

Intergovernmental Language Policy Forum

The right of learners to quality and equity in education –

The role of linguistic and intercultural competences

Geneva, Switzerland, 2-4 November 2010

REPORT

by

Francis Goullier

Language Policy Division
Directorate of Education and Languages, DGIV
Council of Europe, Strasbourg
www.coe.int/lang

© Council of Europe, January 2011

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

All correspondence concerning this publication or the reproduction or translation of all or part of the document should be addressed to the Director of Education and Languages of the Council of Europe (Language Policy Division) (F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex or decs-lang@coe.int).

The reproduction of extracts is authorised, except for commercial purposes, on condition that the source is quoted.

Table of contents

1.	More vulnerable groups and languages of schooling.....	6
2.	The place and role of languages of origin	7
3.	The role of languages of schooling in pupils' educational achievement	9
4.	Development of plurilingual and intercultural competence.....	12
5.	Matching up the Council of Europe's language policy tools with the needs expressed.....	15
6.	Requisite action.....	19
APPENDIX 1: PROGRAMME		23
APPENDIX 2 : LIST OF PARTICIPANTS		27
APPENDIX 3 : DOCUMENTS		40

The Forum was organised by the Language Policy Division with the generous support of Switzerland

The substantial financial support of Norway for this project is also gratefully acknowledged

This forum was organised on the initiative of the Council of Europe's Language Policy Division (LPD) and at the invitation of the Swiss authorities represented by the State Secretariat for Education and Research and the Swiss Conference of Cantonal Directors of Education. It brought together over 200 participants including representatives of 37 Council of Europe member states and associated countries and organisations, such as Canada, the European Commission, OECD and ALECSO, and a 70-strong Swiss delegation. The European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML, based in Graz) was associated with the event.

The forum had five objectives:

- to present, share and discuss with the representatives of countries, regions, associations and INGOs present the findings and principles guiding the Language Policy Division's activities in support of the right to quality and equity in education, and some suggested approaches for the promotion of those values: clear recognition of the language dimension of all teaching; coherence in the teaching of different languages; recognition and enhancement of the importance of learners' plurilingual and pluricultural repertoires; and particular attention to vulnerable groups, such as children and adolescents from immigrant backgrounds and Roma;
- to present the new tools and documents produced on the LPD's initiative to help member states and relevant stakeholders to take initiatives in these fields and undertake wide-ranging consultation on them;
- to encourage the pooling of experience, ideas and initiatives taken in the member states and by the Council of Europe's partners;
- to promote the use of the *Platform of References and Resources for Plurilingual and Intercultural Education*¹, a forum for disseminating documents and pooling experience;
- to identify action to be taken, whether at local, regional or national level or by the Language Policy Division.

The proceedings, which took place under highly satisfactory material conditions, alternated between plenary sessions and workshops. Papers were devoted to the work of the Council of Europe and other European institutions (European Commission and OECD) and to the presentation of studies carried out by various experts in close liaison with the LPD or independently of it, such as the presentation by Professor Jim Cummins, which attracted a great deal of attention.

This policy forum has a particular significance. It coincides with the 50th anniversary of the existence of a specific body within the Council of Europe dealing originally with issues related to modern languages, and which is currently the "Language Policy Division". This very rich history lends particular force to the new work currently in progress. And this forum actually constitutes the launch of a new stage in this work, marked by a significant widening of the perspective, which now encompasses in a global approach the cross-cutting, complementary and specific aspects of all "languages in and for education". It constitutes a more in-depth approach to the promotion of plurilingual and intercultural education and contributes to the necessary efforts to further the right to quality education.

The main findings reached during the proceedings can be summarised under four headings:

- The results of academic research, studies conducted by European bodies or at national level, observation of teaching practices and curriculum analysis all point in the same

¹ www.coe.int/lang/en

direction. They show the importance for educational success of mastering academic discourse genres², particularly in the language of schooling, even if languages are not the only factor for success or failure and other parameters are involved such as educational traditions, the family's relationship to the written word or to school, the power relationship between languages and cultures and the socio-economic circumstances.

- It is desirable to seek greater coherence and build on the convergences in the learning of different languages, and in the first instance foreign languages, even if we know that such an approach still encounters many obstacles and that the levers for action are situated in places which differ widely according to the context, the stakeholders' perceptions and educational traditions.

- Taking due account of the increased presence of languages of origin in schools is a pedagogical, educational and political priority.

- Attention to vulnerable groups – children and adolescents from migrant backgrounds, Roma or others – is essential and their difficulties, particularly in mastering academic language, are indicative of the obstacles facing many other learners, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds.

These shared findings are echoed extensively in the ECML's new call for submissions.

1. More vulnerable groups and languages of schooling

The papers delivered at the beginning and end of the proceedings were mainly devoted to the situation of children and adolescents from migrant backgrounds and Roma. This is no coincidence. The ways in which education systems may analyse the reasons for the learning difficulties encountered by many of these young people and attempt to find appropriate responses to them are of growing interest to all member states. The access enjoyed by these groups to education, knowledge and educational achievement is a major criterion for the quality of education and how the demand for equity is met. Access to knowledge and qualifications is clearly one of the preconditions to be met if these sections of the population are to achieve full democratic citizenship, social cohesion and social integration, which are values shared by all the member states. Efforts to this end are a matter of respect for human rights. Creating the conditions for success for these children and adolescents was, implicitly at least, the guiding thread throughout the proceedings of the forum.

Although some characteristics of these groups do call for tailored pedagogical responses, the attention focused on them does not mean, however, that these groups should receive specific treatment either through placement in special facilities or through a lowering of the education system's expectations with regard to them. Such an approach would be contrary to the very principle of equity and would be overlooking consistent research findings and observations.

On the one hand, the consequences of the increasing presence of these children and adolescents in schools are of concern to the entire school population and all stakeholders of the education system. What is at stake is not only to enable young people from linguistic and cultural minorities to adapt to the dominant educational context, but to encourage the different components of the school population to learn about each other. This principle of

² The word "academic" refers here, and in the remainder of the text, to the language practices and forms which are specific to teaching and communication concerning the content of the different subjects as part of the knowledge-building process, in that they differ substantially from the use of language for other communication purposes.

“two-way” integration lies at the very heart of intercultural dialogue, whose importance for our societies is stressed by the Council of Europe.

On the other hand, one of the benefits of this focus on the conditions for the success of more vulnerable children is to reveal the difficulties encountered by a much greater number of children. The problems with which migrant children and adolescents are faced are indicative of the obstacles standing in the way of all learners, which hinder or sometimes even halt a large proportion of them in their learning process, particularly those from a culturally disadvantaged family background where they do not always find sufficient support for mastery of the academic language which opens the doors to educational achievement. The number of young people who leave the education system without qualifications and the scale of underachievement in these groups in particular, as noted in the PISA surveys, are a stark reminder of this. **The fight against educational exclusion of vulnerable groups is a fight for quality and equity in education systems which can only benefit all young people attending school and to which they are all entitled.**

2. The place and role of languages of origin

Based on research findings³, two major statements can be made about the languages of origin of some pupils. First, the attitude of learners towards education and the language of schooling is strongly influenced by recognition and valuing of their linguistic and cultural identities. Recognition by school of learners as complete individuals is one of the prerequisites for the self-esteem which is essential for personal commitment; on the other hand, their rejection by school or, more often than not, its failure to appreciate them and the accompanying low self-esteem contribute to underachievement. Secondly, this research shows that fears that the use of other languages in the home might hinder the acquisition of the language of schooling are unfounded; it may even be highly conducive to educational achievement, particularly when it fosters a positive attitude towards the written word.

Several avenues of enquiry suggest themselves to us and have already been explored to some extent. They can be summarised in the form of four main ideas: enhancement of the value of the individual language repertoire, recognition of the resource represented by languages of origin, specific teaching of the language of origin or the language of schooling as a second or foreign language, and partnerships.

Enhancement of the value of languages learnt or spoken outside school is a pedagogical necessity. This can be done through the *European Language Portfolio* (ELP), one of whose functions is precisely to allow users to document and highlight the full range of their plurilingual and pluricultural repertoire and to think about ways of using the resources of which it is composed. This increased value attached by school may also involve giving the pupils concerned the opportunity to assess the competences acquired in their language(s) of origin, and even to incorporate the results of this assessment into school documents (school reports, “record of competences” etc). Although there is indeed some debate surrounding this possibility, some experiences described in the workshops showed, for example, that, among other things, an official reference of this kind facilitates access for these pupils to higher education.

Enhancing the value of these languages in the collective perception of the class may also involve their being mentioned and used by the teacher. Admittedly, a teacher cannot know all or even part of the range of languages which may be present in the classroom and the multilingualism which typifies an increasing number of schools makes it a very complex and delicate matter to give special consideration to one or some of these languages. But in this

³ See [“Putting the Evidence back into Evidence-based Policies for Underachieving Students”](#) –paper by Jim Cummins related to his presentation at the forum

area too, the participants in the forum identified some interesting avenues of enquiry. Some programmes to raise awareness of languages, such as the EOLE and ELBE projects in Switzerland, cover a large number of languages and enable reference to be made to them without the teacher having any specific knowledge of them. Learners may be encouraged to produce personal material in their language of origin, to which their classmates may be given access via a bilingual version. Another example of how pupils' language repertoire can be put to use is provided by the experiments in use of the Creole spoken by a large number of pupils in the French overseas *départements* and territories for the learning of French as the language of schooling. In general, when teachers possess the corresponding tools or information, they should not deny themselves the possibility of referring, from a contrastive perspective, to one or another of the languages which the pupils know or speak.

Knowledge and use of languages of origin are not harmful to the learning of the language of schooling and to educational achievement. Neither do they signify an attitude of rejection of that language or of withdrawal with respect to education and integration.

These two findings forcefully stated on the basis of qualitative observations and research may be supplemented by yet another statement: **the resources offered to pupils by their languages of origin can be used to facilitate their access to knowledge**. Some particularly promising experiments involve giving these pupils the opportunity, in group exercises for example, to use their language(s) of origin to access information related to the subject-matter being taught or to achieve a better command of the concepts being taught through exchanges and verbalisation in their first language; such an approach also makes it easier for them to draw on their prior knowledge in order to progress in mastery of the subject-matter.

It should be noted that several of the avenues of enquiry discussed above have the advantage of enabling other pupils to encounter these languages in a context which shows them in a positive light, thus furthering the aim of providing education in the value of plurilingualism and linguistic and cultural diversity and contributing to the development of intercultural competence.

There are questions surrounding the **teaching of the language and culture of origin** in Europe. As it is currently implemented, it often occupies a marginal position in organisational arrangements and in people's perceptions. Sometimes there is no control of its quality and effects. Furthermore, curricula are seldom designed on a long-term basis and are not always amenable to monitoring. It would certainly be desirable to incorporate them into the overall school curriculum while possibly maintaining partnerships with, and the participation of, other stakeholders (NGOs, associations, parents etc).

There are some examples of schemes in which these languages of origin are taught as a subject in their own right, with a status which may differ according to their particular situation, as in the case of migrant languages in some Scandinavian countries or the bilingual education provided in ethnically mixed schools in Russia. The value of offering such teaching to pupils other than those for whom these languages are languages of origin is recognised, but there are many obstacles to its implementation.

There is, however, one conclusion which must be drawn from all the observations made: the effectiveness of any support for language learning presupposes a detailed assessment of the competences acquired by these pupils both in the language(s) of origin and in the language of schooling.

Children and adolescents from migrant backgrounds have widely varying circumstances in terms of the social status of their language of origin, the relationship between that language and the language of schooling, their degree of command of their language of origin and of

literacy in that language, and their standard of knowledge of the language of schooling during their schooling in the host country. The use of the label “plurilingual” to refer to all these widely varying situations may accordingly be deceptive. It entails a dual risk: it may lead one to take the view that the educational and personal development goals of plurilingualism have been achieved once a pupil has several languages in his or her individual repertoire; and it may draw attention away from the essential need to seek the approaches best suited to each specific case. The most effective procedures for helping these learners may in fact differ widely from one case to another. The concept of “plurilingualism” should be used primarily with reference to the values and dynamics of plurilingual and intercultural education.

Lastly, the key to effectiveness lies in **seeking out and deriving benefit from a wide range of partnerships**: the teachers and other operators responsible for teaching languages and cultures of origin often work in isolation, whereas close co-operation with teachers of the language of schooling and teachers teaching in that language would be beneficial for all, for example by bringing in specialists in languages of origin to assist pupils speaking those languages in teaching sequences in the language of schooling. But the possible and desirable partnerships go far beyond that and should ensure the involvement in local initiatives of parents, associations and representatives of the partner countries when the latter are in charge of teaching of the language of origin. Furthermore, the degree of attention paid to the linguistic training of adults has major repercussions for the success of their children.

As may be seen, many avenues of enquiry are already being explored and many experiments are in progress. Tools are available and the studies distributed by the LPD at the forum should help all those involved, in particular the concept paper *The linguistic and educational integration of children and adolescents from migrant backgrounds*⁴ and the accompanying studies. The challenge is now to give them the coherence which is sometimes lacking and to enable as many learners as possible to benefit. However, this calls for policy decisions because the education system’s attitude towards languages of origin and the possibility of defining a coherent strategy clearly presuppose a consensus among the various partners, including the parents, and depend to a great extent on society’s perceptions of and attitude towards these issues and towards linguistic and cultural minorities.

3. The role of languages of schooling in pupils’ educational achievement

The example of young people from migrant backgrounds is particularly enlightening.

Learning to communicate in the dominant language at school is clearly an essential requirement for young people newly arrived in the host country. The Irish experiment in support for the **acquisition of the language of schooling as a second language** by these pupils, making use of the *European Language Portfolio* and appropriate lower level descriptors from the scale of proficiency of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*, represents an interesting response.

But a command of the language of schooling as the usual language of communication in interpersonal or social relations, such as may be possessed to some extent by, for example, second-generation migrant children, is not sufficient to succeed in school subjects. They do not succeed any better, and sometimes fare even worse, than first-generation migrant children. It seems clear that the conditions for success include the general attitude adopted towards the culture of the written word and mastery of academic registers in the language of schooling. This mastery of academic discourse, in terms of both comprehension and expression, is a condition for building knowledge by gaining access to it and exploring it and plays a huge part, with far-reaching implications, in the forms of assessment implemented in

⁴ www.coe.int/lang/en → Events in 2010 → Policy Forum, Geneva → Documents

the different subjects. **However, these requirements are usually neither explicitly stated nor transparent. What is at stake is to ensure that this important component of the curriculum is clearly explained for each subject, transparency being a source of quality and equity.** In seeking to achieve this transparency, education systems will gauge the magnitude of the issues at stake and find ways of taking up the challenge represented by mastery of the language of schooling in the different subjects, in other words ensuring that learners are gradually put in a position where they can understand and acquire a wider and more varied discourse repertoire.

This naturally applies to all learners.

Of course, the strong assumption regarding the influence of a mastery of academic registers in the language of schooling should not lead to a situation where, in seeking to identify the conditions for pupils' educational success, we disregard other factors, among which we might mention the influence of the particular educational culture and respect for styles of learning. Similarly, certain pedagogical imperatives would need to be clearly formulated: the need to give learners the necessary time for them to understand and/or perform the tasks set, whether they are oral or written and involve reception or production; the importance of giving them more speaking time; recognition of the role played by oral expression when dealing with academic language, and particularly when instructions and tasks are rephrased to make them clearer, without altering their content; the priority to be given to building learners' confidence in the use of subject-specific concepts; attention to written production in the teaching of subjects.

The presentations and discussions in the workshops revealed that there is an overall consensus in Europe regarding the need to take due account of the language dimension in all subjects and to combat the still all too widespread idea that the language used in the different subjects is exactly the same as the language of communication used in familiar contexts and perfectly clear to every speaker of the language concerned, except for the use of specialised vocabulary. Some participants also expressed the need for consideration to be given to approaches to assessment that take account of mastery of the language of schooling in the teaching of subject-specific content.

This consensus regarding principles is also reflected in the very wide range of initiatives taken in the member states, varying greatly in terms of level and scope. Some form part of a national strategy: for example, the development of a curriculum in Norway which identifies the basic competences to be acquired in each subject; the setting in Sweden of explicit objectives incorporating the communicative competences and discourse genres required for all subjects and descriptors for assessment, all this being accompanied by aids for teachers; and the curriculum reform in Denmark. In other countries, the approach may be limited provisionally to certain subjects, e.g. in Switzerland, by means of national education standards (common to the three linguistic regions) initially covering languages, maths and natural science. In others still, advances are being made on a smaller geographical scale, as in Germany. This list of experiments mentioned during the forum is not exhaustive.

These initiatives constitute an asset which should be placed at everyone's disposal. This pooling of experience and ideas would certainly also benefit the stakeholders involved in these schemes.

This is indeed the perspective that emerges from the tools presented at the forum. Several studies have been carried out in the very recent past by groups of researchers, experts and practitioners in different countries on the teaching of science and history. A document focusing on the learning/teaching of literature will very shortly be added to this series of studies which is due to be expanded to other subjects. The authors of these studies have analysed the curricula for the subjects concerned in various countries. On this basis, a

protocol has been drawn up on the initiative of the LPD specifying the issues and principles involved and procedures that could be applied to all subjects in order to ensure that the language dimension of the various curricula is made explicit. This is clearly not a reference framework but an aid to any group of decision-makers or practitioners at local, regional or national level wishing to facilitate the access of learners to mastery of the language expected in scientific, artistic and technical communication, with a positive impact on the acquisition, use and processing of knowledge. **The document presented at the forum is, as is stated in the text, “the outline of an approach and a description of a pedagogical attitude”.**

This approach involves identifying the discourse functions mentioned in the curricula of the different subjects taught in the language of schooling and the corresponding linguistic realisations. It also involves analysing verbal communications in these subjects, which constitute the community of practice characteristic of each subject at its different levels of mastery. Based on these lists of discourse genres, text types and their linguistic realisations, it is possible to identify paths for the construction of the expected discourse repertoires.

The suggested approach favours local or national initiatives based on common guidelines and principles in Europe. Following wide-ranging discussion at workshops and conferences prior to the forum, the idea of developing European standards relating to the language of schooling was abandoned. It seems very difficult and perhaps even counter-productive to propose such standards when educational traditions and subject-specific practices differ so widely in Europe. Several participants in the forum in fact reiterated the importance of developing any reference framework in close conjunction with all stakeholders and with due regard for the reality of pedagogical contexts and practices. The lack of a European reference framework for languages of schooling does not mean that we are condemned to inactivity. Numerous participants stated the need for descriptors to make the guidelines provided in the curriculum operational, to design paths of progression and to clarify the outcomes expected. Such descriptors, if designed non-prescriptively and from the positive perspective of the descriptors of foreign language proficiency levels of the *Common European Framework of Reference*, have the merit of drawing attention to the importance of attaching value to what learners succeed in doing with the language and not defining them according to what they are not (yet) capable of doing. They also focus teachers' and learners' attention on the way language is used rather than its analysis. Discussions are in progress on the form and content of the descriptors best suited to the different target groups and to educational cultures regarding the language of schooling. But the presence on the *Platform of References and Resources for Plurilingual and Intercultural Education* of a space dedicated to “reflections on the use of descriptors in learning, teaching and assessment” shows that their interest is by no means called into question, less in fact, where the language of schooling is concerned, from an assessment standpoint than from that of the design of teaching content and progressions.

The general agreement observed among the participants in the forum shows that **the time has come to start really implementing the principles identified. Tools are available. Each educational context can define the level of intervention which seems most appropriate to it.**

This implementation will obviously need to take due account of the specific characteristics of the level of education concerned. In view of the multidisciplinary functions performed by primary teachers, primary education seems more conducive to consideration of the transversal nature of language competences, even if the lesser degree of specialisation may sometimes result in less pronounced use of the language specific to each subject.

In secondary education, precautions should be taken in communication aimed at teachers and the need for training should be taken seriously. These teachers are not specialists in language teaching and learning and need guidelines on the importance of the language

dimension, the proper approaches to it and the limits to the attention to be accorded to it. It is important not to put too much pressure on them. It is useful to emphasise, on the one hand, the fact that these approaches can make things simpler for them by making it easier for learners to explore and build knowledge, and on the other, the importance of subject content, which is by no means reduced by these approaches.

Whatever the level of the class and whatever the subject, all the evidence points to the value of co-operation between subject specialists – or specialists in the particular level of education – and language specialists. A number of successful experiments reported during the forum point in the same direction, such as the one carried out in certain schools in Germany with all the teachers of a particular grade coming together to define and harmonise their approaches and requirements, including in terms of language competences.

When discussing the co-operation needed between language specialists and specialists in other subjects or educational levels, we are of course very quickly reminded of the CLIL/EMILE bilingual teaching initiatives, which cover languages of origin as well as regional and minority languages. Indeed, it was stressed on several occasions during the workshop discussions that these initiatives can be a useful and effective starting point for thinking about the use of language in school subjects. In addition to this, of course, there is the richness of the intercultural dimension provided by a comparison between different approaches to the same subject areas. It is in the field of bilingual teaching and CLIL/EMILE that the greatest number of practical initiatives may be seen. The teachers involved in these schemes are directly confronted with the issues, even if, unfortunately, curricula for this type of teaching sometimes say nothing about the link between language and content. Taking up the issues associated specifically with these teaching schemes could be a way of raising awareness of them among all stakeholders of the education system. During the proceedings, this belief was expressed, for example, through the following two remarks or suggestions: each teacher of a subject should act as if the pupils being addressed did not possess a command of the language used as the first language; if all teachers experienced a CLIL/EMILE situation, for example during their training, that would develop an awareness in them of the importance of the language dimension and improve their mastery of communication and language skills.

One of the issues at stake is to create a discourse common to all teachers regarding the use of the language of schooling. Much work has still to be done to develop this common discourse. It will necessarily involve addressing the variation between subject-specific discourse types and taking into account in teaching the variation in oral usages at school. Variety within the language of schooling concerns two particular aspects: on the one hand, the specific nature of the discourse genres and linguistic forms used in the different subjects (variation in the language of schooling), and on the other, the language registers specific to school in a given context, which may not be self-evident to a good many pupils, particularly those whose families are from a culturally disadvantaged background.

4. Development of plurilingual and intercultural competence

The preceding sections – whether on the place of languages of origin, the reciprocal nature of the integration of children of migrant origin and their classmates, or mastery of the language of schooling – all deal with plurilingual and intercultural competence. The main point of specifically addressing this educational objective, as happened during the second part of the forum, was to provide feedback on the contributions and exchanges on these different aspects within the overall framework. It was also a case of specifically dealing with questions of convergence between the different language learning processes inside and outside school. One last aim was to propose a curricular design which would take account of both the wealth of situations and needs and the immense diversity of educational contexts, with the consequence of a wide range of modes of action and developments. The opportunity for this was provided when the Language Policy Division published, for this

forum, a provisional version of a *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education*⁵. This document, which was produced in the follow-up to the previous Policy Forum in Strasbourg in February 2007, is entering a consultation phase geared to improving and, if appropriate, validating its content.

Even though the links among all the components of plurilingual and intercultural education were clearly presented in the introduction to the concept of plurilingual competence in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), they were only gradually confirmed.

This latter document triggered a rapid transformation of the representations and practices of modern language teaching in Europe. It facilitated a more credible redefinition of the goals pursued, and promoted a more open and positive assessment of the competences acquired. The CEFR reaffirmed the link between language learning, mastery of cultural and social factors in communication and education for dealing positively with otherness. It focused attention not just on the language being taught but also on the learners themselves, with the individual wealth of all their linguistic and cultural competences (whatever the context in which they were acquired, inside or outside school), with their successes (even partial ones), and with their experiences of learning and using languages. Even if its actual presence in the classroom is quantitatively fairly modest, the *European Language Portfolio*, with its 111 models validated in the past ten years in Europe, has, either directly through its utilisation or indirectly owing to its influence on educational materials and teaching practices, played a considerable role in promoting learner autonomy, notably thanks to the role its accords to self-assessment.

However, we cannot overlook⁶ the fact that consideration of the CEFR has, more often than not, focused on the technical aspects of teaching or assessment, and has sometimes disregarded in practice the fact that this tool is mainly geared to promoting values which we all share: values of linguistic and cultural diversity, the importance of individual plurilingualism, of learner autonomy and education in diversity for intercultural dialogue, social cohesion, and participation by all in democratic citizenship. Furthermore, as the importance of plurilingualism is gradually recognised and as the idea of taking account of the individual's plurilingual and pluricultural repertoire gains ground, the limits of the organisation of our educational provision become increasingly clear: how are we to ensure valuing individual plurilingualism, and learning how to manage the resources of each learner's language and cultural repertoire and to expand this repertoire, without considering the place and role of the languages of origin, languages learnt outside school, or without addressing head-on the issues bound up with the language(s) of schooling? This/these language(s) of schooling is/are, for most pupils, the basis of plurilingualism, or at least one of its primary components.

Lastly, the very definition of plurilingual and intercultural competence requires us to consider seriously the optimum means of exploiting possible convergences among all the experiences effected in the different languages. **It is a matter, among others, of developing transversal competences and seeking the utmost coherence in our pupils' linguistic development.**

These multiple relations are illustrated by the chart on the relevant Internet pages presenting the contents of the *Platform of resources and references for plurilingual and intercultural education* and their interactions: the first entry is devoted to the socio-linguistic situation in

⁵ www.coe.int/lang/en - Events 2010 - Policy Forum, Geneva – Documents

⁶ Report on the 2007 Forum on “The CEFR and the development of language policies: challenges and responsibilities”: www.coe.int/lang/en - Events 2007 - Intergovernmental Forum, Strasbourg – Report

the school, the learner with the languages which (s)he brings into the school; the language of schooling then occupies a central position, sub-dividing into the language as a subject and language(s) in other subjects; lastly, around this language of schooling are spaces earmarked for foreign languages - modern and classical, and regional, minority and migration languages. The last space is centred on the use of descriptors. As we can see, all the aforementioned components are taken into account. However, alongside the content of each of these spaces, an important aspect of the chart is the link-ups between these different "domains".

The process which has led up to this stage in our collective reflections has involved exploring the various domains in question (foreign languages, languages of origin, languages of schooling). The next stage is to restore the overall coherence required for a form of plurilingual and intercultural education taking account of the learner in all the complementarity and complexity of his knowledge, competences and experiences. The *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education* takes up these different challenges, providing a reference document intended to promote the further development of existing curricula in terms of taking account of these values and their educational potential. It lists a series of possible points of entry with a view to an operational definition of convergences between foreign languages, languages of origin, regional or minority languages, classical languages and languages of schooling. It lays the foundations for improving the horizontal coherence among the different simultaneous linguistic and language learning processes and proposes, with the concept of curricular scenarios, a tool for conceptualising longitudinal coherence in successive stages of the school curriculum. The pursuit of such coherence is economic in terms of resources, increases efficiency in teaching and learning terms, and constitutes an educational added value. Obviously, this search for coherency does not exclusively mean exploring synergies and convergences, but also involves the diversity of experiences of learning and using languages as facilitated by the organisation of the curriculum. Here again, the *European Language Portfolio* can play a major role in pursuing these orientations.

It must, however, be acknowledged that concerted efforts to secure convergence among language learning processes are still few and far between.

Probably one of the most striking current examples in Europe is the curricular reform being conducted in one Swiss region (German-speaking cantons along the French-speaking linguistic boundary), entitled *Passepartout*⁷, which provides, precisely, for co-ordinating the teaching of modern foreign languages, the language of schooling and the languages of origin, thus providing support for pupils in establishing and exploiting links between the acquisitions and learning processes, and helping them to rebuild the unity of their educational experience. It integrates the development of mediation activities, and methodological and intercultural competences. The implementation of this form of curricular renovation, whose implementation and impact it is still too early to assess, is based on a close link-up between curriculum, standards, teaching and assessment methods and teaching training. It is backed up by the regular and continual use of the *European Language Portfolio* and the production of several textbooks implementing an integrated pedagogic approach to the various languages taught.

The debates on the approach set out in the *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education* have highlighted many remaining obstacles. These obstacles may relate to collective representations of language learning which still have currency among the majority: the illusion of the foreign language as a mere vehicle for communicating knowledge, opinions and feelings constructed in the first

⁷ <http://www.passepartout-sprachen.ch/de.html>.

language; ignorance of the organic link between a language and specific cultural references, etc. The difficulties may also arise from the purposes of language teaching: is it solely, or primarily, a matter of transmitting functional skills in these languages, or even cultural knowledge, or do we also want to contribute to an educational project built on values and give learners a capacity for managing and developing their individual language repertoires and intercultural skills? The lack of proven models for seeking to implement such coherence between the different language learning processes is a further impediment, albeit probably a temporary one. Questions remain as to the legitimacy of plurilingual uses in the language class: is there room for polyglot dialogue in a language class? Should we replace the “one teacher – one language” model with plurilingual teachers? The exchanges also show that we should avoid opposition between education for diversity (e.g. the “language awareness” approach) and learning a specific language, taking great care to present these two complementary options in a balanced manner, which may vary according to class levels and contexts. Similarly, we should remember that promoting intercultural education is not incompatible with developing the pluricultural competence acquired via experiences in and learning of different languages; on the contrary, when the latter is used to promote the intercultural dimension, it constitutes an effective springboard for learning the skills needed to interact with linguistic and cultural otherness in general.

Initiatives are required, no doubt using a “slowly but surely” methodology, making the most of all opportunities and tailored to specific situations.

Once again we might regret that the specific theme of developing intercultural competence seldom cropped up during the exchanges. This omission might, wrongly, be interpreted as a sign of “avoiding stating the obvious”; but the fact is that there is not yet any real consensus on the exact scope of this concept. Intercultural competence is sometimes seen as covering the learners’ experiences outside school, i.e. out of the teachers’ sight and responsibility, and separate from those situations whereby native speakers from other cultures intervene in the classroom. And yet a number of countries have incorporated this dimension into their school curricula, and are beginning to use the tools available for its development. It would certainly be useful to scrutinise the latter with an eye to amplifying the Council of Europe’s discourse on the values related to intercultural dialogue.

The same care should be used in developing the *European Language Portfolio*, making it available to learners and teachers and training them in its use. This tool, together with the *Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters*⁸, helps make plurilingual and intercultural education completely meaningful to learners.

5. Matching up the Council of Europe’s language policy tools with the needs expressed

One of the last statements presented during the forum endeavoured to place the LPD’s current projects in perspective. This analysis highlights the major foreseeable as well as the yet unpredictable effects of extending to the language of schooling the themes hitherto dealt with under these projects.

It also pointed to certain tensions in the tools developed and disseminated by the LPD over the last few years, including the CEFR, the ELP and the *Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe (from linguistic diversity to plurilingual education)*⁹, tensions between mechanisms designed for training institutions and the concern for the

⁸ www.coe.int/lang/en - Autobiography of intercultural encounters.

⁹ www.coe.int/lang/en - Policy instruments - *Guide and studies*: towards plurilingual education.

learner, between the prescriptive aspect which can arise from the emphatic reference to common levels of competence and the stress on individual needs and paths, and also between the celebration of linguistic and cultural diversity and plurilingual education, which is only one of the possible forms of such diversity. Even if they can be seen as contradictory or paradoxical, the two poles do nonetheless – when we attempt to link them up – fuel a dynamic which is sometimes difficult to manage but which has facilitated considerable progress in many fields.

We can see from the debates that took place during the forum that similar tensions have also been noted in connection with the tools presented over the three days. Three of them were characterised during the proceedings.

The first concerns the perspective taken in the papers presented during the forum, concentrating on the teaching approach, the contents which the pupils are supposed to acquire, the progressions to be followed and the possible and necessary changes to curricula. This perspective should not obscure the fact that **all these tools and the pointers emerging from them must serve the individual in the learning process, this being their fundamental end purpose.** A link must be forged with what we know or can observe regarding the individual construction of knowledge and competences by the learners.

This balance can certainly be sought in the “Portfolio approaches”. The LPD has launched work on exploring the means of taking account of the experience of the *European Language Portfolio* in order to foster the learner’s personal reflection on their experience, progression and the goals which they can set vis-à-vis mastering the language of schooling in the different subjects and in its multiple uses inside and outside school. The conclusions of this initial examination were made available to the forum¹⁰. The integration perspectives of the “Portfolio approaches” in taking account of the language dimension of different subjects will obviously differ according to class level. It would appear possible to create a specific tool, possibly incorporating the ELP, for primary education. One of the main features of this educational level is the inter- and trans-disciplinary position of primary teachers, which is particularly favourable to holistic, integrated consideration of linguistic variety, subject-specific discourse genres and the types of text encountered and/or expected from the users. On the other hand, the varying degree of specialisation of teaching in the different secondary school subjects militates for the creation of appropriately adapted modules, which would nonetheless require some degree of internal coherence.

It would no doubt also be useful to remove a possible misunderstanding about the use of the word “curriculum” in the studies disseminated by the LPD and in the statements presented during the forum. The latter are all based on a conception of the curriculum which integrates the school or “educational” curriculum into a broader curriculum embracing all the individual’s learning and experiences related to learning and personal development within the educational system or outside school. This school or “educational” curriculum itself comprises two parts: the “language” curriculum, which reflects or organises what should be acquired in terms of mastery of language use, forms of discourse and languages themselves at the different stages in the pupil’s school career; and the “experiential” curriculum, which defines the types of experiences to which learners will be exposed in order to complete their learning path under favourable conditions, the forms of learning and the plurality of approaches which they will experience. We should note that this broad definition of the curriculum takes account of the diversity of languages learnt or known, and is not confined to taught or assimilated subject contents but also includes the diversity of experiences of learning and using languages, an inherent requirement of the concept of quality education.

¹⁰ www.coe.int/lang/fr - Events 2010, Geneva – Documents – Languages in and for education: possible inputs of “portfolio approaches”.

The second tension noted during the forum concerned the optimum means of encouraging the desirable changes. The presentation of the documents and discussions during the meeting possibly gave the impression that the LPD was prioritising a holistic approach, particularly in the work on subject curricula.

The enormous diversity among the participants in terms of institutional position, professional experience and educational context quite obviously influenced the stances they adopted. However, a very broad consensus emerged on the fact that, whatever the educational system, its mode of organisation and traditions, **an approach to the issues using the written curriculum is insufficient and must be complemented by taking into account the modalities and conditions for changing teaching practices.** Some participants even stated that the global or curricular approach was the least effective method. The tension expressed here is between a top-down and a bottom-up approach. Educational contexts are so diverse that the documents formulated at the European level have to provide a sufficiently broad framework to provide everyone with the most suitable means of action for his or her specific context and needs. In short, these documents are reference documents rather than action plans.

In order to make the most of the contributions and exchanges on this subject, we should return once again to the “curriculum” concept as adopted by the LPD in the documents circulated. A second feature of the conception of the curriculum on which these studies are based concerns the relevant levels of intervention. The curriculum as conceived here is not a matter only for national or regional authorities but is determined by a variety of levels, from the “supra” level (international bodies) to the “nano” level (individual learning processes and experiences), through the “macro” levels (national or regional levels) and the “meso” levels (schools). This presentation shows that the entry point selected, for instance, by the *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education* does not indicate any focus on partners in the ministries or bodies responsible for formulating national or regional curricula, but explicit consideration of the possibilities for action at all levels of the educational system. It must, however, be admitted, as was pointed out in one of the workshops, that the lack of coherence in attitudes and initiative among these different levels can be counterproductive and considerably dilute the impact of these actions. In fact, it was from this angle that the importance of involving all the stakeholders, including teachers and school heads as well as parents and learners, in the work on the curriculum was reiterated on many occasions during the forum; similarly, it is vital that we think about the organisation and content of teacher training.

This having been specified, several pointers to possible change were described:

The procedures for analysing practices and expectations in the various subjects were very favourably received, although the participants obviously had insufficient time to appropriate them. It is imperative to complement them as quickly as possible with examples of their practical implementation, whether in terms of modifying curricula or in training and/or teaching practices. The main question is how these tools are to be implemented.

Rather than adopting a comprehensive approach, it is sometimes better to initiate change via work on a more limited scale: geographical limitation (regions or areas with favourable features or schools/classes that can be supported in this activity), sectoral limitation (type of class or pedagogic measures) or thematic limitation.

The logic and efficiency of the approaches proposed should foster the development of a holistic language policy for the school in question, ensuring teamwork and dividing up the tasks among the various players to avoid teacher overload.

Teachers might be helped to change their representations via approaches based on existing educational materials and by communicating examples of good practices which have been tried and tested, including recordings of teaching sessions, accompanied by recommendations on the relevant use of these resources, given that not all of them are transposable to all situations.

Winning the teachers over to these approaches presupposes: (i) clearly differentiating the approach according to target group and situation; (ii) pinpointing good practices and recognising and capitalising on local initiatives; (iii) supplying educational materials and resources; (iv) providing peer support and assistance from researchers (e.g. action research).

Documents for teachers should be worded comprehensibly, avoiding any theoretic overload, and must be very accessible.

Guidelines might be formulated for authors of handbooks and for teacher training courses.

The pooling of experiences, difficulties, questions and success stories should be facilitated by teacher networks.

One question emerges from these exchanges: does the Council of Europe have the institutional legitimacy and the resources to initiate work in direct contact with schools or classes? Is not its role rather to offer policy guidelines based on the values to be promoted and to provide member states and the various potential players with tools created on the basis of the work carried out in different contexts? Is its specific responsibility not also to scrutinise the initiatives taken in order to pool the beneficial results of this work? Is it not for the member states to seek, at home or under co-operation ventures with other regions or States, the optimum means of implementing these policy thrusts? The needs identified might lead us to seek a wide variety of modes of partnership at the European level, whether in the context of the ECML's calls for submissions, which provide genuine opportunities for supporting the LPD's work, or under European programmes run by the European Commission.

A third tension repeatedly emerges in the work related to the role of languages of schooling in school subjects, and has already been mentioned above. **Whereas the European dimension of the CEFR and the ELP has played a decisive role in terms of the member states taking account of Council of Europe input in the field of foreign language teaching and assessment, the approach adopted for languages of schooling is different.** It has evolved during the successive projects, workshops and conferences, so that it now recognises the impossibility of creating a common reference framework for all educational contexts, with their widely varying traditions and practices in terms of educational culture, the status of languages of schooling and also the specific responsibilities in terms of teacher training. The option taken is therefore to leave it to each body responsible for drawing up the curriculum, training teachers or producing educational materials to implement the proposed procedures, to create the descriptors best suited to the realities and needs of their educational context and, if they wish, to define educational standards.

This choice does not, however, mean abandoning individuals to work on their own. First of all, as the tools provided for participants showed, the LPD is intending to play a co-ordinating role between these approaches by pooling documents, reflections and summaries of the work conducted. The *Platform of resources and references for plurilingual and intercultural education* will no doubt play a decisive role here. Such pooling of resources may possibly lead to close co-operation among several education systems. Moreover, the Council of Europe's constant reminders of the values underlying these approaches are also an effective means of linking the experiences of member states.

We might note that this tension is nothing new. It was already making itself felt in 1998, at the launch of the pilot project for the *European Language Portfolio*, when the Council of Europe decided not to draw up a single ELP model for each age bracket, but instead left it to each education system to define its own models in accordance with common principles and guidelines. The large number of models designed in the member states has led to a considerable improvement in the quality and a gradual enrichment of the content via a process of pooling all the advances made.

That having been said, the **affirmation and visibility of the European dimension of the work conducted at the local, regional and/or national levels must continue as requirements for action in the member states, and obviously for the work of the Council of Europe.**

6. Requisite action

The first message from the forum is clear: **the time for action has come.** Taking account of the **language dimensions throughout education and in the individual learning paths of all learners** necessitates changes to practices **taking specific account of the needs of children from the most vulnerable groups.** Obvious points emerging from the observations, analyses and studies must be reflected in the guidance given and the reference documents issued.

A second finding on completion of the work is equally important: the action initiated must not overlook any of the stages significant in the process of changing practices, and **the modalities best suited to the constraints and possibilities of the specific context should be defined without a priori assumptions.** They may be deliberately based on supporting individual practices, developing educational materials or resources illustrating the approaches promoted, or again formulating educational guidelines, curricula devoted to linguistic, methodological and strategic competences cutting across the various subjects, or, lastly, enriching existing curricula for each subject. Four constants must, however, be respected: teacher training is a vital aspect; all partners and players must be involved in the action undertaken; the different levels of intervention must be linked up as far as possible; and tried and tested methods of carrying out curricular changes must be disseminated.

A third obvious point emerged: **progress towards plurilingual and intercultural education should in most cases be pursued by means of a “step-by-step” approach;** such progress means transition and gradual improvement, rather than radical breaks.

Consequently, apportionment of responsibilities and roles among the Council of Europe, the member states and the associate organisations should be redefined, reinforcing the dynamic which was launched after the February 2007 Policy Forum: our respective responsibilities should be understood against the background of a European educational environment based on common values and challenges, which we have noted is becoming increasingly real. The tools presented over these three days are actually based on the experiences, realities and reflections of various education systems. The advances are to be expected from the action taken in each State under partnerships and exchanges with others, under the impetus of the Council of Europe, and in assistance or support initiatives launched by the LPD and, in a different form, by the ECML. The forum also provided an opportunity for participants to read and discuss the ECML's Call for Submissions¹¹ for its new medium-term programme (2012-2105); there is no doubt that the action conducted in this framework at the ECML can contribute to the LPD project “Languages in Education – Languages for Education”.

¹¹ <http://call.ecml.at/Home/tabid/2264/language/en-EN/Default.aspx>.

Moreover, this is how we might interpret the role and purpose of the *Platform of resources and references for plurilingual and intercultural education* on the LPD site. It materialises the forms of exchange among all the partners in this new project, including exchanges between the LPD and member states or NGOs, by supplying studies and documents produced on its initiative, and also exchanges among member states and all the players concerned by means of studies, documents, tried and tested case studies, examples of good practices, etc. It can also help circulate relevant documents produced outside Europe. The first priority is evidently to ensure that the Platform remains active by publicising and utilising it as broadly as possible. From this angle, critical analyses of the tools presented during the forum and their satellite studies are expected.

The rationale behind the above is also to be found in the *Language Education Policy Profiles* which are available for member states, regions and/or cities. This activity consists in supporting the local players and decision-makers in a self-analysis of their language education policies from the angle of adapting them to internal changes in society or developments in the corresponding European debate. This support consists of providing Council of Europe guidelines and analytical tools and also sending experts commissioned by the LPD from countries and educational contexts which can provide a relevant contribution. This type of activity, which can sometimes target a single specific aspect, can certainly also play a major role in addressing issues relating to languages of schooling and languages of origin.

In this context it is impossible to define the priorities to be adopted by each party. We can nevertheless set out two priorities, the need for which was clearly stated at the forum. The LPD must set up **a network of permanent correspondents in each of the ministries, the institutional partners responsible for the activities covered** by the “Languages in education – languages for education” project, with which it can undertake activities focused on practical progress, with early positive effects on the learners and bringing all the potential players together to take up the challenges facing us. Dissemination of the results of the work conducted for and during the forum can be promoted by **organising seminars at national or regional level**.

Several participants point to the opportunities created in their countries by new work on the curriculum for taking account of the input from the forum. Some of them refer to the prospects for development through bilingual teaching. Others consider that no real progress will be achieved in their particular context other than through work on practices and actual examples of implementation. All those involved must define their action priorities in accordance with their specific educational, political and economic context.

Clearly, the Council of Europe’s responsibility also lies at another level. It has a major political role to play in alerting officials in member states to the questions which we have debated, convincing them of the need to encourage initiatives to address them. This may take the form of submitting a motion to the Committee of Ministers for a Recommendation to member states on the right to plurilingual and intercultural education, or other policy initiatives by the Steering Committee on Education.

Furthermore, the LPD can help to promote complementarity in the work conducted at European level, whether by the European Commission, the OECD or other bodies. For instance, the work of the forum confirmed that surveys by these organisations provide important quantitative or statistical results and highly valuable information; this work can help us in our qualitative analysis of the questions discussed and in defining the strategies to be implemented at the local level or on a wider scale. The policy orientations of the European Commission in the educational field can also provide support for the action conducted or initiated by the Council of Europe, even though the two Organisations have specific

mandates.. Lastly, the LPD is also responsible for exchanges and co-operation with other organisations or countries, e.g. ALECSO and Canada, which have voiced keen interest in the LPD's work by their active presence at the forum.

The participants' evaluation of the forum confirms the highly positive overall assessment of the work, and the general satisfaction with the quality of the welcome and organisation by the Swiss authorities, and also the preparation of the event by the LPD. This overall assessment provides a very favourable basis for launching the new phase of the work on the project "Languages in education – languages for education".

The recent consideration of questions relating to languages of schooling and the increasing attention being paid to the place of languages of origin obviously strike a new balance in the work on the various fields in question. There are already many documents and tools on modern and second language teaching and learning which should be disseminated and supported, as the main issue is to ensure that these resources are used in practice. The emphasis must henceforth be on the language of schooling and its role in subject learning and teaching, so as to ensure a balance more suited to the conception of plurilingual and intercultural education. However, this does not mean changing the main policy thrust or placing the work on foreign languages on hold. Clearly, foreign languages still play an important role in the implementation of plurilingual and intercultural education. These languages even benefit from the broader discussion promoted by the realisation that they are not mere tools to be used as neutral vehicles for knowing or communication about contents acquired in the language of schooling. The CEFR and ELP are still fundamental components of the LPD's strategy to promote values linked to diversity, social cohesion, intercultural dialogue, democratic citizenship and the right to quality and equity in education.

The shift in focus towards issues related to the language of schooling is being effected in close partnership with the member states. The composition of delegations to the forum in fact reflects these developments, as intended by the LPD: participants from various subject domains, with different responsibilities, from the foreign languages field and the teaching of languages of schooling, experts and officials with educational and administrative responsibilities.

This forum follows on from a series of meetings and conferences which facilitated the production of a large number of documents and studies¹² which were made available to all on the *Platform of resources and references for plurilingual and intercultural education*, and some of which were printed for participants in the forum. Only a few of the texts were presented during proceedings, but the scope and wealth of the reflections clearly can only be reflected by taking account of the diversity of these studies and related supporting documents.

The pointers for further work and reflection identified during the forum all lead to plurilingual and intercultural education, sensitive to the needs and abilities of all learners, and particularly those from the most vulnerable groups. They are informed by the desire to secure the right to quality education. This key principle of the right to quality education forges a very strong link between quality and equity: equity requires the education offered to all to be of high quality; and the quality of such education can only be guaranteed by the constant pursuit of equity.

¹² See list of publications printed for the forum : www.coe.int/lang/en - Forum, Geneva - Documents.

APPENDIX 1: **PROGRAMME**

Tuesday, 2 November, 14.00

10.00 – 13.45	Registration of participants (Conference area: level -1)
12.00 – 13.45	<i>Buffet-lunch</i>
Chair: Johanna Panthier	OFFICIAL OPENING
14.00 – 14.30	Charles Beer, State Councillor in charge of the Department of Public Instruction, Culture and Sport of the Republic and Canton of Geneva Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Director General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport, DG IV, Council of Europe
14.30 – 15.15	Introduction to the Conference: Francis Goullier, <i>General Rapporteur</i>
Chair: Joseph Sheils	SESSION 1: <i>Languages for educational success, the right to plurilingual and intercultural competences: the responsibilities of educational systems and the contribution of international Organisations</i>
15.15 – 16.00	Aims of all languages in/for education – Michael Fleming
16.00 – 16.45	<i>Coffee break</i>
16.45 – 18.00	Children from disadvantaged backgrounds: Field and working methods of international Organisations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>Closing the Gap for Immigrant Students: Policies, practice and performance</i> – Miho Taguma, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) o <i>The Multilingualism policy of the European Union - Facing new challenges</i>– Fiorella Perotto, European Commission o <i>Policy guidelines and tools developed by the Language Policy Division concerning the linguistic and educational integration of children and adolescents from migrant backgrounds</i> - David Little
19.30	Reception and official Dinner in the presence of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Isabelle Chassot, State Councillor, Director of Public Instruction, Culture and Sport of the Canton of Fribourg, Chair of the Swiss Conference of Canton Directors for Public Instruction (CDIP) ▪ Paul Widmer, Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Switzerland to the Council of Europe ▪ Joseph Sheils, Head of the Department of Language Education and Policy, Council of Europe

Wednesday, 3 November

Chair: Irene Pieper

SESSION 2: *Linguistic competences in knowledge construction*

9.00 - 9.30

Procedures for describing linguistic competences in “non-language” school subjects - Jean-Claude Beacco & Helmut Vollmer

Introduction to questions for group work - Irene Pieper

9.30 - 11.45

Group work A (including coffee break)

1. *How can a subject curriculum be conceived which adequately takes into account its language dimension (in primary and secondary education)?*
2. *How might the procedures presented in the previous plenary session concerning the description of language competences contribute to the development of curricula in your context?*
3. *How could this be concretely implemented in the classroom, and what are the implications for textbooks, teacher training, etc?*
4. *How can developments and experiences be shared, for example using the ‘Platform of resources and references for plurilingual and intercultural education’?*

Chair: Daniel Coste

SESSION 3: *Languages and curriculum development for plurilingual and intercultural education*

11.45 - 12.30

Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education- Mirjam Egli - Marisa Cavalli

Introduction to group work - Daniel Coste

12.30 - 14.30

Lunch

14.30 - 15.15

Round table: Group work A Rapporteurs - Chair: Sandra Hutterli

15.15 - 17.00

Group work B (including coffee break)

Based on the ‘Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education’, which strategies might be used to gradually promote the concept of plurilingual and intercultural education

- *in the field of foreign languages?*
- *in the field of languages of schooling?*
- *by taking into account migration languages?*

17.00 - 17.30

Example of horizontal and vertical coherence: Co-ordination of language teaching in Switzerland - Sandra Hutterli

Chair: Joseph Sheils

SESSION 4: *Council of Europe perspective (Part 1)*

17.30 - 18.00

In support of plurilingual people living in multilingual societies: the contribution of the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) - Waldemar Martyniuk & Susanna Slivensky

18.15 - 19.15

Show & Tell: selected Language Policy Division, ECML and Swiss projects

20.00

Dinner at the hotel

Thursday, 4 November

9.00 – 9.45

Round table: Group work B Rapporteurs – Chair: Danièle Moore

Chair: Joseph Sheils

SESSION 5 Council of Europe perspectives (Part 2)

9.45 – 10.45

Language Policy Division

- The current projects of the Division in a wider perspective - Daniel Coste
- Platform of resources and references for plurilingual and intercultural education Jean-Claude Beacco

10.45 – 11.15

Coffee break

SESSION 6: Key note

11.15 – 12.15

Languages of Schooling: Exploring the Connections between Research, Theory, and Policy in an Ideologically Complex Environment - Jim Cummins

SESSION 7: Summing up

12.15 – 13.00

Conclusions

- Francis Goullier, General Rapporteur
- Johanna Panthier, Language Policy Division, Council of Europe

Closure

- Olivier Maradan, CDIP, Switzerland

13.00 – 14.00

Lunch

Departure of participants

APPENDIX 2 : LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES / REPRESENTANTS NATIONAUX

ALBANIA / ALBANIE

Ms Tatjana VUÇANI, Senior Specialist, Pre-University Education Department, Ministry of Education and Science, Rruga e Durrësit Nr 23, AL - 1001 TIRANA
Tel: 355 692100298 / e-mail: vucanit@mash.gov.al / vucanit@hotmail.com

Ms Adriatike LAMI, National Coordinator of the project " Languages of Schooling", National Agency for Evaluation of Student's Achievements (MASH) , Ministry of Education and Science, Rruga e Durrësit No. 23, AL - TIRANA
Tel: 355 68 25 15 403. / e-mail: adriatikelami@gmail.com

ARMENIA / ARMENIE

Ms Anahit MKRTCHYAN, Higher Pedagogical Education Specialist, Centre for Education Projects, Ministry of Education and Science, 73 Vratsyan Street, 0070 YEREVAN
Tel: 374 1 0 575 644 /Fax: 37410 55 97 50 / e-mail: anahitmkrtyan@yahoo.com

AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE

Ms Muriel WARGA-FALLENBÖCK, Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Kunst und Kultur (BMUKK), Leiterin des Referates 1/5b: „Sprachenpolitische Koordination“, Minoritenplatz 5, A - 1014 VIENNA
Tel: 43 4 53120 2297 / Fax: 43 1 53120 81 2297 e-mail: Muriel.warga-fallenboeck@bmukk.gv.at

Mr Gunther ABUJA, Austrian Centre for Language Competence, Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum(ÖSZ), Hans Sachs-Gasse 3/I, A - 8010 GRAZ
Tel: 43 316 82 41 50 / Fax: 43 316 82 41 505 / e-mail: abuja@oesz.at

Ms Anna LASSELSBERGER, Bundesministerium für Unterricht, Kunst und Kultur (BMUKK), (Federal Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture), Minoritenplatz 5, A - 1014 VIENNA
Tel: 43 1 53120 2528 / Fax: 43 1 53120 2599 / e-mail: anna.lasselsberger@bmukk.gv.at / anna.lasselsberger@gmx.at

AZERBAÏDJAN / AZERBAIJAN

Ms Elnara HUSEYNOVA, Expert, International Relations Department, Ministry of Education, Khatai avenue 49, BAKU
Tel: 99412 4933311 (ext. 184) /e-mail: e.huseynova@edu.gov.az / h_elnara@yahoo.com

BELGIUM / BELGIQUE

French Community / Communauté française
Mme Patricia POLET, Chargée de mission, CFWB, Administration générale de l'enseignement et de la recherche scientifique, Direction générale de l'Enseignement obligatoire, Rue Adolphe Lavallée, 1, B - 1080 BRUXELLES
Tel: 32 2 690.83.55 / e-mail: patricia.polet@cfwb.be

Flemish Community / Communauté flamande

Ms Katrien MONDT, Strategische Beleidsondersteuning, SBO, Departement of Education and Training, Hendrik Consciencegebouw, Koning Albert II-laan 15, B - 1210 BRUSSEL

Tel: 32 2 553 9566 / Fax: 32 2 553 9565 / e-mail: katrien.mondt@ond.vlaanderen.be

Ms Hilde VANDERHEYDEN, Ministerie van Onderwijs en Vorming, AKOV, Hendrik Consciencegebouw, Koning Albert II laan 15 (2B24), B - 1210 BRUSSEL

Tel: 32 2 553 88 30 / e-mail: hilde.vanderheyden@ond.vlaanderen.be

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA / BOSNIE -HERZEGOVINE

Ms Tatjana BOGDANOVIC, Pedagogic Institute of Republika Srpska, 39 Milos Obilic St., 78000 BANJALUKA, REPUBLIKA SRPSKA

Tel: 387 51 430 110 / Fax: 387 51 430 100 / e-mail: t.bogdanovic@rpz-rs.org

BULGARIA / BULGARIE

Mrs Evgeniya D KOSTADINOVA, Director of Educational Programmes and Educational Contents Directorate, Ministry of Education, Youth, and Science, 2A Kniaz Dondukov blvd., 1000 SOFIA

Tel: 359 2 9217 446/ Fax: 359 2 9217 598 / e-mail: e.kostadinova@mon.bg

CROATIA / CROATIE

Ms Nada JAKIR, Senior Adviser, Ministry of Science, Education and Sports, Directorate for National Minorities, Donje Svetice 38, HR - 1000 ZAGREB

Tel: 385 1 4594 355 / Fax: 385 1 4594 319 / e-mail: nada.jakir@mzos.hr

Ms Biljana BIRAČ, Associate, Directorate for International Cooperation and European Integration, Ministry of Science, Education and Sports, Donje Svetice 38, HR - 10000 ZAGREB

Tel: 385 1 4594 413 / Fax: 385 1 4594 316 / e-mail: biljana.birac@mzos.hr

CYPRUS / CHYPRE

Ms Eleni LOIZOU, Inspector of Greek for secondary education, Ministry of Education and Culture, Department of Secondary Education, NICOSIA 1434

Tel: 357 22806319 / Fax: 357-22800862 / e-mail: elloizo@yahoo.gr

Mr Sotiris ELEFThERIOU, Inspector of Secondary Education, Ministry of Education and Culture, Department of Secondary Education, 1434 NICOSIA

Tel: 357 22800932 / Fax: 357 22305117 / e-mail: eleftheriousotiris@gmail.com

CZECH REPUBLIC/ REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE

Ms Irena MAŠKOVÁ, Department for International Relations, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, 7, Karmelitska, 118 12 PRAHA 1

Tel: 420 2 57 193 611 / Fax: 420 02340811 397 / e-mail: maskova@msmt.cz

DENMARK / DANEMARK

Mr Christian Lamhauge RASMUSSEN, Head of section, Ministry of Education, Department of Primary, Lower Secondary and General Adult Education, Frederiksholms Kanal 26, DK - 1220 COPENHAGEN K

Tel: 45 3392 5000 / Dir Tel: 45 3392 5418 / Fax: 45 3392 5302 / e-mail: clr@uvm.dk

ESTONIA / ESTONIE

Ms Maie SOLL, Adviser of Curriculum Division, General Education Department, Ministry of Education and Research, Munga 18, 50088 TARTU

Tel: 372 7350 0229 / Fax: 372 730 1080 / e-mail: maie.soll@hm.ee

Mr Tõnu TENDER, Adviser of Language Department, Ministry of Education and Research, Munga 18, 50088 TARTU

Tel: 372 735 0223 / 372 51 54 365 / Fax: 372 7350 220 / e-mail: tonu.tender@hm.ee

FINLAND / FINLANDE

Ms Pirjo SINKO, Counsellor of Education, Finnish National Board of General Education, PO Box 380, Hakaniemenranta 6, 00531 HELSINKI

Tel: 358 40 348 7281 / Fax: 358 40 348 7865 / e-mail: pirjo.sinko@oph.fi

FRANCE

Mme Viviane BOUYASSE, Inspectrice générale de l'éducation nationale, Ministère de l'Education nationale, 107, rue de Grenelle, 75007 PARIS

Tel: 01 55 55 34 23 / Fax: 01 55 55 06 46 / e-mail: viviane.bouyasse@education.gouv.fr

Mme Magali ROSA, Chargée d'études responsable du dossier « Enfants nouvellement arrivés en France » et du Français langue étrangère, Bureau des Ecoles, DGESCO A1-1, 110 rue de Grenelle, 75007 PARIS

Tel: 01 55 55 3884 / e-mail: magali.rosa@education.gouv.fr

Mme Brigitte REAUTE, Chargée d'études, Bureau des collèges, DGESCO A1 - 2, Ministère de l'Education nationale, 107 rue de Grenelle, 75007 PARIS

Tel: 01 55 55 38 44 / Fax: 01 55 55 38 92 / e-mail: brigitte.reaute@education.gouv.fr

M.Bruno LEVALLOIS, Inspecteur Général de l'Education Nationale, Président du Conseil d'Administration de l'Institut du Monde Arabe, Ministère de l'Education nationale, 110, rue de Grenelle, 75007 PARIS

e-mail: bruno.levallouis@education.gouv.fr

GEORGIA / GEORGIE

Ms Marika ODZELI, Head of Georgian Language Division, Ministry of Education and Science, 52, Dimitri Uznadze St, 0102 TBILISI

Tel: 995 77 17 33 03 / Fax: 995 32 23 3366 / 995 32 23 37 96 / e-mail: makodzeli@hotmail.com

Mr Tinatin JAVAKHISHVILI, Head of Telavi Educational Resource Centre, 16, Erekle II ave, TELAVI

Tel: [995 77 171189](tel:99577171189) / e-mail: tikote@gmail.com

Mme Tamara JAKELI, Head of the Division of Humanitarian and Social Sciences, National Curriculum and Assessment Centre. 52D Uznadze St., 0102 TBILISI
Tel: 995 32 95 83 13 / e-mail: tjakeli@ganatileba.org

GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Mr Christof ARNOLD, Ministry of Education (Bildungsministerium Mecklenburg-Vorpommern) of the Federal State of Mecklenburg - Western Pomerania (Ref. 219H), Werderstr. 124, D - 19055 SCHWERIN
Tel: 49 3887594 / 49 385 55592020 / e-mail: christof.arnold@web.de

GREECE / GRECE

Ms Alexandra KOULOUMBARITSI, Hellenic pedagogical Institute, 392 Lesoforos Mesogeion Street, room 216, AGIA PARASKEVI
Tel: 30 210 600 3804 / Fax: 30 210 3442471 / e-mail: alcoul@pi-schools.gr

HUNGARY / HONGRIE

Mme Katalin TÖRÖKNÉ SZILÁGYI, Chef du Département des Relations Internationales du Secrétariat d'État du Ministère des Ressources Nationales, Szalay utca 10, 1054 BUDAPEST
Tel: 36-1-7954045 / Fax: 36-1-7950219 / e-mail: szilagyi.katalin@nefmi.gov.hu

IRELAND / IRLANDE

Mr Brendan DOODY, Primary Divisional Inspector, Department of Education and Skills, Floor 1, Block 3, Marlborough St., DUBLIN 1
Tel: 353 (0) 1 88/92241 / Fax: 353 1 889 6524 / e-mail: brendan_doody@education.gov.ie

Ms Breda NAUGHTON, Principal Officer, Department of Education & Skills, Room 217, Floor 2, Block 2, Marlborough St, DUBLIN 1
Tel: 353 (0) 1 889 2496 / e-mail: breda_naughton@education.gov.ie

ITALY / ITALIE

Ms Colaiuda CINZIA, Ministry of Education, University and Research, Viale Trastevere 76, I - 00153 ROMA
Tel: 39 06 58493467 / Fax: 39 06 58492312 / e-mail: cinzia.colaiuda@istruzione.it

Ms Gisella LANGE, Inspector to the MPI/USR Lombardia, Ministero Istruzione Università Ricerca, Ufficio Scolastico Regionale per la Lombardia, Via Ripamonti 85, I - 20141 MILANO
Tel: 39 02 574627 292 / 0/5/ Fax: 39 02 574627245 / e-mail: gislang@tin.it

Ms Angiolina PONZIANO, Inspector, Ministry of Education, University and Research, Department of Education, Directorate General of Head-School, Teachers and Staff-Training, Viale Trastevere 76a, I - 00153 ROMA
Tel: 39 06 5849 3473 / Fax: 39 06 5849 2312 / e-mail: angiolina.ponziano@istruzione.it

LATVIA / LETTONIE

Ms Inita JUHNEVICA, Ministry of Education and Science, Valnu Street 2, LV - 1050 LATVIA
Tel: 371 67047908 / Fax: 371 67047904 / e-mail: inita.juhnevica@izm.gov.lv

LITHUANIA / LITUANIE

Ms Ona CEPULNIENE, Chief Specialist of the Basic and Secondary Education Division,
General Education and Vocational Training Department, Ministry of Education and Science,
A.Volano str. 2/7, LT - 01516 VILNIUS
Tel: 370 5 2191151 / Fax: 370 5 2612077 / e-mail: ona.cepulniene@smm.lt

LUXEMBOURG

Mme Edmée BESCH, Professeure-attachée, Responsable de l'enseignement des langues,
Ministère de l'Education nationale et de la Formation professionnelle (MENFP), 29 rue
Aldringen, L-2926 LUXEMBOURG
Tel: 352 247-85107 / Fax: 352 2478 5130 / e-mail: edmee.besch@men.lu

MOLDOVA

Ms Elena BELEACOVA, Director General of the Bureau of Interethnic Relations of the
Republic of Moldova, "A. Mateevici" street, N° 109/1 MD - 2033 CHISINAU
Tel: 373 22 23 50 40 / 373 22 21 40 80 / Fax: 378 22 24 15 32 / e-mail: corina_pc@yahoo.com

Mme Doina USACI, Consultante au Département de l'Enseignement Supérieur, Ministère de
l'Education, 1, Piata Marii Adunari Nationale, MD - 2012 CHISINAU
Tel: 373 22 23 32 13 / Fax: 373 22 23 24 43 / e-mail: usacidoina_88@yahoo.com

Mme Elena PRUS, Directrice, Institut des Recherches Philologiques et Interculturelles, 52,
rue VI.Pârcălab, MD - 2012 CHISINAU
Tel: 373 22 20 59 26 / Home: 373 22 44 25 14 / Fax : 373 22 220028 /
e-mail: elena_prus_ro@yahoo.fr

MONTENEGRO

Ms Jelena ŠARANović, High Adviser, Department for International Cooperation and
European Integration, Ministry of Education and Science, Vaka Djurovica b.b., 81000
PODGORICA
Tel: 382 20 410 100 / Fax: 382 20 410 101 / email: Jelena.abramovic@gov.me

Ms Ljiljana SUBOTIC, Senior Adviser, Bureau for Educational Services, Zavod za školstvo,
Podrucna jedinica Tivat, Nikole Djurkovic bb, 85320 TIVAT
Tel: 382 32 670 100 / Fax: 382 32 670 100 / e-mail: suboticlj@t-com.me

NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Ms Daniela FASOGLIO, Projectleider Tweede Fase, SLO - Netherlands Institute for
Curriculum Development (Nationaal expertisecentrum leerplanontwikkeling), Piet
Heinstraat 12 - Postbus 2041, NL - 7500 CA ENSCHEDE
Tel: 31 53 4840610 / Fax: 31 53 4307692 / e-mail: d.fasoglio@slo.nl

NORWAY / NORVEGE

Mr Gerard DOETJES, Norwegian Centre for Foreign Languages in Education,
Fremmedspråksenteret, Høgskolen i Østfold, Remmen, NO-1757 HALDEN
Tel: 47 45295435 / e-mail: gerard.doetjes@fremmedspraksenteret.no

POLAND / POLOGNE

Ms Barbara SKACZKOWSKA, Head of Unit, International Cooperation Department, Ministry of National Education, 25, Szucha Avenue, PL - 00-918 WARSAW
Tel: 48 22 34 74 629 / Fax: 8 22 34 74 253 / e-mail: Barbara.Skaczkowska@men.gov.pl

Ms Magdalena SZPOTOWICZ, lecturer, University of Warsaw, Pedagogic Unit, 16/20, Mokotowska Street, PL - 00-561 WARSAW
Tel: 48 22 55 30 861 / Fax: 48 22 629 89 79 / e-mail: m.szpotowicz@uw.edu.pl

PORTUGAL

Mme Isabel ALMEIDA - Direction Générale du Développement Curriculaire et Innovation (DGIDC), Ministère de l'Éducation, Av. 24 de Julho, 140 - 5°, P - 1399-025 LISBOA
Tel: 351 21 3936842/ Fax: 351 21 3936833 / e-mail: isabel.almeida@dgidc.min-edu.pt

Mrs Isabel OLIVEIRA, Head of Department for Educational Innovation, Av. 24 de Julho, 140 - 5°, P - 1399-025 LISBOA
Tel: 351 21 3936804 / Fax: 351 21 3934690 / e-mail: isabel.oliveira@dgidc.min-edu.pt

ROMANIA / ROUMANIE

Ms Liliana PREOTEASA, Directrice Générale de la Direction Générale de l'Enseignement Préuniversitaire, Ministère de l'Éducation, de la Recherche, de la Jeunesse et du Sport, 30, G-ral Berthelot, District Nr 1, BUCAREST
Tel: 40 21 405 62 21 / Fax : 40 21 313 55 47 / e-mail: liliana.preoteasa@medu.edu.ro

RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE RUSSIE

Ms Ksenia GOLUBINA, Moscow State Linguistic University, Department of English Stylistics, Ostozhenka street, 38, 119034 MOSCOW
Tel/Fax: 7 499 246 28 07 /e-mail: golubina@linguanet.ru

Ms Irina KHALEEVA, Rector, Moscow State Linguistic University, Ostozhenka street, 38, 119034 MOSCOW
Tel/Fax: 7 495 246 28 07 / e-mail: Khaleeva@linguanet.ru

SLOVAK REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE

Mme Anna BUTASOVA, Directrice du Département des Langues Romaines, Université Comenius de Bratislava, Šoltésová 4, 81107 BRATISLAVA
Tel: 421 914325340 / e-mail: anna.butasova@fedu.uniba.sk

Mme Katarina VASKANINOVA, Directrice, Institut national de Pédagogie, Statny pedagogicky ustav, Pluhová 8, 830 00 BRATISLAVA
Tel: 421 2 49276323 / e-mail: katarina.vaskaninova@statpedu.sk

Mme Darina DE JAEGER, Responsable du Département des Langues étrangères, Institut national de Pédagogie, Statny pedagogicky ustav, Pluhová 8, 830 00 BRATISLAVA
Tel: 421 2 49276 306 / e-mail: jaegher@statpedu.sk / lomnicka@yahoo.fr

SLOVENIA / SLOVENIE

Mr Mirko ZORMAN, MSc, Head of Department for International Cooperation, National Education Institute, Poljanska 28, 1000 LJUBLJANA

Tel: 386 1 3005 166 / Fax: 386 1300 5199 / e-mail: mirko.zorman@zrss.si

Ms Andreja DUHOVNIK, Senior Advisor for Slovenian minority abroad, National Education Institute, Regional Branch Koper, Cankarjeva 5, 6000 KOPER

Tel: 386 5 6100604 / Fax: 386 5 6100619 / e-mail: andreja.duhovnik@zrss.si

SPAIN / ESPAGNE

Ms Pilar PÉREZ ESTEVE, Vocal Asesora, Gabinete de la Secretaría de Estado de Educación y Formación Profesional, Ministerio de Educación, C/ Alcalá, 34, 5- planta. Despacho 511, SP - 28071 MADRID

Tel: 34 91 701 82 43 / Fax: 34 91 701 86 30 / e-mail : pilar.pereze@educacion.es

SWEDEN / SUEDE

Ms Anna ÖSTERLUND, Swedish National Agency for Education (Skolverket), Alstromergatan 12, SE - 106 20 STOCKHOLM

Tel: 46-73377 3585 / e-mail: anna.osterlund@skolverket.se

Mr Mats WENNERHOLM, Swedish National Agency for Education (Skolverket) SE - 106 20 STOCKHOLM

Tel: 46-733-77 35 85 / e-mail: mats.wennerholm@skolverket.se

SWITZERLAND / SUISSE

National participants of host country on separate list / Participants nationaux du pays hôte sur liste séparée

TURKEY / TURQUIE

[Ms Nihal COSKUN](#), [Turkish Board of Education](#) , [Turkish Ministry of National Education](#), Milli Egitim Bakanligi [Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanligi](#), [Teknikokullar](#), 06330 ANKARA

Tel: [90 312 212 65 30 /4337](tel:9031221265304337) / Tel direct: 90 312 215 20 72 / Fax: 90 312 212 25 71 /

e-mail: nihalcoskun@meb.gov.tr / nihalcoskun@gmail.com

[Ms Zuhul KARAKOC](#), Expert, Department of Directorate for Foreign Relations, [Ministry of National Education](#), Milli Egitim Bakanligi Dis Iliskiler Genel [Mudurlugu](#), [6. Kat C Blok](#), [BAKANLIKLAR 06648](#), ANKARA

Tel: [90 312 413 38 28](tel:903124133828) / Fax: 90 312 418 82 89 / e-mail: zkarakoc@meb.gov.tr /

zkarakoc@yahoo.com

UKRAINE

Ms Oksana KOVALENKO, Leading Specialist, Department of General and Pre-school, Ministry of Education and Science, Pr Peremohy. 10, 01135 KYIV

Tel/Fax: 38044 4862481 / e-mail: o_kovalenko@mon.gov.ua

UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Mr Elidir KING, National Director for Languages, The Languages Company, Hamilton House,
Mabledon Place Bloomsbury, UK - LONDON WC1H 9BB
Tel: 44 207 554 8644 / Fax: 44 207 554 8501 / e-mail: lidking@languagescompany.com

NON-MEMBER STATE HAVING OBERVER STATUS WITH THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE / ETAT
NON MEMBRE AYANT LE STATUT D'OBSERVATEUR AUPRÈS DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

CANADA

M. Larry VANDERGRIFF, Professeur titulaire, Institut des langues officielles et du
bilinguisme (ILOB), Université d'Ottawa, 600, avenue King-Edward, pièce 303, OTTAWA ON
K1N 6N5
Tel: 613-562-5800 poste 3464 / Fax: 613 562 5126 / e-mail: lvdgrift@uottawa.ca

M. Hilaire LEMOINE, Cadre en résidence/Executive in Residence, Institut des langues
officielles et du bilinguisme (ILOB)/Official Languages and Bilingualism Institute (OLBI),
Université d'Ottawa/University of Ottawa, 200 rue Wilbrod St. pièce/Room 010B, OTTAWA
ON K1N 6N5
Tel: 01 613-562-5800 (1575) / Fax: 01 613-562-5126 / e-mail: hlemoine@uottawa.ca

FORUM COORDINATING GROUP / GROUPE DE COORDINATION DU FORUM

M. Jean-Claude BEACCO
Université de la Sorbonne nouvelle-Paris III, UFM DFLE, 43 rue Saint Jacques, 75005 PARIS,
FRANCE
Tel: 33 (0)1 40 16 06 90/ e-mail: Jean-Claude.Beacco@univ-paris3.fr /
JCB.MDG@wanadoo.fr

Mr Michael BYRAM
University of Durham, School of Education, Leazes Road, UK - DURHAM DH1 1TA, UNITED
KINGDOM
Tel: 44 191 38 41446 / e-mail: m.s.byram@durham.ac.uk

M. Daniel COSTE
Professeur émérite, Ecole normale supérieure Lettres et Sciences humaines, 17, rue
Plumet, 75015 PARIS
Tel/Fax: 33 (01) 56 58 18 60 /e-mail: dlcoste2@wanadoo.fr

Mme Marisa CAVALLI
25, Avenue du Grand-Saint-Bernard, I - 11100 AOSTE / ITALIE
Tel: 39 0165 41 5 49 / Fax: 39 0165 36 11 42 / e-mail: mrcavalli@alice.it

Mr Mike FLEMING
School of Education, University of Durham, Leazes Road, UK - DURHAM DH1 1TA, UNITED
KINGDOM
Tel: 44 191 3348349 / 44 7801704055 / e-mail: m.p.fleming@durham.ac.uk

M. Francis GOULLIER
Inspecteur Général de l'Education Nationale, Rapporteur Général du Forum, Ministère de
l'Education nationale, 107 rue de Grenelle, 75007 PARIS, FRANCE
Tel: 33 6 33 15 41 19 / e-mail: francis.goullier@education.gouv.fr

Mme Sandra HUTTERLI

Secrétariat général CDIP (Conférence suisse des directeurs cantonaux de l'instruction publique, Maison des Cantons, Speichergasse 6, Case postale 660, CH - 3000 BERNE 7
Tel: 41 31 309 51 62 / e-mail: hutterli@edk.ch

M. Olivier MARADAN

Secrétaire général adjoint, responsable de l'unité de coordination "scolarité obligatoire",
Secrétariat général CDIP (Conférence suisse des directeurs cantonaux de l'instruction publique, Maison des Cantons, Speichergasse 6, Case postale 660, CH - 3000 BERNE 7
Tel: 41313095122 / e-mail: maradan@edk.ch

Ms Irene PIEPER

Institut für deutsche Sprache und Literatur, Universität Hildesheim, Lüneburger str. 3, D - 31141 HILDESHEIM, GERMANY
Tel: 49 (51) 21 88 36 51 / e-mail: irene.pieper@uni-hildesheim.de

KEY NOTE SPEAKER / INVITE D'HONNEUR

Mr James CUMMINS

University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), 252 Bloor Street W, TORONTO, ONTARIO, M5S 1V6, CANADA
Tel: 416 - 978-0269 / e-mail jcummins@oise.utoronto.ca

EXPERTS

Ms Laila AASE

Nordisk institutt, Universitetet i Bergen, Sydneplassen 7, N - 5007 BERGEN, NORWAY
Tel: 47 99464767 / e-mail: laila.aase@lle.uib.no

Mme Marie-Madeleine BERTUCCI

Professeure des universités en Sciences du Langage, Université de Cergy-Pontoise, Département de Lettres Modernes, Les Chênes 2, 33, bd du Port, 95011 CERGY-PONTOISE CEDEX, FRANCE
Fax: 01 42 74 26 80 / e-mail: marie-madeleine.bertucci@u-cergy.fr

Mme Véronique CASTELLOTTI

Professeure des universités, en sciences du langage et didactique des langues, Université François Rabelais, UFR de Lettres et langues, Département SODILANG, 3 rue des Tanneurs, F-37041 TOURS CEDEX 01, FRANCE
Tel: 33 2 47 36 65 66 / Fax 33 2 47 36 67 76 / e-mail: veronique.castellotti@univ-tours.fr

Mr Alexandru **CRISAN**

Executive President, Center Education 2000+, Assoc. Professor - Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest, Str. Caderea Bastiliei, Nr. 33, SECTOR 1, BUCURESTI / ROMANIA / cod 010613
Tel: 40 72 2 630 771 / e-mail: crisanalexandru11@yahoo.com / acrisan1@hotmail.com

Mme Marcella BEACCO DI GIURA

34 rue Rodier, 75009 PARIS, FRANCE
Tel: 33 (0)1 40 16 06 90 / e-mail: JCB.MDG@wanadoo.fr

M. Jean-Marie GAUTHEROT
21, rue Jacob Mayer, F 67200 STRASBOURG, FRANCE
Tel.: 33 (0)3 88 27 34 71 /e-mail: jmgautherot@noos.fr

Ms Ingrid GOGOLIN
Universität Hamburg, Institut für International and Interculturell Vergleichende
Erziehungswissenschaft, Von-Melle-Park 8, D - 20146 HAMBURG, GERMANY
Tel: 49 40 428383398 / Fax: 49 40 42839 4298 / e-mail: Gogolin@uni-hamburg.de

Mr Gareth HUGHES
Trefenai, Druid Road, Menai Bridge, ANGLESEY LL59 5BY, WALES / UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: 44 1248 717 216 / e-mail: hughestrefenai@gmail.com

Mr David LITTLE
Centre for Language and Communication Studies, Trinity College, IRL - DUBLIN 2, IRELAND
Tel: 353 (1) 2884437 / e-mail: dlittle@tcd.ie

Ms Joanna MCPAKE
Lecturer, School of Education, University of Strathclyde, Jordanhill Campus, 76 Southbrae
Drive, UK - GLASGOW G13 1PP / SCOTLAND
Tel: 44 (0)141-950 3261 / Fax: 44 (0)141-950 3662 / e-mail: joanna.mcpake@strath.ac.uk

Mme Danièle MOORE
Professor, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, 8888 University Drive, BURNABY
BC V5A 1S6, CANADA
Tel: 1 778 782 4269 /Fax: 1 778 782 3203 / e-mail: danmoorefr@yahoo.ca

Ms Florentina SAMIHAIAN
Lecturer, University of Bucharest, Faculty of Letters, Str. Edgar Quinet, Nr 5-7, Sector 1,
BUCURESTI, ROMANIA
Tel: 4 021 313 88 75 / 4 021 314 35 08/interior 2141, 2143, 2278 / Fax: 4 021 313 43 36 /
4 021 314 61 77 / e-mail: litere@g.unibuc.ro / tinasamihaian@gmail.com

Ms Maria STOICHEVA
Sofia University "St Kliment Ohridski", Faculty of Philosophy, 15 Osvoboditel blvd, 1504
SOFIA, BULGARIA
Tel: 359 889 715321 / e-mail: maria.stoicheva@gmail.com / mpantaleeva@yahoo.com

Mr Eike THURMANN
Wiedbach 68 D - 45357 ESSEN, GERMANY
Tel: 49 201 47849750 / e-mail: thuermanneike@googlemail.com

Mr John TRIM
Director of Council of Europe Modern Languages Projects 1971-1997
78A London Road, Stapleford, UK - CAMBRIDGE CB22 5DR, UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: 44 1223 847034 / e-mail: john.trim1@tiscali.co.uk

Mr Piet-Hein VAN DE VEN
ILS, Graduate School of Education, Radboud University, postbus 9103, 6500 HD NIJMEGEN /
NETHERLANDS
Tel: 31 24 3612912 / Fax: 31 24 3615695 / e-mail: P.vandeven@ils.ru.nl

Mr Helmut VOLLMER
Universität Osnabrück, Professor emeritus, FB 7: Sprach-u.Lit.wiss, Leiter der
Forschungsstelle, Bilingualismus und Mehrsprachigkeit, Neuer Graben 40, D-49069
OSNABRÜCK, GERMANY
Tel: 49 541 9694258 / Fax: 49 541 969 4256 / e-mail: hvollmer@uni-osnabrueck.de

INGO enjoying participatory status with the Council of Europe/ /OING ayant un statut
participatif avec le Conseil de l'Europe

ALTE (Association of Language Testers in Europe / Association des Centre d'Evaluation
en Langues en Europe)
Mr Nick SAVILLE, Director, Research and Validation, c/o University of Cambridge ESOL
Examinations, 1 Hills Road, UK - CAMBRIDGE CB1 2EU, UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: 44 1223 553777 / e-mail: Saville.N@cambridgeesol.org

EALTA (European Association for Language Testing and Assessment)
Mr Sauli TAKALA, former President of EALTA, Poikkikuja 6 A 17, FIN - 65100 VAASA,
FINLAND
Tel: 358 40 726545 / e-mail: sjtakala@hotmail.com / saulitak@gmail.com

ICC (International Certificate Conference)
Mr Anthony FITZPATRICK, ICC, Berner Heerweg 183, D - 22159 HAMBURG, GERMANY
Tel: 49 61 71 26 137 /49 17 28 16 41 62 /Fax: 4932223716149 / e-mail: Tony.Fitzpatrick@t-online.de

ELC (European Language Council)/CEL (Conseil européen des Langues)
Mr Wolfgang MACKIEWICZ, CEL/ELC President, Freie Universität Berlin, Zentraleinrichtung
Sprachenzentrum, Habelschwerdter Allee 45, D - 14195 BERLIN, GERMANY
Tel: 49 30 838 54501/504 / Fax: 49 30 838 53717 / e-mail: erasmspr@zedat.fu-berlin.de

Mme Brigitte FORSTER VOSICKI, Université de Lausanne, Centre de langues, CH-1015
LAUSANNE, SUISSE
Tel: 41 21 692 29 21 / e-mail: Brigitte.ForsterVosicki@unil.ch

European Parents Association
Mr Tony STOCKWELL, EPA, Strozzigasse 2/ZI.418, A - 1080 VIENNA, AUSTRIA
Tel: 423 3922107 / Fax: 423 3922108 / e-mail: info@effect.li

FIPLV (Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Langues Vivantes)
Mr Terry LAMB, School of Education, The Education Building, 388 Glossop Road, UK -
SHEFFIELD S10 2JA, UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: 44 (0)114 222 8118 / Fax: 44 (0)114 279 8631 / e-mail: t.lamb@sheffield.ac.uk

INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS / ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES

Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organisation / Organisation Arabe pour
l'Education, la Culture et les Sciences (ALESCO)
Mme Hayet WADI, Directrice, Direction de l'Education, Avenue Mohamed V, TUNIS -
TUNISIE
Tel: 216 71 905 334 / Fax: 216 71 909 065 / e-mail: h.wadi@alesco.org.tn

European Commission / Commission européenne
Ms Fiorella PEROTTO, Deputy head of Unit A.5 - Multilingualism, Directorate A Lifelong Learning: Horizontal Policy Issues and 2020 Strategy, Directorate-General Education and Culture, Office Nr : MADO 16/64, B-1049 BRUSSELS, BELGIUM
Tel: 32 2 2958045 / Fax: 32 2 2996321 / e-mail: fiorella.perotto@ec.europa.eu

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development / Organisation de Coopération et de Développement économique (OECD / OCDE)
Ms Miho TAGUMA, Policy Analyst, EDU/ETP, Marshall Building 4141, 2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS, FRANCE
Tel: (33-1) 45 24 92 65 / Fax: (33 1) 01 44 30 62 20 /e-mail: Miho.TAGUMA@oecd.org

COUNCIL OF EUROPE / CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE - www.coe.int

DIRECTORATE GENERAL IV - EDUCATION, CULTURE AND HERITAGE, YOUTH AND SPORT /
DIRECTION GÉNÉRALE IV - EDUCATION, CULTURE ET PATRIMOINE, JEUNESSE ET SPORT
Mme Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI, Director General / Directrice Générale

DIRECTORATE OF EDUCATION AND LANGUAGES / DIRECTION DE L'ÉDUCATION ET DES LANGUES

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND POLICY / SERVICE DES POLITIQUES LINGUISTIQUES ET DE LA FORMATION EN LANGUES
Language Policy Division - www.coe.int/lang / Division des Politiques linguistiques - www.coe.int/lang/fr

Mr Joseph SHEILS
Head of Department/ Language Policy Division / Chef de Service / Division des Politiques linguistiques
Tel: 33 (0)3 88 41 20 79 / e-mail: joseph.sheils@coe.int

Mme Johanna PANTHIER
Administratrice / Administrator

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

Mr Christopher REYNOLDS
Administrative assistant / Assistant Administratif
Tel: 33 (0)3 90 21 46 86 / e-mail: chrstopher.reynolds@coe.int

Mlle Corinne COLIN
Secretariat / Secrétariat
Tel: 33 (0) 3 88 41 35 33 / e-mail: corinne.colin@coe.int

European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) - www.ecml.at / Centre européen pour les Langues vivantes
Mr Waldemar MARTYNIUK
Executive Director / Directeur Exécutif
Tel: 43 316 32 35 54 / e-mail: waldemar.martyniuk@ecml.at

Ms Susanna SLIVENSKY
Deputy Director and Head of Programmes (ECML) / Directrice exécutive adjointe et
Directrice des programmes (CELV)
Tel: 43 316 323 554
e-mail: susanna.slivensky@ecml.at

Mr Michael ARMSTRONG
Head of Administrator / Administrateur
Tel: 43 316323554 / Fax: 43 316323554-4 / e-mail: michael.armstrong@ecml.at

Mr Alan DOBSON, Chair of the ECML Governing Board, 13 Harbord Road, UK - OXFORD OX2
8LH
Tel/Fax: 44 (1865) 310670 / e-mail: alandobson02@btopenworld.com

Interpreters / Interprètes

[Ms Starr PIROT](#)
e-mail: s.pirotd@aiic.net

[Ms Lucie DE BURLET](#)
e-mail: luciedeburlet@bluewin.ch

APPENDIX 3 : DOCUMENTS

Intergovernmental Policy forum on
THE RIGHT OF LEARNERS TO QUALITY AND EQUITY IN EDUCATION
The role of linguistic and intercultural competences
Geneva, 2-4 November 2010 - www.coe.int/lang

LIST of 4 series of DOCUMENTS prepared for the Forum

(downloadable from the website: → section Events)

Forum politique intergouvernemental sur
LE DROIT DES APPRENANTS A LA QUALITE ET L'EQUITE EN EDUCATION
Le rôle des compétences linguistiques et interculturelles
Genève, 2-4 novembre 2010 - www.coe.int/lang/fr

LISTE de 4 séries de DOCUMENTS élaborés pour le Forum

(téléchargeables depuis le site web : → section Evénements)

ENGLISH	Auteurs / Authors	FRANÇAIS
1. Concept Paper: THE LINGUISTIC AND EDUCATIONAL INTEGRATION OF CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS FROM MIGRANT BACKGROUNDS + 'Toolkit':	David Little	1. Document d'Orientation : INTÉGRATION LINGUISTIQUE ET ÉDUCATIVE DES ENFANTS ET ADOLESCENTS ISSUS DE L'IMMIGRATION et 'Boîte à outils' :
1. <i>Language diagnostics in multilingual settings with respect to continuous assessment procedures as accompaniment of individualized learning and teaching</i>	Drorit Lengyel	1. <i>Le diagnostic des compétences en langues dans des contextes multilingues : un processus continu favorisant l'enseignement et l'apprentissage individualisés</i>
2. <i>Languages of schooling: focusing on vulnerable learners</i>	Eike Thürmann, Helmut Vollmer & Irene Pieper	2. <i>Langue(s) de scolarisation et apprenants vulnérables</i>
3. <i>Migrant pupils and formal mastery of the language of schooling: variations and representations</i>	Marie-Madeleine Bertucci	3. <i>Elèves migrants et maîtrise formelle de la langue de scolarisation : variations et représentations</i>
4. <i>Capitalising on, activating and developing plurilingual and pluricultural repertoires for better school integration</i>	Véronique Castellotti & Danièle Moore	4. <i>Valoriser, mobiliser et développer les répertoires plurilingues et pluriculturels pour une meilleure intégration scolaire</i>
5. <i>Professional development for staff working in multilingual schools</i>	Jim Anderson, Christine Hélot, Joanna McPake & Vicky Obied	5. <i>Formation professionnelle du personnel travaillant dans les écoles multilingues</i>
6. <i>Cooperation, management and networking: effective ways to promote the linguistic and educational integration of children and adolescents from migrant backgrounds</i>	Christiane Bainski, Tanja Kaseric, Ute Michel, Joanna McPake & Amy Thompson	6. <i>Coopération, gestion et travail en réseau : comment promouvoir l'intégration linguistique et éducative des enfants et adolescents issus de l'immigration</i>

III. PLURILINGUAL AND INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION - LANGUAGES IN/FOR EDUCATION 2 studies:		III. EDUCATION PLURILINGUE ET INTERCULTURELLE - LANGUES DANS / POUR L'EDUCATION 2 études :
1. <i>Languages in Education / Languages for Education: a role for portfolio approaches?</i>	Mike Fleming & David Little	1. <i>Langues dans l'éducation/langues pour L'éducation : apports éventuels des « approches portfolios »</i>
2. <i>The Aims of Language Teaching and Learning</i>	Mike Fleming	2. <i>Les objectifs de l'enseignement et de l'apprentissage des langues</i>

IV. LANGUAGE AND SCHOOL SUBJECTS - LINGUISTIC DIMENSIONS OF KNOWLEDGE BUILDING IN SCHOOL CURRICULA Overarching document + 3 subject specific documents:	Jean-Claude Beacco, Daniel Coste, Piet-Hein van de Ven, Helmut Vollmer	IV. LANGUE ET MATIERES SCOLAIRES - DIMENSIONS LINGUISTIQUES DE LA CONSTRUCTION DES CONNAISSANCES DANS LES CURRICULUMS Document cadre + 3 études pour des disciplines spécifiques :
1. <i>Items for a description of linguistic competence in the language of schooling necessary for learning/teaching history (end of compulsory education) - An approach with reference points</i>	Jean-Claude Beacco	1. <i>Eléments pour une description des compétences linguistiques en langue de scolarisation nécessaires à l'apprentissage / enseignement de l'histoire (fin de la scolarité obligatoire) - Une démarche et des points de référence</i>
2. <i>Items for a description of linguistic competence in the language of schooling necessary for learning/teaching sciences (end of compulsory education) - An approach with reference points</i>	Helmut Vollmer	2. <i>Eléments pour une description des compétences linguistiques en langue de scolarisation nécessaires à l'apprentissage / enseignement / des sciences (fin de la scolarité obligatoire) - Une démarche et des points de référence</i>
3. <i>Items for a description of linguistic competence in the language of schooling necessary for learning/teaching literature (end of compulsory education) - An approach with reference points</i>	Irene Pieper	La version française ne sera disponible qu'après le Forum



Further reading: Platform of Resources and References for Plurilingual and Intercultural Education → www.coe.int/lang, in particular "Plurilingual and Intercultural Education as a right" → Box 'The learners and languages present at school'

Autres documents à lire : Plateforme de Ressources et Références pour une Education Plurilingue et Interculturelle → www.coe.int/lang/fr, en particulier « Education plurilingue et interculturelle comme droit » → Boîte 'L'apprenant et les langues présentes à l'école'