

**REPORT ON THE PILOTING OF
PROVIDERS OF COURSES FOR ADULT MIGRANTS - SELF-ASSESSMENT HANDBOOK
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA CENTRE FOR SLOVENE AS A SECOND/FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

**(prepared by Asst. Prof. Nataša Pirih Svetina, PhD
University of Ljubljana, Centre for Slovene as a Second/Foreign Language)**

A. ABOUT THE CENTRE FOR SLOVENE AS A SECOND/FOREIGN LANGUAGE

The Centre for Slovene as a Second/Foreign Language is part of the Department of Slovene Studies at the University of Ljubljana's Faculty of Arts. It was established in 1965, when the first Seminar on the Slovene Language, Literature and Culture (SSJLK), aimed at foreign students of Slavic languages and Slovene, was organised; the 50th anniversary of the Seminar will be marked in July 2014. Today the Seminar is only one of the activities of the Centre for Slovene as a Second/Foreign Language, an institution spreading and promoting the Slovene language, literature and culture to the rest of the world. The Centre combines the activities of eight different programmes (www.centerslo.net). In addition to the SSJLK, it includes the Slovene at Foreign Universities programme, which combines the operation of 57 language instructorships or centres for Slovene studies in various university centres in Europe, the Americas and Asia, where about 1,500 students learn the Slovene language every year. The Symposium "Obdobja" programme organizes an annual symposium on various topics related to Slovene studies; The Slovene Language Courses and the Slovene Language Courses for Young People are programmes implementing various forms of Slovene language instruction and are attended by about 800 people in Slovenia every year. The Centre began organising Slovene language courses in the 1980s, but its offer has been expanding and becoming increasingly specialised over the years. Special courses aimed at immigrants in Slovenia were launched in 2012. The Examination Centre of the Centre for Slovene as a Second/Foreign Language provides Slovene language examinations to those who need a certificate of knowledge of the Slovene language for official purposes;¹ two of the Centre's programmes are of a more infrastructural nature: the Education Programme, which offers various forms of training to different target groups of teachers in the field of learning, teaching and certifying Slovene language, and the Publishing Programme, which covers the publication of high-quality literature related to the Slovene language – including textbooks for teaching Slovene as a non-native language.

In the school year 2013/14 the Centre for Slovene as a Second/Foreign Language had 11 permanent employees, and it collaborates with more than 100 contractual professionals, mostly teachers. The Centre's organisation is managed by Mojca Nidorfer Šiškovič, PhD and the academic head of the Center is Prof. Marko Stabej, PhD, a full professor at the Department of Slovene Studies of the University of Ljubljana's Faculty of Arts.

¹ Slovenian language examinations are held on several different levels in accordance with the common reference levels laid down in the "Common European Framework of Reference for Languages" (CEFR or SEJO in Slovene, 2010) and in accordance with the applicable public educational programmes for adults adopted at the ministerial level.

A.1 COURSES FOR IMMIGRANTS AT THE CENTRE FOR SLOVENE AS A SECOND/FOREIGN LANGUAGE

The Republic of Slovenia adopted the *Decree on aliens integration* in 2008 and the *Decree on ways and scope of providing programs of support for integration of third country nationals* in 2010 (as amended in 2012, effective as of 1 January 2013), which for the first time gave immigrants in Slovenia greater possibilities of learning the Slovene language free of charge.

Slovenia is not traditionally an immigrant country and is often not the final destination of immigrants, but since the 1960s it has seen a continuous influx of residents from the southern parts of former Yugoslavia. The increased influx of immigrants was observed when Slovenia gained independence and immediately afterwards as wars broke out in the Balkans in the first half of the 1990s and later, especially after Slovenia's accession to the European Union in 2004. The as yet relatively unregulated integration policy may be linked to the fact that the country has not traditionally been a target for immigrants. As soon as it was established, the Slovenian state set clear requirements regarding the expected knowledge of Slovene, e.g. in the Citizenship Act (Ferbežar, 2004), in particular with regard to the obligation of immigrants applying for citizenship to prove their knowledge of Slovene, while not setting any obligations for itself, e.g. by giving immigrants the right to acquire knowledge of Slovene. Slovene language courses were always voluntary and for most end users – not free. It was the adoption of the above mentioned *Decrees* that established a system enabling Slovenia to co-finance, with the help of the European Union and money from the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals, the implementation of Slovene language courses, which became free for certain categories of immigrants who are nationals of third countries. In accordance with the *Decree*, the Ministry of the Interior has since been issuing periodic calls for applications for the implementation of a state-approved programme titled *Initial Integration of Immigrants*; educational institutions may apply and, if selected, provide free Slovene language courses to immigrants. The Centre for Slovene applied to one such call for applications in July 2012 and thus became the sole provider of free courses in the Slovene language and Slovenian history, culture and constitutional order in accordance with the *Initial Integration of Immigrants* programme in the Ljubljana area and its surroundings (Central Slovenian Region). The Centre for Slovene began holding these types of courses in December 2012 and continued to do so in 2013 and 2014, when it completed 16 blocks of courses and organised instruction in 45 course groups for a total of 635 participants. In 2013 the Centre recorded a total of 1,283 adult participants in its various Slovene language courses. The courses under the *Initial integration of immigrants* programme were held in Ljubljana, Domžale, Vrhnika and Grosuplje (2013 Centre Report). In accordance with the *Decree*, the courses, which may include 60, 120 or up to 180 hours of instruction, are provided free of charge to third-country nationals if the students attend at least 80% of the total number of hours. Those who complete this type of 180-hour course, having attended at least 80% of the classes, are also entitled to a free first sitting of a basic-level Slovene language examination, which is a motivator especially for those applying for Slovenian citizenship, given that a certificate of basic-level knowledge of Slovene is one of the conditions for obtaining Slovenian citizenship by naturalisation in accordance with the Citizenship Act.

A. INITIAL INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANTS PROGRAMME

Slovene language courses for immigrants are held under the state-approved educational programme titled *Initial integration of immigrants - a Single Programme for Learning the Slovene Language and Getting to Know Slovenian History, Culture and Constitutional Order* (Slovenian abbreviation "ZIP", 2011). The programme has two levels in terms of its objectives and themes – and is designed to bring students up to reference level A2 or B1 of language skills in accordance with the Common European Framework of

Reference for Languages (CEFR). The topics included in the educational programme are those that are normally part of language programmes for adults and are partially also included in existing language textbooks: Introduction to Education; Personal identity; Housing and Residence, Family and Home; Labour Market and the Workplace; Health and Social Security; Education; Public Life in Slovenia; Slovenian Culture, Society and Constitutional Order. Two associates of the Centre for Slovene, Ina Ferbežar and Nataša Piriš Svetina, are the co-authors of this programme.

B ON THE PROVIDERS OF COURSES FOR ADULT MIGRANTS - SELF-ASSESSMENT HANDBOOK AND ITS PILOTING AT THE CENTRE FOR SLOVENE

The Council of Europe's invitation to participate in the piloting of the *Handbook* was forwarded to Centre by the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport of Slovenia in the summer of 2013. As an institution that conducts Slovene language courses for migrants, but also develops teaching tools and other necessary infrastructure, including the training of teachers teaching Slovene to immigrants, we felt that the invitation was addressed to us and we accepted the piloting of the *Handbook* as a professional challenge and an opportunity for further development in the area of Slovene Language Courses for Adult Migrants. The piloting was designed and carried out in several stages despite time constraints:

- Initially, we asked the Council of Europe for a translation of the Handbook into Slovene since we assumed that individuals would find it easier to work with a Slovene language version of the Handbook.
- We made a selection of individual parts of the questionnaire in the *Handbook* that, based on our experience in working with immigrants, appeared to be most relevant to our work.
- We distributed the selected parts of the questionnaire to various target groups and individuals (course organisers, administrators, teachers, managerial staff, etc.).
- This was followed by the collection and partial analysis of the completed questionnaires, which previously had been sent to teachers (teacher questionnaires were sent to approx. 30 addressees; one-third were completed and returned).
- As agreed, the co-author of the *Handbook*, Mr Richard Rossner, was also invited to take part in the piloting. An invitation to a meeting with Mr Rossner was sent to approximately 40 different recipients, mostly teachers and a few organisational professionals.
- The basic idea was to address individual questions and parts of the questionnaires (with which the staff members were made familiar in advance) at the meeting with Mr Rossner.
- We also organised a visit by Mr Rossner to the Centre for Slovene.
- A workshop, attended by 10 teachers and 10 other members of the staff, was held on the first day of Mr Rossner's visit to the Centre for Slovene, on 16 October 2013; the workshop addressed those parts of the questionnaire that were completed by teachers.
- The morning of the second day (17 October 2013) was entirely dedicated to the meeting between Mr Rossner and the staff of the Centre for Slovene. Some of the remaining parts of the questionnaire were analysed and discussed.
- At the end of the visit, the staff were made familiar with Mr Rossner's report.
- This was followed by a brief report on the visit and the piloting of the *Handbook* by Nataša Piriš Svetina, which was sent to the Council of Europe in November 2013.
- In the end, further analysis was conducted, and the results from the questionnaires were selected and interpreted, which constitutes part of the report.

C RESULTS OF THE PILOTING – SURVEY CONDUCTED – PARTICIPANTS’ FEEDBACK

Given that the Centre for Slovene as a Second/Foreign Language was the only institution that until then had piloted the *Handbook*, there were no clear instructions or established procedure according to which to carry out the piloting. This means that the Centre also had to establish the method according to which piloting could be carried out at all in the given situation. We envisaged several stages (see above) of piloting. Two people (Head of the Education Programme, who was also the main contact for the CoE and the organiser of Mr Rossner’s visit, and the head of the group of teachers teaching courses to immigrants) carefully reviewed the entire *Handbook*. In doing so, they made a selection of questionnaires, which they then sent to various target groups:

Section of the questionnaire		Profile of people completing the questionnaire
1.	Adult migrants’ learning needs, and the desired outcomes of the courses provided	Organisers of the courses
2.	Planning teaching and learning	Head of teacher training and the head of teachers in the courses
3A	Educational resources and facilities – rooms for teaching and learning	Organisers of courses
3B	Educational resources and facilities – teaching materials and equipment	Head of teacher training and the head of teachers in the courses
4	Teaching/supporting learning	This section of the questionnaire was sent to 40 teachers who taught courses for migrants at the time of the piloting; this section of the questionnaire was also addressed by the workshop with Mr Rossner;
5.	Assessment of progress and achievement	Head of teacher training and the head of teachers in the courses
6.	Internal quality assurance	Head of teacher training and the head of teachers in the courses
7.	Other services to course participants	Head of teacher training and the head of teachers in the courses
8.	Staff qualifications, experience & training	Organisers of the courses
9.	Internal communications	Head of organisation at the Centre

The most important part of the piloting were definitely the two meetings with the co-author of the Handbook, Mr Rossner. The first meeting involved about 15 teachers who had previously been made familiar with the 4th section of the questionnaire (4 Teaching/supporting learning) and also responded to it. At the same time they had also been tasked, in addition to answering questions, with commenting on the questionnaire itself. The discussion at the meeting was therefore effectively of a hybrid kind. It was

partly a self-assessment activity as teachers assessed their own and other teachers' work in the courses for migrants by answering the questions from the questionnaire, exchanging opinions, practices and attitudes in the process; and at the same time they also responded to the questions regarding the questionnaire itself (individual wordings, the design of the questionnaire, etc.). Although teachers meet at regular weekly gatherings and monthly didactic and educational workshops, the questions from the *Handbook* raised numerous issues relevant to the discussion and directly related to classroom work. Different opinions were expressed regarding the identification of the needs of course participants and the meeting of those needs. The fact is that teachers who teach courses to immigrants at the Centre for Slovene also provide instruction to other types of students and are therefore faced with students with different needs in different courses. They were all also specifically trained for work with immigrants (in accordance with the *Initial Integration of Immigrants* educational programme (ZIP, 2011), which requires at least 24-hour initial teacher training for work under this programme), but a variety of opinions, positions and even skills related to individual issues could be observed at the meeting.

Although the discussion was lively and the participants were highly involved, the subsequent responses indicated that the participants were somewhat confused by the hybrid form of work (both a content-related conversation about and evaluation of their own work and responses to the content and form of the questionnaire) and that somehow they did not recognise the objectives of this type of piloting even though they had been informed about the dual purpose of the meeting. This conclusion seems important for planning similar *Handbook* piloting in the future – it is necessary to both formulate the procedure and envisage the volume of piloting (e.g. restrict the number of the questions to be discussed, restricting the number of participants in terms of focus groups, etc.).

The second day of the meeting was attended by a smaller number of participants, including professional staff from the Centre for Slovene more closely involved with the courses for immigrants, along with the organisational manager, academic head and head of teachers at the Centre. At this meeting most of the remaining parts of the questionnaire were discussed, and some general issues were raised, with regard to both the self-assessment of the Centre and the *Handbook*, which was the subject of the discussion; several concrete ideas for improving and supplementing the Handbook itself were made in the second day's relaxed atmosphere.

The following may be concluded from the answers provided to the entire questionnaire by different types of staff involved in the preparation, organisation and implementation of the courses for immigrants at the Centre for Slovene as a Second/Foreign Language.

Providers of Courses for Adult Migrants - Self-Assessment Handbook was recognized as a useful tool both for the self-assessment of institutions during the implementation of courses for immigrants and for the institutions themselves; it could also be a welcome tool in preparations for receiving immigrants, i.e. even before an institution begins to organise such courses – individual actors (education organisers, teachers) could thus better prepare themselves before receiving immigrants and organising the courses:

they could analyse their positive sides, determining which organisational and technical issues are well covered and which less so or not at all, and they could upgrade their resources adequately even before the very beginning of the course.

The Centre for Slovene is aware that the *Handbook* is intended for a wide range of institutions engaged in organising courses for immigrants worldwide. Even so, the authors would like to point out that this huge variety of institutions should be mentioned at least somewhere in the *Handbook* and specifically taken

into account in the questionnaires, while also somehow taking account of the individual characteristics of particular institutions as well as the veracious social and linguistic contexts in which these institutions operate. As for the Centre, it is an institution operating within a public University with its own autonomy and relatively rigid rules; we are also a specific institution, dealing with one language only from a scholarly, technical and practical point of view (the Centre is not a language school in the classical sense, nor is it a University language centre), i.e. with the Slovene language, which, within the area of the Centre's activity, is the official language of the country, while also being the dominant language in public communication for the majority of the population. At the same time, of course, it should be noted that Slovene is a language less widely used and less widely taught globally and that Slovenia has a somewhat specific immigration profile. Most of its immigrants still come from the former common state, Yugoslavia, and are also speakers of closely related Slavic languages, which ultimately also affects the very methodology of teaching Slovene to immigrants. The Centre was therefore unable to answer some of the questions in the questionnaire as the initial context of the questions could not at all be compared to or correlated with the situation in which the Centre for Slovene operates. Our alternative suggestion to the authors is to enable institutions to at least have the option of describing their specific situation and thus appropriately supplementing and clarifying the rather sparse numerical scores (from 0 to 3). We would like to point out that a score of 0 does not necessarily indicate a problem or a weak area; our evaluation has shown out that a score of 0 may mean that due to the specific nature of the Centre's operation a particular area does not exist at all, which, of course – again for reasons of context – is not and cannot be something negative at all. One of such questions was, for instance, the question about the possibility of offering courses in other (foreign) languages to immigrants. As mentioned above, the Centre is not a language school and does not offer foreign language courses (e.g. in English or German); therefore, from our point of view, this is not an area that could be problematic in any way – it simply does not exist. All participants also agreed that a score of 3 cannot possibly mean that no improvement is needed. We believe that improvement is possible always and everywhere, and tools such as the *Handbook* are helpful in achieving that goal.

The individual parts of the questionnaire are intended for specific recipients: some for teachers, others for organisers. We would like to note that in small organisations such as the Centre (11 permanent employees and some 30 contractual teachers on the Slovene language courses for immigrants, with the courses for immigrants being only one of its many activities) the roles are often intertwined. It seems that the *Handbook* should definitely take account of the situation of these small institutions, which, due to their small size, do not have ramified organisational and administrative systems or are themselves parts of larger systems such as universities. Our impression is that the authors of the *Handbooks* primarily had major institutions (and mainly major world languages), with their well-established organisation and management systems, on mind. In our case, certain issues have proved irrelevant, such as spatial organisation (the Centre does not own any property), access to databases (such databases as would meet the needs of immigrants and could be used in work with them are not available for Slovene), commercial language tests (no such tests exist for Slovene; on the other hand, the Centre is probably the only organisation developing language testing tools in Slovene as a second/foreign language for public and official purposes). The usability of individual parts of the questionnaire therefore depends on the type of institution and the context in which a self-assessment takes place. We find the proposed activities and procedures for the use of the *Handbook* presented in the Introduction apposite.

D POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS

During our meeting with Mr Rossner we suggested that, for example, questions as self-assessment cues rather be replaced with statements given that questions logically require answers such as "Yes", "No" or "Maybe/Sometimes/To some extent", while statements can effectively be rated with numerical scores (from 0 to 3) and scores can be commented upon, as appropriate. Given that some of the questions are repeated in full or in part in different sections of the questionnaire, we suggest that the repetitions either be taken out or that cross-references be provided where appropriate. We have noticed that some of the questions are quite complex and, therefore, at least in the Centre's case, it was not possible to answer them unequivocally.

E CONCLUSIONS

The Centre for Slovene has positively assessed the piloting *Providers Of Courses For Adult Migrants - Self-Assessment Handbook*. On the one hand, it has provided us with a different insight into our own work; on the other hand, it has been a new, previously unknown experience of collective creative work. The fact is that the Centre for Slovene is engaged in various professional activities, courses for immigrants being only one of them, and the piloting has allowed us to get to know each other better and to get something done together. The piloting of the *Handbook* has even given rise to the idea that some of the conclusions which we arrived at during the piloting process should be included in the action plan for the further development of the Centre for Slovene, not only when it comes to courses for immigrants, but in terms of the development of the Centre as a whole. The fact that in some of its activities (e.g. holding Slovene language examinations) the Centre for Slovene also co-operates with language schools and some other educational institutions in Slovenia, for whose employees it also prepares professional training, has led the Centre to conclude that it might be a good idea to present the *Handbook* to these institutions and help them assess their own work, which, in turn, could also lead to a more credible assessment of their work (as our subcontractors) on our part.

The Centre for Slovene regards *Providers Of Courses For Adult Migrants - Self-Assessment Handbook* as a perfectly adequate tool, and we are grateful for the opportunity we have been given by its piloting.

F REFERENCES

Decree on the Methods and Scope of Programmes Providing Assistance in the Integration of Aliens Who Are Not Citizens of the European Union (Regulation, 2013)

<http://www.pisrs.si/Pis.web/pregledPredpisa?id=URED5966> (last accessed: 8 May 2014)

Ferbežar, Ina and Pirih Svetina, Nataša (2004): Certificiranje slovenščine kot drugega/tujega jezika – zgodovina in perspektive (Certification of Slovene as a Second/Foreign Language - History and Perspective). *Jezik in slovstvo* 3–4. 17–33. <http://www.jezikinslovstvo.com/stevilka.php?SID=9> (last accessed 8May 2014)

Centre for Slovene as a Second/Foreign Language. 2012 Annual Report.

[http://www.centerslo.net/files/file/Zalo%C5%BEni%C5%A1tvo/LP%202012_za%20web\(1\).pdf](http://www.centerslo.net/files/file/Zalo%C5%BEni%C5%A1tvo/LP%202012_za%20web(1).pdf) (last accessed 8May 2014)

Začetna integracija priseljencev (Initial integration of Immigrants) (ZIP) (2011)

http://www.mss.gov.si/fileadmin/mss.gov.si/pageuploads/podrocje/odrasli/Programi/Program_odrasli_ZIP.pdf (last accessed 8May 2014)

G APPENDIX

Selection of answers – forwarded to Mr Rossner upon his arrival to Ljubljana.

2.	Planning teaching and learning	grade	Comments
A	CURRICULUM & SYLLABUS		
2.1.	Is there a <u>curriculum</u> document which states clearly the aims and educational philosophy and the overall objectives behind the provision of the language courses?	2	<p>Yes; we have 2 such documents http://programoteka.acs.si/PDF/slo_za_tujce.pdf http://www.mss.gov.si/fileadmin/mss.gov.si/pageuploads/podrocje/odrasli/Programi/Program_odrasli_ZIP.pdf</p> <p>Both of them are state-approved (accredited) educational programmes for adults. The first one is a kind of a general curriculum for learning, teaching and assessing Slovene as a non-native language. It's dating back in 2000; currently we're working on a new programme; it is expected that the new programme will be accredited in 2014.</p> <p>The second one is specially designed for the migrants; the problem is that is not covering the entire vertical according to CEFR (only from A0 to –B1)</p> <p>The co-authors of both programmes, Ina Ferbežar and Nataša Piriš Svetina, are members of the Centre's team.</p>
2.2.	Are the aims, philosophy and objectives in the curriculum consistent with the aim to encourage intercultural dialogue and to develop <u>plurilingual and pluricultural competences</u> ?	3	
2.3.	Is there a system of language proficiency levels that reflects or is cross-referenced to those in the <u>Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)</u> ?	2	<p>The new educational programme as well as tests are related to the CEFR. Also textbooks published at the Centre and used on the courses were related to the CEFR.</p> <p>Information on the textbooks: http://www.centerslo.net/l2.asp?L1_ID=7&L2_ID=31&LANG=eng</p>
2.4.	Are general <u>'can do' statements? descriptors</u> available that specify language abilities at each level, for example in the form of 'CAN DO' statements.	3	<p>There are self-assessment scales included in the textbooks. The standards in the curriculum are based on CAN DO statements.</p> <p>Some relevant references: Preživetvena raven za slovenščino (2004); Opis ravni jezikovnega znanja (2004) – both using CAN DO statements</p>

2.5.	Are these levels and descriptors known to staff and made available to course participants?	2	Documents are available; They were presented to the targets (teachers, staff) when they were published. The question to be raised here is, are the targets really familiar with them. The course participants are familiar with the self-assessment scales in the textbooks. http://www.mizs.gov.si portfolijo/listovnik/jezikovna mapa The general portfolio for adults was not very well accepted at our courses; teachers didn't see an added value of the document; it was difficult to force part-time teachers to do this extra work.
2.6.	Does the curriculum indicate the approach to teaching and learning that will be used?	3	Fully. Communicative approach is adopted.
2.7.	Are there syllabuses or course plans for each level which are linked to course participants' needs, and which summarise what is likely to be covered during the course?	3	Teachers make their own plans for each course. There are course plans in textbooks and teacher's manuals available.
2.8.	Do the syllabuses specify course content and intended <u>learning outcomes</u> clearly both for teachers and for course participants?	3	
2.9.	Are syllabuses flexible enough to enable teachers to <u>adapt</u> courses to learners' specific needs?	3	
B	TEACHERS' PLANS AND RECORDS		
2.10.	Are the teaching plans or <u>schemes of work</u> or other forms of planning suitable for the course aims & content?	3	2.7 We believe this is true, while teachers make their own teaching plan.
2.11.	Are there means for reviewing and updating the syllabuses and other documents related to them?	1	The exams (as the part of the curriculum) are primarily the subjects of evaluation (ALTE), but not the other elements of the curriculum. Check the programme Slovenščina za tujce http://programoteka.acs.si/PDF/slo_za_tujce.pdf This can for sure be improved;

2.12.	Are teachers able to adapt learning objectives in the syllabus to the needs of the adult migrants in the groups?	3	Education and teachers' training on the field of individualization and differentiation. Also parts of the <i>Začetna integracija priseljencev</i> curriculum.
2.13	Do teachers introduce and refer to the objectives and specific learning aims of the courses in a way that enables course participants to fully understand them?	3	
2.14	Do teachers keep a clear records of work covered in class?	3	Yes. Collecting written production of the participants; ZIP also includes a kind of a portfolio.
3.	Educational resources and facilities		
B	TEACHING MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT		
3.10.	Is there enough equipment for the number of teachers and course participants?	3	
3.11.	Is the teaching-learning environment and equipment regularly maintained?	3	
3.12.	If necessary, is training provided in how to exploit the resources available, e.g. SMART boards, computers & the internet?	3	Teacher training provided.
3.13.	Do all teachers regularly use the available resources and teaching materials in their teaching?	2	Depends on the individuals.
3.14.	Do course participants receive adequate orientation to the learning materials and resources available?	3	
3.15.	Is the use of facilities and resources by teachers monitored?	3	Yes; there is a question included the questionnaire for the participants: Do the teachers use various methods, facilities and resources?

3.16.	If course books are used, are they suitable for the course participants' needs and level, and culturally appropriate?	2	Materials are adapted according to the needs of individual groups and individuals in these groups. The textbooks and other teaching resources for Slovene as L2 are relatively »general«. Our teachers are usually developers of the materials, co-authors of the textbooks etc. The Centre itself is the main publisher of the textbooks for Slovene as L2 and FL. The members of the team (staff, teachers) are the co-authors of these textbooks. They're used by the others as well. The textbooks themselves are believed to be based on the participants' needs.
3.17.	If in-house materials are (also) used, is their content and quality suitable for the course participants' needs and level?	3	Check 3.16 above.
3.18.	If books and other resources are made available for learners, are some of them in languages the learners know, i.e. not only in the target language?	2	Instructions in various languages in textbooks for beginners; There is a special version of a textbook (level A1) available for Albanian speaking population.
3.19.	Are resources organised and catalogued so teachers and course participants can access them easily?	0	We don't know how to answer this question. We don't have a data base or virtual library on our own. We do have only textbooks; other resources are due to the financial and organizational problems not available.
3.20.	Are resources up-to-date and regularly checked?	2	If we talk about textbooks – yes;
5.	Assessment of progress and achievement		
A	DURING THE COURSE		
5.1.	Are there clear systems for offering course participants advice on their progress?	1	Depends on the individual teacher; there are some general guidelines on giving feed-back to the participants, on testing the progress etc.
5.2.	Is course participants' progress monitored and assessed on a regular basis?	1	Home work?
5.3.	Are course participants involved in monitoring their own progress?	1	Depends on the individual teacher; some good practice; not centrally regulated

5.4.	Do course participants use a <u>language portfolio</u> , such as that prepared by the Council of Europe specifically for Adult Migrants ² , to regularly monitor their own progress through self-assessment? Are they given guidance and encouragement in the use of this?	0	We would like to have a presentation or maybe a workshop on this issue.
5.5.	Is course participants' progress monitored in class only?	3	Yes, there are no external evaluation or monitoring. The majority of courses for migrants are financed by the Ministry of the Interior which can not be responsible for the content of courses.
5.6.	Are there regular progress tests or assessable tasks?	0	Internal materials only.
5.7.	Is the preparation of these supervised by the institution?	0	
5.8.	Do the progress tests or tasks include an oral part?	0	Only written part; External examinations (proficiency tests) consists of 4 parts, one is oral.
5.9.	Are course participants given adequate information on their progress during the course?	2	Depends on the teacher. Teachers are oriented to give feedback.
5.10.	If course participants are preparing for a required examination, are they given appropriate practice and guidance in dealing with the test-types used?	3	
B	AT THE END OF COURSE		
5.11.	Is course participants' language level assessed at the end of the course, or/and at the end of each term or section of their course?	3	

5.12.	If so, is this done with a formal test or exam? Are other assessment means used as well (e.g. continuous assessment, task-based assessment etc)?	3	For the majority of courses obligatory.
5.13.	Are the tests in line with learning objectives in the curriculum and syllabus? For example, if learning objectives are specified by 'can do' statements, are the corresponding abilities of course participants assessed?	3	
5.14.	Is a certificate issued at the end of each course?	3	Certificate of attendance, ECTS credits ...
5.15.	Does the certificate state the course participant's level and course content?	3	Yes – level; beginner, intermediate, advanced not – content.
5.16.	Do the levels indicated relate to those described in the CEFR? Are interim CEFR levels e.g. A1+, A2+, etc, also used for describing course participants' language levels at the end of the course?	1	Textbooks are classified according to the levels described in CEFR. At the end of the course – only »pure« levels and not interim levels. We're planning to include the indication of the level related to those in CEFR in our course certificates. The levels will be indicated on the certificates of exams (according to the new curriculum).
5.17.	Are course participants' competences in other languages also indicated in the course certificate or a supplementary report?	0	Our Centre is focused on the field of Slovene as L2 and FL; we're not dealing with other languages at all (we're not a classical language school nor a university language centre).
5.18.	Is there reference to the relevant national qualifications framework, where one exists?	3	Our programme (curriculum) is nationally recognized (accredited).
5.19.	Is a report issued on course participants' progress and achievement?	2	Report on a course participants' progress and achievement is included in a teacher's report, but not in the form of »diploma supplement«.

5.20.	Does the report indicate the links between the course participants' proficiency in the target language and likely communicative needs, e.g. related to seeking employment, using health services, and interacting with the host community?	0	5.19 General description of the level achieved is the supplement to the Certificate of Slovene on basic, intermediate or advanced level: http://www.centerslo.net/l2.asp?L1_ID=3&L2_ID=97&LANG=eng
6.	Internal quality assurance		
A	LESSON OBSERVATION		
6.1.	Is there a system of regular class observation, in which, for example, co-ordinators or academic managers observe teachers in turn, especially less experienced teachers, and discuss the lesson with them afterwards?	3	Observation scheme (available in Slovene only)
6.2.	Does it include a mix of these different types of lesson observations for different purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality control (e.g. buzz observations)? • individual professional development (carried out by academic managers, mentors or peers)? 	1	Individually; feed-back to the observed teacher only on particular issues;
6.3.	Are there clear criteria and procedures for lesson observations?	2	We think so, but it is difficult to say.
6.4.	Is oral and written feedback given after observation, and is a follow-up system in place?	2	Only oral feed-back Centre is too small; there is not enough permanent staff to do the observation; on the other hand we all know each other and we trust to each other.
6.5.	Are areas of inexperience or weakness in teaching identified and acted upon?	2	Yes; more experienced teachers as well as the head teacher are giving feed-back and act upon in such situations.
6.6.	Is there a link between issues identified in lesson observation and professional development for teachers?	0	It would be good to include this issues in our programme of professional trainings.

6.7.	Are there opportunities and procedures for peer observation, i.e. teachers observing each other, less experienced teachers observing more experienced teachers?	3	There is always a possibility of peer observation as well as teaching in pairs (tandem –teaching)
B	FEEDBACK FROM COURSE PARTICIPANTS		
6.8.	Do teachers consult with course participants about the aims and content of their course shortly after the beginning, and regularly throughout the course?	3	
6.9.	Is feedback collected by asking specific questions, for example about what participants found useful and less useful in the course and the support for learning?	3	Questionnaire after each course.
6.10.	Is feedback collected from course participants at the end of their course? Are appropriate techniques for gathering feedback used with those with low levels of literacy?	3	6.9 We don't have a lot of experience with participants with low levels of literacy. The problem is that such participants usually don't even get the information on courses. On the other hand we (our teachers) are not educated and trained to teach illiterate or poor literate people. Two members of the staff (Ina ferbežar and Nataša Pirih Svetina) are currently included in the group which is preparing first national curriculum for adult migrant's literacy.
6.11.	If questionnaires are used to collect information on course participant satisfaction, are these made available in relevant languages where necessary?	1	Only Slovene and English versions of the questionnaires are available Question: what languages to be included? What languages we can deal with?.
6.12.	When appropriate, are course participants given a response to their feedback?	0	No; only in the case of a complaint there is a written response to it.
6.13.	Are staff informed which aspects of the courses and services most course participants are satisfied and dissatisfied with?	3	Teachers are well informed on participants feed-back. They're assessed by the participants and they get the information on how they were assessed in relation to the others. Teachers usually receive very high grades: over 4 (5 is the highest grade available).

6.14.	Are changes implemented in response to feedback?	1	Since grades are usually high we might talk only about changes in the long run.
7.	Other services to course participants		
7.1.	Are there clear systems for offering course participants advice on, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • their course • public exams • administrative procedures • independent study • work placement 	2	We think that we're not competent for all mentioned issues. We give clear advice on courses, exams ...
7.2.	Are there systems for dealing with course participants' other queries, e.g. about health, housing, seeking employment etc?	1	It's difficult to talk about systems. Some of the information are covered for example in the ZIP curriculum. There is also a special web page designed by the government on these issues: http://www.infotuji.si/index.php?setLang=EN&t=&id=
7.3.	Are measures taken to incentivise course participants to attend regularly, and to minimise the likelihood of them dropping out of the course?	2	80 % of attendance is a minimum if a participant want to receive the certificate of attendance or obtain ECTS credits; For the ZIP courses 80 % of attendance is obligatory if the course participant want to take the first exam of Slovene on Basic level free of charge based on the <u>Decree on aliens integration</u> . Candidate must provide a <u>certificate attesting compliance for their participation in the programmes</u> when they apply for the exam.
7.4.	Are there written guidelines and procedures covering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course participants' absence and lateness? • Asking for advice and support? • Making complaints • Making up for cancelled classes? • Cover arrangements for absent teachers? Are these available in relevant languages?	3	Internal regulations or guidelines – »študijski red« http://www.centerslo.net/l2.asp?L1_ID=1&L2_ID=84&LANG=slo Available in Slovene in English Translation of these guidelines in other languages?

7.5.	Are course participants and staff familiar with these?	3	
7.6.	Are systems in place to record course participants' attendance and follow up absence?	3	
7.7.	Is one or more member of staff available at specified and advertised times to assist with the welfare of course participants?	3	Opening hours every day at the Centre; student-assistant help 1 hour per week at the course.
7.8.	Are these members of staff able to cope with their task?	2	Yes; but the competences of the staff are limited; only information on courses, language, exams, not housing, documents ...
7.9.	Is interpretation available if required?	1	On general courses with more participants the interpreter is available. Staff members are willing to help or interpret in language they're competent in; but there are no systemic regulations. ZIP curriculum envisages culture mediator.
7.10.	Are arrangements made to allow for course participants religious observances?		