

We talked on the issue to the Ministry's representative and even to the leaders of the Ministry of Education of the RF. I suppose that this is an advertising campaign, as it is not coordinated with us or anybody else. There is an organization "Going together" which has started its election campaign. What can I say? What can a child do in this situation as he is not even a graduate of a higher educational institution, he is a student. He came to us for a month, this time is not enough to understand all the details. Therefore this is not more than an advertising campaign.

Natalia Gorokhovatskaya

Within the framework of the advertising campaign, as you've said, did the young people were aggressive to Chechen pupils or they adopted another attitude? Perhaps, you shouldn't call it an advertising campaign. Of course, they can't teach many things as they are not certified specialist, but they came there with their hearts open.

Reply:

If they had set serious tasks, they would have resolved the issue with an interested party – the Ministry of Education of the Chechen Republic. They would have said: "Dear friends, we'd like to come to you with this purpose, with this programme, etc." But they didn't do that. They came and knew about it through the mass media. Did they contact our representatives? Of course, they didn't. But after the campaign one of the participants of the project told in her interview to the first channel of Russian TV that a pupil of the 7th form doesn't know how much is two multiplied by three. I invite

you to any our school, try to test our pupils' knowledge. I don't know, she might have talked to a backward child. But her conclusion shocked us. If you have any doubts in my words, come to us. I'll guarantee your safety. You're welcome.

Mazurov, historian

The Chechen problem is extremely complicated, everybody convince that today. I am from the Far East, I don't know any prominent Chechenian, the representative of the Chechen Republic. Nevertheless I know that there is a Chechen Mafia in Vladivostok, Khabarovsk and Nakhodka. You see, this is how the common attitude is formed. I mean that this is a complex problem and can't be resolved by two words. I can put it in other words. I'm a historian, and I wish to inform my students about Chechnya, its problems. But where can I obtain the information? This is the problem. It might be a question to you, I think. You may have publications, ready materials, though I understand you've got a complicated situation. Thank you.

Reply:

I've addressed the same question to the Ministry of Education of the RF and the Academy of In-Service Training in the RF. In fact, my example describing the soldiers of the Federal Forces wasn't accidental. They are located in Chechnya, and they don't know anything about it, and you don't have the necessary materials. Firstly, it is better to establish contacts on a horizontal level. We have three higher educational institutions. Very good historians work there, they are developing a textbook dedicated to Chechnya's history. I think that they and we will present the materials. I suppose that such an experience of establishing horizontal contacts may be useful to all the regions of the RF. Thank you for your question, for such a request.

APPENDIX V

LIST OF ACTIVITIES

1999

“One day Teachers' Meeting on the new methods in teaching history”, Kazan, 12 April 1999.

“The initial and in-service training of history teachers in the Russian Federation and their evaluation”, Nijniy Novgorod, Russian Federation, 15 – 17 April 1999.

“New history textbooks and teaching resources: aims, preparation and use in the classroom”, Petrozavodsk, Russian Federation, 16 – 18 June 1999.

Follow-Meeting to the Seminar on “The teaching of history in multicultural societies and border areas”, St Petersburg, Russian Federation, 21-22 June 1999

“Standards for history teaching for secondary schools: present situation and future developments”, Irkutsk, Russian Federation, 16 – 18 September 1999.

Meeting of experts to discuss future co-operation with the Russian Federation within the programme on “The reform of history teaching”, St. Petersburg, Russian Federation, 23 - 24 November, 1999.

2000

“New history textbooks for secondary schools: new approaches to their preparation and evaluation”, Yaroslavl, Russian Federation, 10 – 12 April 2000.

“New methods in teaching history in present-day secondary schools in the Russian Federation”, Volgograd, Russian Federation, 19 – 21 June 2000.

Meeting of Experts on History – Japan and the Russian Federation, Tokyo, 25-28 October 2000

Meeting of experts to discuss future co-operation with the Russian Federation within the programme on “The reform of history teaching“, Publishing House “Prosveshenye”, Moscow, Russian Federation, 4 December 2000.

The Tbilisi Initiative” – Seminar on: “New approaches in teaching history in secondary schools in a regional context”, Kislovodsk, Russian Federation, 13 – 15 September, 2000.

2001

“History education and the Information and Communication Technologies (ICT)” and one-day training workshop on the use of ICT in education, Moscow, Russian Federation, 5 – 7 April, 2001.

“New approaches in the preparation and publication of history textbooks in the Russian Federation”, Vladivostok, Russian Federation, 21 – 23 May 2001.

Joint Programme of Co-operation between the European Commission and the Council of Europe to Strengthen Democratic Stability in North Caucasus:

- “History teaching in secondary schools: teacher training and history textbooks”, Dombay, Karachaevo-Cherkesskaya Republic, Russian Federation, 23 – 24 April 2001.
- “How history teaching can strengthen reconciliation, mutual understanding and tolerance in present-day society”, Nalchik, the Republic of Kabardino-Balkarya, Russian Federation, 5-6 October 2001.

2002

“New approaches for the assessment of pupils’ knowledge and skills in history at secondary level in the Russian Federation”, Samara, Russian Federation, 28 – 29 June 2002.

“New approaches in the preparation of textbooks on the history of the 20th Century for secondary schools in the Russian Federation”, Kaluga, Russian Federation, 23– 25 September 2002.

Joint Programme of Co-operation between the European Commission and the Council of Europe to Strengthen Democratic Stability in North Caucasus:

- Seminar on “Interpretation of historical facts when teaching history in secondary schools”, Elista, the Republic of Kalmikiya, Russian Federation, 26 – 27 April 2002
- Teacher training workshops for history teachers from Chechnya, Kislovodsk, Russian Federation, 23-24 October 2002;
- Seminar on “New interactive methods in teaching history in present-day secondary schools”, Kislovodsk, Russian Federation, 25-26 October 2002.

