



Plurilingual and intercultural education in vocational education curricula

Seminar

Strasbourg, 10 - 11 May 2012

Report presented by Francis Goullier

Language Policy Unit
DG II – Education Department
Council of Europe

www.coe.int/lang

Contents

A. Context and aims of the seminar.....	3
1. The process of which the seminar is part.....	3
2. Seminar organisation and participants.....	3
3. A seminar devoted to vocational training	4
B. Languages of schooling as subjects and as languages for other subjects.....	5
1. Languages of schooling in the context of plurilingual and intercultural education	5
2. The actual roles assigned to languages of schooling in the countries/regions represented	7
C. Foreign languages in "short courses" of vocational training	8
1. Modern foreign language teaching in the education systems represented: reality and outlook....	9
2. The great diversity of ways in which the <i>Common European Framework of Reference for Languages</i> (CEFR) is used.....	10
3. The consequences of plurilingual and intercultural education for the objectives, content and methods of foreign language teaching on short courses of vocational training	10
4. The results of the discussions in working groups.....	12
D. The experience of mobility.....	13
E. Curriculum development promoting plurilingual and intercultural education during vocational training.....	14
1. Diversity between countries in terms of the role played by the different levels of decision-making on the curriculum.....	15
2. Very different methods of control	15
3. The possible role of curriculum scenarios.....	15
F. Some lessons learned from the seminar	16
Appendix 1: <i>Programme</i>	18
Appendix 2: List of participants	20

A. Context and aims of the seminar

1. The process of which the seminar is part

The seminar, held in Strasbourg on 10 and 11 May 2012, was the second in a series of meetings on the implementation of the *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education*¹ (hereafter referred to as the "Guide"). Distributed by the Council of Europe's Language Policy Unit on the occasion of the Intergovernmental Policy Forum held in Geneva in November 2010, the *Guide* was produced in response to a request made at the previous intergovernmental Forum, held in Strasbourg from 6 to 8 February 2007, on "The *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) and the development of language policies: challenges and responsibilities".

The need had been expressed for an explanation of the scope of the objective of plurilingual and intercultural education which underlies the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) and the tools produced by the Council of Europe, but which remains one of the aspects of the Council of Europe's language education policy aims of which implementation in Europe's education systems is most hesitant.

This aim of plurilingual and intercultural education had already been the subject of major developments in "*From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education: Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*"². The *Guide* on which discussions focused during the seminar, for its part, deals with its place in curricula, implementation possibilities and the influence of this aim on language teaching and assessment methods.

It was intended that the seminars held in 2011 and 2012 should not only take stock of the progress made towards plurilingual and intercultural education in the various education systems and examine with the representatives of the participating member states the most effective ways of taking this aim into account in language learning and teaching, but also identify the extent to which this *Guide* can help member states and all concerned to improve teaching quality and better to serve the values upheld by the Council of Europe.

Each seminar is attended by only a small number of member states, so as to facilitate the discussions and the pooling and exchange of relevant practices in the countries represented. Participants are chosen by the European network of persons and institutes with responsibility for curricula, which was set up following the Geneva Forum of 2010 and comprises the Language Policy Unit's contacts in member states.

Coordination of these successive seminars is done by a single team of representatives of the Council of Europe's Language Policy Unit (Johanna Panthier and Philia Thalgott) and persons who were involved in the drafting of the *Guide* (Jean-Claude Beacco, Marisa Cavalli, Mirjam Egli Cuenat and Francis Goullier). A link with the work of the European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML) in Graz is ensured by the presence in the coordinating team of Ms Cavalli, a consultant on some of the projects on the new 2012-2015 work programme.

An initial seminar took place in November 2010. This considered the ways in which plurilingual and intercultural education is implemented in secondary education in general, and, within this education sector, the convergences between modern languages and also between those languages and the languages of schooling. Seeking such convergences is, quite clearly, one of the easiest ways of promoting the comprehensive approach to language education at school, which is associated with a better quality of education. A report on the seminar is available on the Council of Europe's [Platform of resources and references for plurilingual and intercultural education](#)³.

2. Seminar organisation and participants

The second seminar, on "Plurilingual and Intercultural Education in vocational education and training curricula", was attended by 18 persons representing 15 countries and regions: Armenia, Austria, the Flemish-speaking Community of Belgium, the French-speaking Community of Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, the Land of Hamburg (Germany), Malta, Netherlands, Spain and Switzerland.

¹ [Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education](#),

Jean-Claude Beacco, Michael Byram, Marisa Cavalli, Daniel Coste, Mirjam Egli Cuenat, Francis Goullier and Johanna Panthier (Language Policy Unit), 2010 (<http://www.coe.int/lang/>)

² Beacco & Byram, 2003, revised in 2007

³ Seminar on [Curriculum convergences for plurilingual and intercultural education](#), Strasbourg, 29-30 November 2011 (<http://www.coe.int/lang/> "EVENTS" >>> 2011)

Participants represented a wide range of positions and responsibilities within education systems. Half of them were specialists in vocational education and training and the other half were responsible for language teaching in secondary education as a whole, either just for modern languages or for those languages and languages of schooling as a subject. The list of participants is appended to this report.

In order to take account of the lessons of the previous seminar, held in November 2011, several significant decisions had been taken about the organisation of the work:

- Each country was invited to write a brief description of its sociolinguistic situation and its specific organisation of vocational education and training. These descriptions were made available to all participants well in advance of the seminar. Thus the specific context of the arrangements referred to at the seminar could be known to other participants already and did not need explanation prior to each oral contribution;
- An alternation between contributions in plenary sittings and discussions in working groups was applied, but with more time being allowed for group discussions, so with a considerable reduction in the number of presentations in plenary;
- The number of subjects dealt with was reduced, so as to leave the necessary time for discussion.

These initiatives do seem to have met participants' expectations. When the two days of the seminar were assessed, two aspects in particular were considered highly positive in the 15 questionnaires completed: the time allocated for discussion during the seminar (awarded marks of 5 or 4 on a scale ranging from 4 to 5 by 13 of the respondents) and the genuine opportunities for exchanges between participants (12 respondents awarded 5 or 4).

More careful attention will nevertheless have to be given to the linguistic management of seminar activities (balance between the languages used, translations of contributions distributed in due course, etc).

As for the previous seminar, a questionnaire was sent out to the contacts in the 15 countries and regions while preparatory work was under way, and the replies enabled some characteristics of vocational education and training in the education systems concerned to be identified. An inventory of this kind is useful from two viewpoints.

It is important to realise that plurilingual and intercultural education, although it may lead to appreciable changes to language curricula, is based on actual experience and initiatives in certain education systems, and that this experience must be built on.

Also, the fundamental common points and significant differences between practices and representations must be noted, so as to encourage a pooling of ideas and approaches from the different education systems. In order to be helpful, the discussions must take into account potential differences in situations, approaches followed and reasoning, so as to encourage each person to view his or her own context in a new light.

3. A seminar devoted to vocational training

The decision to devote a seminar specifically to "short courses" of vocational education and training was explained at the very beginning of the event. The time spent on languages – whether foreign/modern or languages of schooling – seems to be limited everywhere in vocational education, particularly in certain branches, for the sake of a more "practical" education oriented more towards the world of work. Nevertheless, whichever course is being followed, the putting of words to actions, the working out of concepts linked to the chosen branch and the development of discourse specific to the various activities foster learners' cognitive development. It is important to give them an independent capacity to read instructions, discuss their work with other professionals or customers, develop arguments, make presentations, bid for tenders, etc.

It is also important to give them the means and resources they will need to be able to continue their training independently throughout their lives and to become responsible adults and informed citizens. One of the challenges of language learning as part of vocational education and training is to enable learners to acquire an adequate command of the discourse styles relevant to their activities, so that they do not simply perform tasks, but become full players in their own working lives and in our societies.

The decision to focus attention more particularly on "short courses" of vocational education and training does nevertheless throw up one difficulty. The forms that such education takes and the way in which it interlinks with general education vary considerably from one education system to another. The discussions did not therefore cover any particular kind of training, but the approaches adopted towards learners planning to move into the labour market without post-secondary education.

This decision was nevertheless amply justified by the substance of the discussions which took place during the seminar, underlining the specific nature of the way in which the language dimension of this training is perceived and the relative importance of certain lines which by no means play such a role in general training.

Furthermore, it was a decision appropriate to the content of the *Guide*, which does include among its "prototypical" curriculum cases scenarios relating to "short courses" of vocational training⁴.

Finally, it should not be forgotten that the particular attention given to this kind of training is common to the work of both the Council of Europe and the European Commission, although the concerns of the two European bodies may differ, in line with the specific vocation of each. A report by the "Languages for Jobs" Thematic Group⁵, presented during the seminar by Mr Manfred Thönicke, confirmed that firms' needs in terms of employees' language skills are increasing. The expected skills are increasingly viewed from a pragmatic angle and, depending on contexts and needs, less emphasis is placed on the requirement to use the language correctly. While English is necessary, it cannot be enough, and plurilingual competence is an obvious asset for both the individual and the business. Of course, in this context, the study referred to emphasises the importance of the authenticity of the learning tasks, which must as far as possible correspond to the framework within which these languages are used within the firm or the working environment, as well as the professional importance of mediation activities. The study also points up two problems: current assessments do not take sufficient account of the interaction between language activities, and businesses are still insufficiently aware of the benefits of mobility for training.

The seminar was therefore devoted to certain specific aspects of "short courses" of vocational education, namely those related to the language dimension of secondary education and training whereby pupils and apprentices can directly obtain a vocational qualification.

These aspects include the following subjects selected for particular discussion:

- the role of the language of schooling and its contribution to learners' success in all the component parts of the training followed;
- the specific needs of these pupils' foreign language(s) training;
- the particular experiences which play a part in learners' language and intercultural training, especially preparation for, and experience of, international mobility;
- the benefits of a more comprehensive view of the contribution of this teaching and these experiences, ensuring optimum consistency and efficiency.

For each of these aspects, presentations covered the main input of the *Guide*, which needs to be compared with the experience of the different countries and regions represented, and which was the subject of group discussions. They will be broached in succession below, although it seems clear that all have certain common features, broadly determined by a few similar factors, and that possible developments involve identical levers.

B. Languages of schooling as subjects and as languages for other subjects

From the outset, the seminar focused, not on foreign languages, but on the roles of languages of schooling. An accurate perception of the scope of plurilingual and intercultural education is in fact facilitated by giving thought to this subject. The specific contribution made by the *Guide* and by the Council of Europe-led discussions on languages of schooling in vocational training was described by Professor Jean-Claude Beacco, whose address is reproduced in full below.

1. Languages of schooling in the context of plurilingual and intercultural education

A language of schooling taught as a subject (to impart knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, literature, linguistic practice, etc) is the same language used to teach knowledge of scientific, technical and vocational subjects. This divided role has long prompted queries about complementarities between these subjects, an issue which is therefore being considered again in the context of plurilingual and intercultural education. Its underlying principle is the creation of convergences between all language teaching (language of schooling, foreign languages, etc), for it is that teaching which breaks down language as a single faculty.

⁴ *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education*, part 3.3.2, pages 55-58

⁵ European strategic framework for education and training, *Languages for Jobs – providing multilingual communication skills for the labour market*, July 2011

This complementarity can be put into effect in a fairly minimalist way. There are many contexts in which the language of schooling is taught purely to ensure a proper command of the "language" (spelling, syntax, norms, ordinary or specialised forms of communication, and so on), a concern which is not much present in the teaching of other subjects, where priority is readily given to the acquisition of knowledge and vocational skills, and to the effectiveness of communication (not whether it is in general terms "correct", conforming to the norms of the language and the dominant sociolinguistic standards). With a broader remit, the teaching of other subjects also bears this responsibility (to give attention to the correctness of language, especially in written exercises), but it is fairly easy in this context to develop more specific activities relating to scientific and technical or job-specific vocabulary and terminology.

Other forms of language-related objectives may appear in training courses with a vocational dimension: access (receiving or producing) to forms of discourse used in a given occupation, and typical thereof. These kinds of discourse clearly vary from one field to another and, within a single field, from one language to another. And they fall outside the ordinary language experience of most learners, who seldom come into contact with them. These kinds of specialised discourse within all kinds of occupational activities have frequently become important objectives during training courses, for they correspond to an objectivised perception of learners' needs: the analysis of specific language-use situations, particularly in occupational contexts (often referred to as language needs analysis), is an approach brought into use at a very early stage, in the mid-70s, for vocational courses. Subsequently, job benchmarks (or reference frameworks) have systematically been created for each branch of work. They are vital to the creation of appropriate language training courses, containing specifications of language knowledge and skills which combine with job-related skills (ability to deal with bank or post office customers' requests, to talk to public transport users for ticket collectors) or which are used for the forms of communication practised in a given occupational field (interaction during staff meetings, negotiations with suppliers, etc). Such matters should also be a responsibility of the language of schooling as a subject, but it is the case that reasoning in terms of communication needs is still too infrequent in a school subject which is composite and meets objectives of different types. At all events, the concept of the *discourse genre* offers a common entry point to language as a subject and to the other subjects in terms of determining the learning objectives, and therefore course programmes.

While a functional view of this kind is both vital and legitimate in these vocation-oriented educational contexts, it alone cannot claim to define the purposes of language teaching in vocational training courses. In particular, a number of these specific kinds of discourse which pupils are taught to use take very limited forms (because of the speciality concerned). They are standardised and often predictable, including their variations. Their production (especially in written form) can to an extent be based on the use of a limited range of stereotyped or recurrent forms of words. Such texts can therefore be acquired through imitation or through a form of word substitution, filling in the "gaps" in a model text, without the learners actually becoming aware of how they function.

This being so, this functional approach, while it is vital, remains inadequate, for it does not necessarily prepare learners:

- to deal with ordinary communication situations, which also occur during professional activities, between colleagues or with superiors or customers/users (dealing with different forms of expression of disagreement, requests relating to work stations, complaints, etc);
- to deal with relations with other groups of workers which use other practices (so with different communication habits), or those with the same practices but in another country or context. For these intercultural contacts between different occupational spheres, learners need to be taught how to think for themselves and identify these different linguistic practices and grasp how they work;
- to undertake independent further training, presupposing that they have constant access to information about innovations and trends in the work sphere, achieved through individual forms of technological monitoring, requiring access to texts and a critical reading thereof.

With a view to plurilingual and intercultural education, learners are considered to be entitled to try out forms of discourse other than those used in ordinary everyday communication: the "*school's role is to widen the range of discourse genres to which learners have access, which we will call their discursive repertoire (which may include discourse genres in different languages)*"⁶. Beyond the mere expansion of the repertoire essential to given occupational skills, however, particular texts – those where knowledge is produced and displayed (so "primary" texts in that others are derived from them) – are crucial to our argument: language can in this instance be a means of

⁶ *Language and school subjects. Linguistic dimensions of knowledge building in school curricula*, page 11, 2010, Jean-Claude Beacco, Daniel Coste, Piet-Hein van de Ven and Helmut Vollmer (<http://www.coe.int/lang/>- Events in 2010, Intergovernmental Policy Forum, Geneva)

creating knowledge, the creation and writing of knowledge then being two sides of one and the same process. It is such discourse that we have termed "academic". Although not immediately useful, it must be included in vocational training, as it is able to gain learners' cognitive involvement, and not just to call on language skills. Familiarity with texts of this kind and the appropriation of some of them (receiving or producing) is in fact intended to make clear the functioning and methods of the building of the knowledge created and displayed there, as represented by the texts.

For, in these discourse genres, knowledge and techniques are clear to see in their construction: they are not just displayed and described, but justified and backed by argument. They are thus one of the areas where linguistic reflectivity goes hand-in-hand with learners' cognitive involvement. Familiarity with them plays a decisive role in getting learners to perceive the linguistic and cognitive methods of such cross-cutting operations as describing, deducing, comparing, classifying, naming and defining, operations needed in every subject: "[...] *it is clear that a command of knowledge can by no means be reduced to a command of the language through which it is expressed [...]. The language used by learners in scientific, artistic and technical subjects (including, partially, courses in the language(s) of schooling) should be regarded by the teachers of those subjects as a set of outward signs allowing them to observe indirectly the learners' cognitive gains. But conversely, as it were, if learners master the 'right' linguistic means of communication in relation to the particular area of knowledge, that mastery may be able to have a positive influence on their gains and help them to develop the desired scientific attitudes and approaches*"⁷.

These reflective dimensions, where the acquisition of knowledge and techniques is inseparable from a degree of familiarisation with academic discourse genres, constitute an area of transversality between disciplines (through linguistic/cognitive operations). Their presence in curricula meets the need for linguistic reflectivity which characterises plurilingual and intercultural education⁸. It is not enough to take learners "outside" social communication discourse in the form of "I – here – now" and into job-related discourse to turn them into responsible and independent players in society. A humanistic conception of language education also implies giving them access to discourse on which knowledge is based, so that they grasp, as critical observers, its production and dissemination conditions and thereby have an overview of the discursive topology which makes up their future working space. This distancing should enable them to adopt appropriate and contextualised discursive conduct in the strictly occupational sphere and in ordinary exchanges, as a source of clarity in communication extending across them.

2. The actual roles assigned to languages of schooling in the countries/regions represented

Many fundamental aspects of the ideas set out above have very little in common with the realities and practices described in the replies to the questionnaire. They do seem to have one thing in common, however: work-related situations play a unifying part in defining the role and objectives of all the languages learned and used, whether they are languages of schooling or foreign languages. The taking into account of these work-related situations within every subject is a vital factor in co-operation between the teachers of different subjects.

Yet the consequences for the different education systems vary considerably, especially where the convergences sought or exploited between the different kinds of teaching are concerned. In certain situations, there seems to be no claim of an overall approach to all languages (Netherlands), or each language has its content and objectives defined separately (Armenia, Bulgaria). In a majority of cases, there is an at least partly common approach to all languages, whether they are languages of schooling or foreign languages (Flemish-speaking Community of Belgium, Finland, Georgia, Hamburg). And finally, a few countries report that all languages are considered together, with a common framework of reference (French-speaking Community of Belgium, France).

Generally speaking, however, there are few cases in the questionnaire replies in which there is clearly a wish to make consistent use for teaching purposes of the synergies between this language teaching. As if the focus on work-related situations was the only legitimate perspective, leading to neglect of all the other possibilities offered by the learning situations themselves.

Of course, a few examples of the opposite were mentioned, as in Switzerland's reply to the questionnaire ("use of the teaching methods adopted for language 2 to enable weak pupils to improve their writing in the language of

⁷ *Language and school subjects. Linguistic dimensions of knowledge building in school curricula*, page 8, 2010, Jean-Claude Beacco, Daniel Coste, Piet-Hein van de Ven and Helmut Vollmer
(http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Source2010_ForumGeneva/KnowledgeBuilding2010_en.pdf)

⁸ *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education*, part 2.4.1.5, page 35

schooling"), and in Malta's reply referring to its experience, with the learning of transfers of skills from one language to another being described as vital in a country where individual bilingualism is a reality.

We should not, however, jump to over-hasty conclusions from the lack of references to the use of such synergies. Indeed, co-operation between teachers of different languages (if only through a focus on the same work-related situations) seems to occur fairly frequently.

In several countries or regions, it was in fact emphasised that the teachers of the language of schooling and of foreign languages have to coordinate their objectives and choose common teaching approaches (Austria). In the Czech Republic's reply there is a reference to the award of a European "label" to one school which had managed to establish very strong co-operation between the teachers of the different languages. Lastly, forms of co-operation arise out of the importance in vocational training of specific kinds of teaching such as bilingual teaching, the CLIL/EMILE arrangements, project-based teaching and the simulation of job-related situations.

These findings may be summed up by saying that certain conditions really do exist for better taking into account the implications of a command of languages of schooling for a command of discourse genres. First and foremost among these conditions is the unifying role played by the vocational profile for teachers co-operating on clearly defined projects involving all disciplines. Furthermore, the authorities give broad encouragement to this approach. Other favourable factors include the obligation to undertake work placements, which in practice encourages analysis (trainees' reports, critical analysis of incidents) of which the language dimension can and should be part.

It may nevertheless be suspected that the precise scope of this requirement, as defined in the Guide, is not necessarily perceived, and not all the lessons are learned. This was broadly confirmed by the discussions within the working groups. In most of the countries, the curricula for short courses of vocational training include the learning of standard and job-related discourse and also leave room for general subjects, since these allow changes of course and develop learners' ability to play their role as citizens. Interaction between the two is not always taken into consideration. Incidentally, the place of literature in this training is a subject of debate which merits clarification, although it is generally agreed that the creative and artistic dimension of the language of schooling should be preserved.

It also came to the fore during the discussions that one of the main obstacles to better implementation of certain components of plurilingual and intercultural education stemmed from the lack of preparation during teacher training for tackling the language dimension of learning. In the face of this situation, teachers, both of the language of schooling and of the foreign language, should certainly be encouraged to work in co-operation. It remains an open question whether all teachers, of all subjects, need to promote awareness of this language dimension, the giving of thought to it and the learning of discourse connected with all job-related situations and with learners' individual needs.

An example showing that they do need to do so was given, however, in plenary by Ms Nynke Jansma and Ms An ter Haar, with reference to training at an establishment in the Netherlands. Teamwork was deliberately fostered, through, for instance, the physical arrangement of the premises, with classrooms being used for several subjects, and with the existence of departments. Lessons were organised around core tasks in terms of the vocational skills to be developed. In addition to the vocational components of these tasks, the language dimension was highlighted, particularly for Dutch. The teachers of vocational subjects took account of this language dimension, and during work placements learners might be asked to do certain things in Dutch.

Possible courses of action were also identified. Certain characteristics of a large number of learners following short courses of vocational education, except in certain educational cultures such as that of Switzerland, where such training may also be highly regarded, should encourage teachers to take action to foster a more reasoned command of the language of schooling and the valuing of this. In practice, a great many learners either need to be re-motivated and have their confidence restored after certain setbacks at school or have proven problems in using the language of schooling.

C. Foreign languages in "short courses" of vocational training

The questionnaire replies quite clearly show the specific nature of language teaching during short courses of vocational training, firstly through the importance in this context of work-related situations as well. In this huge majority of cases, the objectives and content of the training are determined by the specific needs of the jobs for

which students are being prepared, including the content and objectives of the language teaching. This is, for example, clearly expressed by the title given in Hamburg to the teaching of English, which is "Vocational English".

This taking into account of the situations in which languages are used in the work context closely corresponds to pupils' needs and is likely to motivate them. Of course there should be no confusion between work-related situations in which languages are used and a specialisation in languages. A specialised vocabulary is vital, but is not the main thing needed in job-related situations.

Furthermore, the question arises of the link between this kind of taking into account of work-related communication situations and the general objectives of language teaching in the context of plurilingual and intercultural education.

1. Modern foreign language teaching in the education systems represented: reality and outlook

The direct influence of work-related communication situations means that the place and role of language learning vary in more than a few cases, depending on the training being followed. In certain training courses, no foreign languages are taught (this is the case in four of the 15 countries represented). In others, learners are taught just one foreign language, with a second usually being optional (in five countries). In other countries or regions, study of two modern foreign languages is compulsory.

In those last-named, pupils are free to choose one of the two languages, as there really seems to be no choice about English. The specific role of English was often highlighted in the replies, several of which pointed to the relationship between English and work-related situations. Some practical vocational lessons are systematically taught in English.

Although the arrangements described were often said to be essential for occupational purposes, there must nevertheless be some choices which are made for educational reasons. The countries and regions where the study of several languages is compulsory, with the choice being left to pupils, are not mainly those whose sociolinguistic situation would so require. These choices for educational reasons may sometimes appear problematic in the light of the values represented by plurilingual and intercultural education. It may be noted, for instance, that in some cases the general training objectives are dropped for some pupils, although it is asserted at the same time that one of the objectives of the training is to prepare for lifelong learning. Other descriptions state that the objective of cultural diversity, while it is pursued in general education, is dropped for short courses of vocational training.

To characterise the way in which "short courses" of vocational education dovetail with the general objectives of the education system, it is possible to identify a continuum between three situations:

- a) language teaching without any particular relationship with work situations, apart from the attention given to the learning and use of a specialised vocabulary specific to the occupational branch;
- b) the existence of a significant common core with general education, to which are added components specific to the vocational training. In Bulgaria, for example, a specialised subject called "job-related language" is added. Another example is that of France, where different teaching approaches and assessment methods are grafted onto this common core, taking account of the needs of the pupils concerned and the individual rate of acquisition.

An illustration of this last-named scenario is provided by Switzerland: "During a major school reform relating to retail staff training, a requirement for 'islands of learning' (Lerninseln/ilôts d'apprentissage) was added to foreign languages teaching. These 'islands' are sequences during which projects are carried out to practise job-related language activities".

- c) an occupational approach to all training courses; all the language teaching relates to authentic work situations.

It is striking to note that the influence of the occupational dimension on the way in which the general training objectives are pursued may have positive effects in terms of development towards plurilingual and intercultural education. In a few cases, general thinking within the education system benefits all training, including short courses of vocational training. In Switzerland, for example, incentives to take diverse approaches to languages and for language teachers to co-operate with each other seem to apply as much to this kind of training as to general training, at least for learners benefiting from the teaching of a foreign language. In other cases, the specific needs of the vocational training course have led to progress which may also benefit general courses, provided that, naturally, representations of the two are not separated from each other. An illustration worth mentioning is the co-operation between the teachers of languages and of other vocational subjects fostered by the inclusion on the curriculum in France of pluridisciplinary vocational activities, or of arts and culture-based classes in short courses of vocational training, whereas such co-operation is not as formalised in general education.

Furthermore, it does seem from the replies to the questionnaire, that the focus on work-related situations may promote an awareness of the language needs associated with such situations, whether through the importance attached to discourse genres or through the discursive functions in use in the occupational sphere.

2. The great diversity of ways in which the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)* is used

As in general education, the CEFR's proficiency levels are used in almost all the countries to set the objectives for the teaching of languages and to define the criteria for assessing language skills, sometimes even for the language of schooling. The arrangements which the CEFR encourages to promote plurilingual and intercultural education, in contrast, are little used. It is particularly noted that the objectives of language training are very infrequently drawn up by reference to the individual language profile. Very seldom is a distinction made between target levels according to language activities. The options chosen for assessment methods, such as the widespread use of oral tests, do not seem to be based on a detailed analysis of the needs.

However, six particular points are noted with great interest:

- a) the frequency with which mediation is one of the objectives set for language teaching or is one of the educational practices described, as is the case for the Land of Hamburg, where the importance of this language activity for short courses of vocational training is highlighted;
- b) the importance of the objective of intercultural training, in conjunction with work-related situations (intercultural mediation, for example). This objective appears in the great majority of replies. The question of course remains of what exactly this reference to the intercultural dimension covers. In fact, the *Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters* is referred to only three times (Austria, Netherlands, Switzerland). And, in certain cases, it is pointed out that the intercultural dimension is an aim, but without this being related to plurilingualism;
- c) the affirmation in several replies of the importance of both the learning of cross-cutting strategies and an openness to other languages;
- d) the opportunity given for plurilingual communication in the classroom, as is the case in Finland, and the work done on a language's own inherent variability (French-speaking Community of Belgium, Finland, France);
- e).the frequency with which work is done on language-learning strategies (Flemish-speaking Community of Belgium, French-speaking Community of Belgium, Finland, France);
- f) the use made of the European Language Portfolio and the Europass, to which five countries referred (Austria, Czech Republic, Finland, Malta, Netherlands).

Finally, the place assigned to languages of origin varies widely from one country to another. In a minority of countries, pupils whose language of origin differs from their language of schooling, whether it is the language of a minority or a language of immigration, may receive teaching of this language, often in addition to the common curriculum for all pupils. Sometimes this teaching is open to all the pupils who so wish (Netherlands), and in one case (Finland) the pupils concerned may be excused study of other languages.

3. The consequences of plurilingual and intercultural education for the objectives, content and methods of foreign language teaching on short courses of vocational training

The convergences between the actual situations described in the replies to the questionnaire and the ideas found in the Guide, like the significant discrepancies between the two, may be measured through an examination of the consequences of the dynamic process of plurilingual and intercultural education for three aspects of the teaching of foreign languages: objectives, methods and content.

Objectives:

Considering the objectives of language teaching during vocational education does not mean making the objectives set for language education for pupils in general education "less ambitious". It is not enough just to take the objectives of general education as a reference point, and reduce them.

The best approach is to consider at one and the same time the needs of pupils in the different occupational sectors and the opportunities open to them during the education provided, although, in many cases, it is not easy to reconcile the two fully. This approach, however, must in particular lead to a distinction being made between objectives according to the different language activities. There is an even greater need for such differentiation than in general education. What is more, it is often found that the need for oral expression skills is greater than for

written skills. Rather than defining a target or required level, it is appropriate to define an individual language profile.

However, and this second aspect is indissociable from the first, this language profile, in order for it to be effective, cannot be confined to a single language learned, but must take more account of the plurality of languages and competencies which make up each learner's individual repertoire. This, of course, cannot be exactly the same for all, making it difficult to formalise it for a specific course of education. But the general aim must be clearly asserted. Although the objectives in terms of command of the language taught may be defined as a level of competency for each language activity, it is important for this to be explicitly included in the general aim of giving pupils complementary competencies in all the languages that they know and are learning, including languages of origin, regional or minority languages and the language or languages of schooling. Furthermore, one of the objectives of language teaching should be that all the learners are fully aware of the potential and richness of their individual repertoire.

The immediate effect of this is that, among the objectives of language teaching in vocational education must be, alongside the levels of proficiency to be achieved, a strategic capacity to draw on all the skills and expertise acquired. Strategic competency has to be interpreted as a pupil's capacity to make the best possible use, each according to his or her resources, of his or her knowledge and skills in order to deal with the various communication situations that may be experienced. This requires an ability to affect transfers between languages and to mediate between the languages concerned or between the kinds of text. It also requires the ability to make a controlled shift from one language to another, according to needs and individual resources, and even to master situations of multilingual dialogue, i.e. an ability to make him or herself understood by someone from another culture who speaks another language, and to understand interaction in another language. All this of course depends on teaching methods and explanations of the content of the teaching, but it may also be included among the explicit objectives.

The third kind of objectives which may be set for this education relate to intercultural skills, meaning the ability to interact responsibly and critically, but in a friendly way, with people who are different. Intercultural competency presupposes both knowledge dispensed by education and individual experience of others, either through situations created during language classes or through experience of contact, international co-operation and mobility. Knowledge and experience, however, give rise to competencies only if explanations are given and a thinking process takes place. The clear inclusion of intercultural education among the objectives pursued may effectively help pupils to move on from a series of experiences to a competency which can be generalised and transferred to all the situations they will meet in their individual careers.

Language teaching methods

Where it relates to planning of the use and learning of languages, the CEFR highlights the usefulness of communication tasks likely to make use of the relevant competencies. These tasks make the required work meaningful and draw on all the resources at the pupil's disposal. Quite clearly, this approach fully deserves its place in language teaching in the context of vocational education. This approach has a place even more obvious, if this is possible, than it has in general education, and it is far easier to implement than in language classes in general education. Situations are all the more credible to pupils for being clearly based on job-related needs. It is clear that project-based teaching and simulations of specific situations are frequently part of this training.

In the context, already referred to above in respect of languages of schooling, of the need to feel valued which may characterise a large number of the learners who take these courses, it is necessary to organise the teaching of languages in such a way as to enable them to experience regular success as they use the languages learned. They cannot be expected to feel motivated unless they experience this kind of success. This means not just valuing pupils' ability to achieve the objectives set, but far more important is a deliberate effort to place them in situations where they can succeed. The objectives set for the teaching of each language over an often limited number of hours sometimes cause teachers to focus on the progression needed. It is vital to remember as well that there should be times during these sequences when pupils are not expected to be learning new things, experiencing new techniques or strategies, but will come to realise that the teaching that they are receiving does effectively enable them to learn ways of successfully completing certain tasks. This experience of success always underlies the self-assessment tools offered by the Council of Europe. The Language Passport in the *European Language Portfolio* and the modern languages part of the *Europass* are instruments for taking stock as the training course goes on. They should not hide the importance of individual consideration of the progress made during the course. The Portfolio's Language Biography may be used for this, or appropriate use may be made of the competence descriptors or of any other method. The important thing is to make the valuing and a growing awareness of any progress, even limited, a

constant part of the language teaching process. In line with this concern, the progress being monitored must not relate solely to the level of language skills, but just as much to the gradual acquisition of strategies.

Finally, in this type of education in particular, a balance should be struck between the communication tasks expected of learners and time to consider what they have learned and the experience they have gained in performing these tasks in the classroom or during more independent work. Such consideration may also extend to the way in which pupils have managed to make use of the resources in their repertoire. It may also be extended to the internal variability of those languages known to the learners, to make it easier for them to become aware of the existence of different registers and the appropriateness of these to communication situations, and to make them more aware of the diversity of their own language resources.

This growing awareness is something else for which the teaching teams as a whole are responsible. Only if language teachers co-operate and strive for maximum convergence between all language learning can pupils derive the fullest benefit from the lessons received.

Content to be acquired.

We shall of course not consider here the content specific to the different languages taught and to any cultures which may be associated with them, but only certain aspects common to all language teaching and stemming directly from what has gone before.

Training pupils to cope with communication tasks associated with job-related situations is of course intended to give them highly contextualised expertise. This is necessary and cannot be challenged. These communication tasks, however, in a teaching situation, are also ways of teaching pupils to develop specific skills as decided by the teacher. Such communication tasks are not an end in themselves. It is important for every teacher to bear in mind that the communication situations in which he or she places pupils should make it possible to ensure that the pupils progress in the use of not only language skills, but also, in line with the ideas above, strategic competencies which are a full part of the content of this teaching.

For a very simple reason. Nobody can know which languages the learner will need during his or her career. Furthermore, the opportunities available through international mobility may require an ability to adapt to a linguistic and cultural environment other than the one for which the teaching prepared him or her. Finally, the shorter duration of the training makes it even more vital for pupils to be systematically prepared for lifelong learning.

The resulting language education content may be summed up in a few points:

- it must include in its own right consistent work on learning strategies, during independent work as well;
- it must give priority to competencies which cut across all languages, whether these are discursive or functional skills or techniques for grasping the meaning of written or oral language;
- is it possible to include in this content the learning of systematic exploitation of the synergies between the languages learned and those known by pupils (through contrast-based work, through valuing risk-taking in transfers between languages, etc);
- it is essential that the content taught must include reasoned and continuing learning of communication strategies transferable to all languages, which are all the more vital for the fact that language skills may be fragile. These include strategies for compensation and for planning how the learner is to carry out a task and monitoring how it is done, and so on.

The specific character of language teaching during short courses of vocational education lies in the effort to strike a balance between language skills and strategic competencies. This balance, which corresponds to the needs of these specific learners, is fully in line with the principles of plurilingual and intercultural education and may lead to advances which could also be of benefit to language education as a whole.

4. The results of the discussions in working groups

The two working groups were invited to discuss a strong affirmation which underlay the contributions made in plenary: the acquisition of the tools needed for independent learning and the development of plurilingual repertoires are necessary for these pupils who will be leaving the education system at a very early stage. Consequently, language curricula for vocational education must specify what sets their priorities and implementation methods apart from those for general education.

Among the main differences noted, the intercultural dimension occupies an important place, particularly in conjunction with the role of individual mobility in vocational training and prospects.

Discussions usually centred on a single theme expressed in terms of two questions: is the course concerned one in a modern language or one in a language to be used for job-related purposes, and should the language be taught to give pupils a work culture connected with the country or countries in which the language is spoken or to equip them to communicate only in their occupational sphere? The answer given suggested that there are three complementary lines of work: a language should be taught to pass on to learners skills in that language, cross-cutting tools for independent learning of other languages, and cultural knowledge. Nevertheless, it was reported that teachers receive no guidance about the cross-cutting nature and the importance of the learning.

Looking beyond these important discussions, however, several lines of thought and problems were mentioned:

- Broader recognition was needed of the importance of a command of foreign languages in vocational education. That training already has appropriate teaching materials available, but recognition of this kind could, for example, give rise to a higher number of specific certifications.
- The importance of genuinely drawing on what learners have learnt in the languages studied and in communication strategies to foster greater confidence and progress is insufficiently realised or understood by teachers, often under pressure because of the lack of time available to them for their teaching.
- A focus during language lessons on work-related situations is undeniably an asset, provided that the teacher does bear in mind the objectives which he or she is pursuing with the learners. It may be very useful in this context for the language teacher to have some knowledge of the occupational sphere.
- All situations of plurilingualism should be deliberately exploited, and mediation activity can play an important role.
- The development of independence should be a major objective of language teaching and, in some education systems, the use of the European Language Portfolio has a positive effect.
- Mobility for both pupils and teachers should be a major line of development.

D. The experience of mobility

If there was one thing that was very widely agreed, it was the benefit of mobility in learners' training experience. In a large number of the countries represented, a very broad range of arrangements existed. Very few did not report particular efforts to promote mobility. Some had introduced a form of special recognition of the skills acquired during the mobility period. And others mentioned the existence of courses to prepare pupils for mobility.

It nevertheless seems that the explicit aims of these measures to promote mobility may be fairly different. In no particular order, they include employability for those courses with a natural international dimension, personality development (particularly where attitudes and values are concerned), personal commitment and co-operation capacity, the ability to work in a multilingual and multicultural environment and the development of self-esteem.

A presentation was made during the seminar of the project carried out in the context of the 2008-2011 work programme of the European Centre for Modern Languages in Graz⁹. This was a specific project on the development of mobility to make it a full part of training¹⁰, based on the principle that future teachers should have this experience, including from the outset activities which they will be able to carry out in this context with the learners whom they are teaching. This project involved:

- various scenarios relating to how the future teachers can prepare for such a period of mobility, manage it and make good use of it on their return;
- the production of materials for the training and preparation of these future teachers;
- various Council of Europe tools were included to make this approach consistent (*European Language Portfolio*, *Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters*, etc).

The project encouraged trainee teachers to consider the scenarios which they would themselves be able to use for their future teaching activity.

The project, addressed to teachers/learners in primary, secondary and post-secondary education, will continue in 2012-2014, developing specific approaches for vocational training. To this end, it will take account of various other

⁹ Promoting inclusive, plurilingual and intercultural education

¹⁰ PluriMobil project, led by Mirjam Egli Cuenat (<http://plurimobil.ecml.at/>). This project was started during the previous work programme (2010-2011) and is being continued during the ECML's current programme (2012-2014)

tools available at European level, such as the **Europass**, or at national or local level (*Europro* attestation in France, *Bildungspass/Livret de formation* in Switzerland, etc).

It will also make use in its approach and in discussions of the experience collected by another project, also presented at the seminar, the Dylan research project¹¹. The University of Basle, in this context, conducted some interviews with trainees whose work placements had been with firms abroad in the Upper Rhine area. The study covered the place of worker mobility in the running of enterprises, the role of multilingualism in the various stakeholders' representations and the contribution of worker mobility to the development of intercultural competency. The findings, presented by Mrs Katharina Höchle Meier, are summed up below in a few sentences:

-The various stakeholders do not all share one and the same view of the objectives and benefits of work placements abroad.

- The main effects relate principally to trainees' self-esteem and their view of other cultures.

- The competencies acquired by the trainees may correspond to level 1 on the scale of the INCA Portfolio of Intercultural Competence¹², developed for vocational training. According to this three-level scale, the basic level 1 is defined as willingness to interact successfully with people of other cultures; ability to learn from others as the learner goes along, but without yet being able to build up a true general competency to deal with intercultural situations (e.g. ability to react positively to events, but without really being capable of planning them); tolerance of other values, customs and practices, even if perhaps finding them odd or surprising and possibly either approving or disapproving them.

One of the main lessons to be drawn from this study is surely that some effects of worker mobility involving another country are undeniable, but that they could be greater if the experience were better prepared for and supported and were the subject of more in-depth consideration by firms in terms of training and practice, particularly in its intercultural dimension.

This state of affairs is not inevitable, as clearly shown by an experiment conducted by the education authority (Académie) responsible for the area of Strasbourg (France). Nor was it by chance that it was presented by the person in charge of the teaching of a foreign language in this Region and the person responsible for the teaching of one of the vocational disciplines, economics and management. They showed how mobility can be one of the explicit objectives of the training given. In this case, it is vital to give it particular attention in advance, during teaching, so as to prepare learners effectively to appropriate the project and derive maximum benefit from it. This preparation runs through three phases: gaining the young person's support for the project, making contractual arrangements during project-based teaching and developing skills.

Seminar participants all commented that most of the time taken to present this Académie's mobility operations was taken up, not by the actual period of mobility, but by preparation for it: inclusion in the language teaching content and in vocational subjects; targeted use of the part of the curriculum devoted to the linking of general education and vocational disciplines; training modules on the subject of "knowledge of others", combining literary or historical knowledge, input from language teaching and the introduction of role-play exercises simulating meetings with others, etc. In this overall context, the need to run a common project centring on "the core of the occupation" is used for the benefit of projects including work done with a partner in the other country (comparative studies, joint production, etc). When the mobility phase is over, value is attached to it through attestations issued at Académie, regional or European (Europass) level, or even by the firms themselves.

E. Curriculum development promoting plurilingual and intercultural education during vocational training

As for secondary education in general, the curriculum concept adopted in the *Guide*, one drawing heavily on the work of the Institute for Curriculum Development (SLO) in the Netherlands, was again confirmed. It encompasses all learning experiences and is not confined to official programmes or texts defining the content of education, assessment methods and, sometimes, recommended methodologies. It makes a distinction between different levels of intervention (from the supra to the nano level)¹³.

¹¹ Dylan project (2006-2011) (<http://www.dylan-project.org>): Language dynamics and management of diversity

¹² INCA (Intercultural Competence Assessment), developed with the support of the Leonardo da Vinci programme and the CILT (National Centre for Languages), page 13 (<http://www.incaproject.org>)

¹³ *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education*, part 1.1.2, pages 13 ff

1. Diversity between countries in terms of the role played by the different levels of decision-making on the curriculum

The respective role of each of these levels varies widely from one represented country to another:

- a. In several countries or regions it seems that the meso level (school) or micro level (teacher) is decisive. Either the descriptions given emphasise that true progress towards plurilingual and intercultural education can be achieved only by individual teachers, or they point to the fact that training establishments have a very broad degree of freedom and may decide for themselves, as in the Czech Republic, how many languages, or that no foreign languages, will be taught as part of the training provided. Or, as in Croatia, the following of curricula is not mandatory.
- b. In another scenario (Finland) arrangements for implementing the aims set at national level are a matter solely for the bodies which organise such training, meaning that there is interaction between the macro and meso levels.
- c. In many other countries, national or regional initiatives are presented as broadly decisive, but without overlooking the challenge of bringing them to the meso or micro level. And this, knowing that in certain cases the macro level itself may vary, as is reported in the reply from Flemish-speaking Belgium, where whole areas of the education system may depend on bodies other than the Ministry itself and may clarify or add further details to the national tendencies.

As was pointed out in the introduction to this part, such diversity is not specific to vocational training. But the role of occupational sectors is very important, or even decisive, as shown by the frequency of work placements and on-the-job training situations, and their importance in the design and running of training. Switzerland's reply to the questionnaire is very clear: "Language teaching depends on the organisation of the world of work and training plans.". This dimension makes it an even more complex task to identify the role of the various players. When considering curriculum players, the importance of the international mobility experiments already mentioned shows up another parameter: relations with establishments or enterprises abroad and European programmes such as Leonardo da Vinci.

2. Very different methods of control

Countries and regions react differently to the realisation that the meso and micro levels are so important when determining curricula. In a very few cases, the macro level seems to accept this and make no attempt to intervene. In a far greater number of countries and regions an effort is made to give incentives or encouragement to teachers to change their practices, with support sites for teachers in the Netherlands, the dissemination of model lessons in Malta, the collection of examples of good practices in the Czech Republic and the encouragement of inter-teacher exchanges in Flemish-speaking Belgium.

Other countries bring direct or indirect "pressure" to bear on schools or their teachers. This may take very different forms: teachers or schools may be required to explain their objectives and methods; inspectorates may intervene; the introduction of a centralised examination may affect practice.

Finally, a few countries, such as France, steer changes in practice by introducing to the curriculum, teaching arrangements conducive to such changes, such as pluridisciplinary vocational projects. These require teachers of general and vocational subjects to work together, deciding on and providing teaching with a view to a group of learners working as a team to produce something or provide a service requiring knowledge and competencies in several disciplines.

3. The possible role of curriculum scenarios

The *Guide* offers those involved in education systems an innovative tool, the "curriculum scenario". A forward-looking approach is proposed to planning the amendments to be made to an existing curriculum or designing a new curriculum, entailing simulation of content and objectives for the various kinds of language teaching at the different stages of the training course, also taking a horizontal view in terms of their timing and complementarity.

The thematised curriculum scenario which featured during the seminar, of course, was used in the context of a consideration of moving vocational education on towards implementation of the principles of plurilingual and intercultural education.

The first challenge is that of drawing up an overall profile of language and intercultural skills for all the languages taught at the school – some of them specific to individual languages and some cutting across all of them – also taking into account the languages present in the learners' repertoires. The other is to try to arrange the curriculum in ways which conform to the needs and practical possibilities of a given context, thereby fostering longitudinal consistency. The questions raised relate to the choice of languages to be taught, on the basis of detailed knowledge

of the context, to the type of curricular arrangement for the different languages (at the same time, at different times, in succession or in alternation), to the creation of proficiency profiles which are consistent from one level to another and with the final overall profile, to content progress consistent with the competency profiles and, finally, to the distribution of learning experience.

In practice, since the ultimate aim of plurilingual and intercultural education is to realise everyone's right to a quality education, the curriculum – taken to mean the "arrangement of the learning process" – must also be devised in the light of the learning experience which the school guarantees to every pupil, so that he or she can build up his or her own experiential curriculum. Throughout their course, pupils should be able, thanks to the variety of ways of appropriating languages and the different approaches adopted, to acquire a learning culture, to gain experience on which to base lifelong learning and to make their way in favourable conditions.

The curriculum scenario makes possible not only the longitudinal dimension already referred to, but also the devising of horizontal consistency. It is indeed desirable to ensure that convergences are achieved between the teaching of different foreign languages, between the teaching of foreign languages and that of the language of schooling, and between the teaching of languages and that of other subjects. Ways of achieving these convergences may be determined according to the scope offered by each context (simple coordination or true synergy and co-operation between the teachers concerned).

With more specific reference to "short courses" of vocational training, the *Guide* outlines two scenarios¹⁴ illustrating a few of the numerous possible curricular alternatives on the basis of the principles of plurilingual and intercultural education.

In these two examples of scenarios, several component parts are dealt with specifically: languages and their objectives; convergences between the teaching of languages and that of other subjects; learning experiences; teaching approaches which enable pupils to have certain learning experiences.

The role of these outlines, which present differing degrees of implementation of plurilingual and intercultural education, is only to get those involved in each education system to do some independent thinking, in that it is vital to take into account the context's specific features, constraints and potential. Presentation of this tool during the seminar was in fact followed by discussion in pairs with a view to setting this dynamic process in motion: comparison of curricula and current practices with the proposals in the outlined scenarios and identification of those seeming closest to the reality of the context concerned; highlighting, for each of the four component parts listed above, what seemed feasible, possible difficulties, the necessary means and measures and anything that might be missing from these outlines.

F. Some lessons learned from the seminar

This seminar must of course be regarded as one stage in a broader process with a view to appropriation of the ideas set out in the *Guide* with a view to plurilingual and intercultural education.

From this point of view, it may be considered a success. In fact, when participants made their final assessment of the seminar, a very large majority felt that the subjects discussed over the two days were relevant (14 out of 15 awarded a mark of 4 or 5 on a scale ranging from 0 to 5). There is also indirect evidence from their active participation and the quality of the discussions in the different groups.

The specific nature of vocational training in its envisaged developments was broadly confirmed. Discourse genres are not appropriated in the same ways as in generalist training, but relate first and foremost to the vocational subjects. Such appropriation seems to be needed less as one of the preconditions for successful schooling than as an educational aim with a view to subsequent career success. It is the vocational subjects which are best placed to strive for convergences between the learning of languages and for co-operation between teachers. Many examples show that genuine progress has been made in this context. The search for a balance between the concepts of languages as instruments of communication, as a training tool, as an educational tool and as a means of acquiring cultural and intercultural skills arises in terms which are very different from those in general education. The reasons for this can be sought in pupils' own actual situation, in the way in which their needs are viewed, in the expectations of occupational sectors and in the brevity of the training.

¹⁴ *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education*, part 3.3.2., pp 55-58

Quite clearly, this agreement on some of the lines of thought presented and discussed during the seminar does not mean that major progress can be expected in the immediate future. Participants have sent out two important messages: these developments absolutely must be interpreted as part of a "step by step" process, rather than as an "all or nothing" effort. This, what is more, is in line with both the letter and the spirit of the *Guide*, although it probably needs to be reaffirmed. And particular attention must be paid to avoiding giving the impression that these aims mean adding new burdens to teachers' already heavy workload. It will only be possible to achieve these major objectives if the *Guide* is systematically accompanied by examples of practice, and if certain aspects are further developed with this in mind, for instance with a view to the acquisition of strategies and the development of competencies in certain linguistic activities, such as mediation. The *Guide* would benefit from the establishment of links with examples of good practice presented via the *Platform of resources and preferences for plurilingual and intercultural education*¹⁵.

Where the *Guide* itself is concerned, looking beyond the points raised above, the discussions during the seminar also showed that several improvements need to be made: improved legibility of the curriculum scenarios whose usefulness is clear only if additional explanations are given; specification and clarification of exactly what is covered by the cultural and intercultural dimension in vocational training; taking into account of the role of occupational branches when the different curriculum levels are designed.

On a very large number of points, these comments and suggestions have much in common with those made at the seminar on plurilingual and intercultural education for general education.

¹⁵ <http://www.coe.int/lang/>

Appendix 1: Programme

Thursday 10 May 2012

08.30 – 09.00	Registration
9.00 – 9.30	Opening The aims of the seminar in relation to the <i>Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education</i> and the other tools of the Language Policy Unit Johanna Panthier - Sjur Bergan Tour de table Summary of the responses to the questionnaire: Francis Goullier , <i>General Rapporteur</i>
<i>Chair:</i> Jean-Claude Beacco	BLOCK A: THE ROLE OF THE LANGUAGES OF SCHOOLING IN PUPILS' EDUCATION
9.30 – 10.00	The language(s) of schooling as a subject and as the language(s) of the other subjects - Jean-Claude Beacco
10.00 – 11.00	Group work : Ensuring pupils master the 'academic language', which is essential to educational, personal and professional success, is the responsibility of all teachers of all subjects
11.00 – 11.30	<i>Coffee break</i>
11.30 – 12.30	Group work : Ensuring pupils master the 'academic language', which is essential to educational, personal and professional success, is the responsibility of all teachers of all subjects
12.30 – 13.00	Feedback from the working groups
13.00 – 14.30	<i>Lunch</i>
<i>Chair :</i> Mirjam Egli	BLOCK B: OBJECTIVES OF AND APPROACHES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING
14.30 – 14.50	Information from the EU Thematic Group work on 'Languages for Jobs' - Manfred Thönicke (results of 2 EU working groups)
14.50 – 15.10	What are the objectives of foreign language teaching in vocational education and training? Francis Goullier
15.10 – 15.40	Taking into account the particularities of vocational education and training in the implementation of language curricula - Nynke Jansma and Ans ter Haar (Powerpoint)
15.40 – 16.10	<i>Coffee break</i>
16.10 – 18.00	Group work : Acquiring the capacity to learn independently and developing plurilingual repertoires are a priority for these pupils, who will leave the education system at an early age ; language curricula in vocational education and training should therefore make clear what is specific - in terms of objectives and approaches - compared to those for general education

Friday 11 May

9.00 - 9.30 Feedback from the working groups

Chair:
Francis Goullier **BLOCK C : THE SPECIFIC ROLE OF MOBILITY IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING**

9.30 - 10.30 Supporting mobility for sustainable intercultural learning ; PluriMobil project (ECML) - Mirjam Egli and Katarina Höchle ([Powerpoint](#))

Preparing and making the most of learners' mobility experiences in vocational education and training : language acquisition and professional culture - Isabelle Wolf and Ginette Kirchmeyer ([Powerpoint](#) and [text](#) with [example 1](#) and [example 2](#))

10.30 - 11.00 *Open discussion*

Coffee break

Chair:
Marisa Cavalli **BLOCK D: CURRICULUM SCENARIOS : VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING GEARED TO PLURILINGUAL AND INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION**

11.00 - 11.30 Scenarios as tools for plurilingual and intercultural education
Introduction to group work - Marisa Cavalli ([Powerpoint](#))
[Ebauches de scénarios](#) : [map 1](#), [map 2](#), [map 3](#), [map 4](#)

11.30 - 13.00 Discussions in pairs

13.00 - 14.30 *Lunch*

14.30 - 15.00 Plenary discussion following the pair work in the previous session

15.00 - 15.15 How to evaluate the acquisition of plurilingual and intercultural skills in vocational education and training : a few principles and challenges - Francis Goullier

Close

15.15 - 15.45 Highlights of the seminar - [Francis Goullier](#)
The next steps - Johanna Panthier

Appendix 2: List of participants

ARMENIA

Ms Melania ASTVASATSRYAN
Chair of Pedagogy and Foreign Languages Teaching Methodology
Head of the Chair, ASLU
Yerevan State Linguistic University after Brusov
42, Toumanyanyan St.
375002 YEREVAN
Tel: 37493 558156 mobile / 37140 272238 home / 37410 534916 extension (204) work
e-mail: armecml@brusov.am or eltyerevanhub@brusov.am

Ms Lusine FLJYAN

Head of the Department on the Development of
the Policy on Higher and Postgraduate Education
Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Armenia
Government House 3
Main Avenue
0010 YEREVAN
e-mail: fljyan@mail.ru

BELGIUM

French Community
Mme Daniele JANSSEN
Inspectrice de langues
Av. du Domaine 149, boîte 14
B - 1190 BRUXELLES
Tel: 322 346 41 01 / Portable : 322 474 45 01 22 / e-mail : daniele.janssen@cfwb.be

M. Philippe LEFEVRE

Inspecteur
Rue Katteput 38/9
B - 1080 BRUXELLES
Tel: 32 0475/73.75.70 / e-mail: philippe.lefevre@cfwb.be

Flemish Community

Ms Veerle BREEMEERSCH
APECK | - Agentschap voor Kwaliteitszorg in Onderwijs en Vorming
Koning Albert II laan 15 (2C05)
B - 1210 BRUSSEL
Tel: 32 02 553 90 29 / e-mail: veerle.breemeersch@ond.vlaanderen.be

BULGARIA

Mme Veselina GANEVA
Expert d'Etat
Direction des programmes et des contenus éducatifs
Département de l'enseignement secondaire général
Ministère de l'Education, de la Jeunesse et de la Science
2 A, Kniaz Dondukov Blvd.
BG - 1000 SOFIA
Tel: 359 2 9217 585 / e-mail: v.popova@mon.bg

CROATIA

Ms Nada JAKIR
Ministry of Science, Education and Sports
Directorate for National Minorities
Donje Svetice 38
10000 ZAGREB
Tel: 385 1 4594355 / Fax: 385 1 4594319 / e-mail: nada.jakir@mzos.hr

Ms Dubravka KOVAČEVIĆ

Teacher Training Agency
Donje Svetice 38
10000 ZAGREB
Tel: 385 1 2785 072 / Fax: 385 1 2785 001 / e-mail: dubravka.kovacevic@azoo.hr

CZECH REPUBLIC

Ms Kamila SLADKOVSKÁ
National Institute for Education
School Counselling Facilities and Facilities for
the Further Education of Pedagogical Employees
Weilova 1271/6
102 00 PRAHA 10
Tel: 420 274 022 615 / e-mail: kamila.sladkovska@nuv.cz

FINLAND

Ms Ulla AUNOLA, M.A
Counsellor of Education
National Board of Education
Vocational Education and training
Hakaniemenranta 6
FIN - 00530 HELSINKI
Tel: 358 40348 7697 / e-mail: Ulla.Aunola@oph.fi

FRANCE

M. Stéphane DELAPORTE
Chargé d'études langues vivantes étrangères
Ministère de l'éducation nationale
DGESCO A1-4 Bureau des programmes d'enseignement
107, rue de Grenelle
75357 PARIS SP 07
Tel: 01 55 55 10 82 / Fax: 01 55 55 12 44 / e-mail : stephane.delaporte@education.gouv.fr

Mme Ginette KIRCHMEYER

Académie de Strasbourg
Inspectrice de l'Education nationale, économie-gestion
Tél: 03.88.23.38.96 / 06.19.72.90.79 / Fax: 03.88.23.39.35
e-mail: ginette.kirchmeyer@ac-strasbourg.fr
Adresse postale:
Rectorat
6 rue de la Toussaint
67975 STRASBOURG Cedex 9

Mme Isabelle WOLF
Académie de Strasbourg
Inspectrice de l'Education nationale, Allemand-Lettres
Tel: 03.88.23.38.70 / Fax: 03.88.23.39.35 / e-mail: isabelle.wolf@ac-strasbourg.fr
Adresse postale:
Rectorat
6 rue de la Toussaint
67975 STRASBOURG Cedex 9F

GEORGIA
Ms Tamara JAKELI
Head of Humanitarian and Social Sciences Department
National Curriculum and Assessment Centre
Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia
52, D. Uznadze str.
0102 TBILISI
Tel: 995 32 47 50 17 / Mobile: 995 77 45 49 85 / Fax: 995 32 95 79 88 / e-mail:
tjakeli@mes.gov.ge / tjakeli@ganatileba.org

Ms Marina ZHVANIA
Head of Department for Educational Programs and Recognition of Education
National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement
1 M. Aleksidze str.
TBILISI 0193
Tel: 995 77 27 88 41 / e-mail : marina.zhvania@ege.ge / marina.zhvania@gmail.com

GERMANY
Mr Manfred THÖNICKE
Schulformübergreifende Themen, Sprachen in der Beruflichen Bildung (HI 24)
Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg
Hamburger Institut für Berufliche Bildung (HIBB)
Hamburger Straße 131
D - 22083 HAMBURG
Tel: 49 40 42863-3526 / Fax: 49 40 427967-202 / e-mail:
manfred.thoenicke@hibb.hamburg.de

MALTA
Mr Raymond J. CAMILLERI
Director
Directorate for Quality and Standards in Education
Curriculum Management and eLearning Department
Room 318, Great Siege Road
FLORIANA VLT 2000
Tel: 356 25982449 / (356) 25982478 / 80 / Fax: 356 25982149 /
e-mail: raymond.j.camilleri@gov.mt

NETHERLANDS
Ms Nynke JANSMA
SLO - Netherlands Institute for Curriculum Development (Nationaal expertisecentrum
leerplanontwikkeling)
Piet Heinstraat 12 - Postbus 2041
NL - 7500 CA ENSCHEDE
Tel: 31 (0)53 484 02 63 / Fax: 31 (0)53 430 76 92 / e-mail: n.jansma@slo.nl

Ms Ans (A.J.M.) TER HAAR
School 'De Meerwaard'
Rietberglaan 4-6
NL - 3770 AE BARNEVELD
e-mail: a.haar@demeerwaarde.nl

SWITZERLAND
Mme Katharina HÖCHLE
Pädagogische Hochschule des Kantons St. Gallen
Notkerstrasse 27
CH-9000 ST. GALLEN
e-mail: katharina.hoechle@phsg.ch

Mme Kathrin JONAS LAMBERT
Responsable de projet - Domaine Langues
IFFP Institut fédéral des hautes études en formation professionnelle
Avenue de Longemalle 1
Case postale 192
CH-1000 LAUSANNE 16 MALLEY
Tel: 41 21 621 82 00 / direct: 41 21 621 82 89 / Fax: 41 21 626 09 30 /
e-mail: Kathrin.jonaslambert@iffp-suisse.ch

COORDINATORS TEAM

M. Jean-Claude BEACCO
Université de la Sorbonne nouvelle-Paris III
46 rue Saint Jacques
75230 PARIS Cedex
Tel: 33 (0)1 40 46 29 25/29 28/29 29 / Fax: 33 (0)1 40 46 29 30 /
e-mail: JCB.MDG@wanadoo.fr

Mme Marisa CAVALLI
25, Avenue du Grand-Saint-Bernard
I - 11100 AOSTE / ITALIE
e-mail: mrcavalli@alice.it

M. Francis GOULLIER
Inspecteur Général de l'Éducation Nationale
Ministère de l'Éducation nationale
107 rue de Grenelle
75007 PARIS
e-mail: francis.goullier@education.gouv.fr

Mme Mirjam EGLI CUENAT
Institut Fachdidaktik Sprachen
Pädagogische Hochschule des Kantons St.Gallen
Notkerstrasse 27
CH-9000 ST.GALLEN / SUISSE
Tel: 41 78 724 67 67 / e-mail : mirjam_egli@bluewin.ch

COUNCIL OF EUROPE - www.coe.int

DG II - DEMOCRACY / *Directorate of Democratic Citizenship and Participation*
Education Department

Mr Sjur BERGAN
Head of Department / Chef de Service

Language Policy Unit - www.coe.int/lang

Johanna PANTHIER
Head of Section
Tel: 33 (0)3 88 41 23 84 / e-mail: johanna.panthier@coe.int

Philia THALGOTT
Head of Section
Tel: 33 (0)3 88 41 26 25 / e-mail: philia.thalgott@coe.int

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

Interpreters

Isabelle MARCHINI, Chef d'équipe
Corinne McGEORGE
Pascale MICHLIN