



COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Language Policy Division
Division des Politiques linguistiques

The Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants: Towards the Evaluation of Policy and Practice

Intergovernmental Conference

Strasbourg

24–25 June 2010

REPORT

by

David Little

Conference Rapporteur

Language Policy Division
DG IV - Council of Europe
www.coe.int/lang

Contents

Executive summary	5
Official opening	7
Joseph Sheils, Head of the Language Policy Division, DG IV, Council of Europe	7
Michel Villan, Chair, European Committee on Migration (CDMG).....	9
John Greenway, Chair, Committee on Migration, Refugees and Population, Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe [PACE]	10
Teresa Condeço, European Commission	11
Georges Lemaitre, International Migration Division, OECD	12
Introduction to the conference	13
Language requirements for adult migrants in Council of Europe member states: report on a follow-up survey	14
An overview of the data – Claire Extramiana	14
Some observations on the survey results – Piet Van Avermaet	18
Presentation of national/regional projects	23
Topics for discussion: Day 1	23
Plenary feedback from the discussion groups: round table with rapporteurs	25
<i>Developing curricula and training programmes</i>	25
<i>Applying the principles of the CEFR</i>	25
<i>Dealing with different needs</i>	25
<i>Teacher training and development</i>	26
<i>Quality assurance</i>	27
Topics for discussion: Day 2	27
Plenary feedback from the discussion groups: round table with rapporteurs	28
<i>Evaluating effectiveness and impact</i>	28
<i>Incentivising migrants to take advantage of language training</i>	29
<i>After courses, what then?</i>	30
<i>Human rights</i>	30
<i>New learning technologies</i>	31

Round table	31
European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) – Barbara John	31
Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC) – Laurent Dalmasso	32
A Canadian perspective – Patrick McEvenue, Citizenship and Immigration Canada	34
Closing session.....	35
Paulina Polownia, Adviser to the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights	35
Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Director General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport, DG IV, Council of Europe	37
Summary of conclusions.....	39
Close of the conference.....	42

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 : <i>Conference programme</i>	43
Appendix 2 : <i>Pre-conference questionnaire</i>	45
Appendix 3: <i>Survey questionnaire sent to member states in November 2009</i>	46
Appendix 4: <i>Evaluation of conference and feedback from participants</i>	50
Appendix 5: <i>List of participants</i>	52

Executive summary

In an increasing number of Council of Europe member states migrants are required to learn the language of the host community, perhaps as part of an “integration contract”; in other member states language learning is voluntary. Sometimes language courses are part of a wider programme of integration and/or vocational training; sometimes the two elements are separate. In an increasing number of countries migrants must also pass a language test in order to qualify for residence and/or citizenship. Requirements relating to language training and tests are usually based on the proficiency levels of the Council of Europe’s *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR). It is the purpose of the Council of Europe’s project on the Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants to facilitate discussion of policy issues in this domain, to share best practice at European level, and where language tests are obligatory, to promote transparency and equity according to internationally accepted codes of practice.

On 26 and 27 June 2008 the Language Policy Division (Directorate General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport – DG IV) and the Migration Division (Directorate General of Social Cohesion – DG III) organised an intergovernmental seminar on the *Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants*. The seminar was the first event of its kind. It presented the results of a survey of policy and practice in Council of Europe member states carried out by the Language Policy Division in 2007; explored Council of Europe principles in relation to language policies for the integration of adult migrants; considered the need for quality assurance in the design and implementation of language programmes; addressed key issues in language testing and assessment; and shared examples of policy development and practice.¹ The work of the seminar was supported by a concept paper, *The role of languages in policies for the integration of adult migrants*, five thematic studies, and five case studies.² Participants in the seminar agreed on the need for further events devoted to this topic.

The 2010 conference, *The Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants: Towards the Evaluation of Policy and Practice*, was held in Strasbourg on 24 and 25 June under the auspices of the Steering Committee for Education (CDED) and the European Committee on Migration (CDMG). Like the 2008 seminar, it was jointly organised by the Language Policy Division and the Migration Division. In 2009 the Language Policy Division carried out a second survey of policy and practice relative to the linguistic integration of adult migrants in Council of Europe member states. The results of the survey were presented at the conference and comparisons drawn with the 2007 results.³ Whereas the 2008 seminar presented tools and studies developed by the project on the Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants, the 2010 conference set out to explore issues of evaluation, taking account of family reunification, permanent residence, nationality/citizenship, and access to the labour market. Two documents were prepared to inform discussion: *Adult migrant integration policies: principles and implementation* (Jean-Claude Beacco) and *The linguistic integration of adult migrants: evaluating policy and practice* (David Little). The latter document is based on the texts prepared for the 2008 seminar and includes key questions for discussion. In advance of the conference, intending partici-

¹ The report on this seminar, which includes a summary of the results of the 2007 survey, is available at www.coe.int/lang → MINORITIES AND MIGRANTS → ADULT MIGRANTS.

² These documents are available at www.coe.int/lang → MINORITIES AND MIGRANTS → ADULT MIGRANTS.

³ A separate report will be published in 2011

participants were asked to name the principal challenges in their context. Their responses, which helped to determine the topics for group discussion, fell into five broad categories: curricula and training programmes; applying the principles of the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment* (CEFR)⁴; dealing with different needs; teacher training and development; and quality assurance.

The report that follows includes a detailed account of the results of the two rounds of discussion. In sum, the discussion groups suggested that the Council of Europe could support member states by

- producing guidelines for the design of language courses for adult migrants that take account of the CEFR and include descriptors that reflect migrants' communicative needs;
- producing guidelines on quality assurance;
- producing guidelines for needs analysis, perhaps with a focus on the parameters that describe migrant situations and migrant groups;
- developing a tool that addresses the needs of migrants below the level of A1 and producing guidelines for meeting the challenge posed by migrants with low literacy skills;
- producing guidelines for (i) measuring the immediate impact of language programmes for adult migrants and (ii) encouraging participation in the programmes;
- facilitating the exchange of good practice.

These suggestions were reinforced and amplified in the individual feedback that participants provided in the evaluation questionnaire they completed at the end of the conference (see Appendix 4). Participants found that the conference was very relevant to their context, that the conference documents, advance information and preparation were very satisfactory, and that the design of the event was very appropriate.

⁴ 2001, CUP/Council of Europe. Available online on the Language Policy website : www.coe.int/lang

THURSDAY 24 JUNE

Official opening

Joseph Sheils, Head of the Language Policy Division, DG IV, Council of Europe

Your welcome presence in such numbers at this conference is further evidence of the increasing importance that member states are according to language policies for integration purposes. The Council of Europe wishes to support you in the development and implementation of your policies and practices, drawing on its wide experience and its European reference instruments in the field of both languages and migration.

This conference builds on the 2008 intergovernmental seminar, for which we carried out our first survey of member states' language policies related to migration. We presented and discussed language policy guidelines and a toolkit to support implementation, which we drafted to promote high-quality, needs-based language support programmes and appropriate forms of assessment of language learning outcomes.

In this follow-up conference our aim is to increase awareness of the benefits of evaluating policies and practices, looking critically at their quality and relevance, their effectiveness and efficiency, while ensuring that they reflect our shared values and principles – respect for human rights, non-discrimination, respect for the dignity of each individual. This conference is an opportunity to share our experience and expertise in approaches to evaluation while looking at our policies and practices from an ethical and human rights viewpoint.

Policies can impact on human rights because of the high stakes situations which directly affect the lives of individual migrants concerned by family reunification and access to residence, citizenship and the labour market. The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE), in its recent Recommendation and Report – *Migrants and refugees: a continuing challenge for the Council of Europe* (Rec 1917, 2010) – has reminded us quite forcibly of the centrality of this human dimension in recalling that 'migration is about people as much as processes'.

Here in the AGORA building (its name means 'forum') we are offering a pan-European forum for dialogue and mutual support, a platform for sharing experience, expertise and best practice among our member states and indeed beyond – migration is a global issue and we are pleased that Canada is also a participant in our deliberations.

In the interests of coherence and effectiveness, the Council of Europe is combining its *acquis* in language policy and practice with its *acquis* in migration policy and practice – the Language Policy Division in DG IV and the Migration Division in DG III are co-organisers.

2010 marks fifty years of languages work at the Council, supporting states in developing and implementing language policies in the field of education. Undoubtedly one of our best known recent reference instruments is the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR), which is particularly relevant to our discussions here today. It has become a world-wide reference instrument for making decisions on language learning, teaching and assessment, and, as our surveys show, it is now widely used as the basis for language training for migrants and for defining language

levels required for entry, residence and citizenship. This conference offers us an opportunity to critically evaluate our use of this reference framework in adult migration contexts.

Our work in migration also includes support for member states in the development of language policy and practice aimed at the successful educational integration of children and adolescents of migrant origin, and we are developing reference tools for that purpose. This also requires an evaluation dimension – one which can have the added benefit of providing valuable insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the education system overall.

The Language Policy Division also provides expert assistance to countries (and cities or regions) in evaluating their language education policy and practice. This is not an external evaluation but Council of Europe assistance with self-evaluation.

Looking at the subject of evaluation in the context of this conference, the pre-conference questionnaires that you completed reveal that the evaluation of language policy and practice in some form or other has been accorded high priority by some countries, but that some others have not yet managed to devote so much time or resources to this crucial area. A glance at some monitoring reports by our European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) confirms the need to pay close attention to evaluation. In certain countries, for example, it is considered necessary

- to ensure a more coherent and coordinated structure for language provision
- to focus more strongly on assessing migrants' language needs
- to intensify efforts to ensure that language training is of good quality
- to offer more incentives for language learning and to review certain measures that may be disproportionate and have a discriminatory or counter-productive impact

This last point serves as a salient reminder that, in the context of the broader goal of integration, we need to ensure that language requirements/obligations do not reach the point where they can cause undue anxiety, even resentment, and consequently seriously discourage migrants from learning the language of the host community. We know that motivation is a vital factor in successful language learning.

If evaluation of the language dimension is to feed into the broader and much more complex and challenging task of evaluating integration *per se*, we need to bear in mind that data gathered on language learning by migrants – reaching a specified CEFR level of proficiency – is exactly that: valuable data on the success of language support initiatives which are an important enabling factor in the ongoing process of integration. However, this in itself does not necessarily provide clear evidence of actual integration as there is no simple one-to-one relationship between a specific level of the CEFR and integration, which is a process with different stages.

As integration is a two-way process it is important to focus evaluation on the reactions of both the migrants and the native population. This implies an examination of the extent to which the native population accepts in a positive way the efforts of migrants to learn and use the language, however imperfectly, and the extent to which they show goodwill towards the languages spoken by migrants. The native population needs to see the plurilingual repertoire of the migrants – which they are developing further by learning the language of the host community – as an asset, an enrichment and

a potentially valuable addition (in economic as well as cultural terms) to the linguistic capital of the country. Education and the media can do much to promote such intercultural attitudes.

This conference provides us with ample opportunity to reflect together on principled approaches to good practice in evaluation. We took note of the comment that there was not sufficient time for discussion at the last conference and have tried to remedy that with two sessions of group work at this event. We also hope that by tomorrow afternoon you will have had time to reflect on how best the Council of Europe can respond to your needs in the future, bearing in mind our specific added value with regard to policy formulation, implementation and evaluation.

In conclusion, Philia Thalgott, Sergey Khrychikov and the Co-ordinating Group have worked hard to ensure that you will have a fruitful and enjoyable conference. I am sure that your active participation will be a just reward for their dedicated efforts.

Michel Villan, Chair, European Committee on Migration (CDMG)

Although migration has been a constant feature of human history, its scale and diversity have increased in recent decades. It owes its durability to both economic and demographic reasons. Looking into the future, demographic trends mean that international migration is increasingly seen as a way of dealing with the consequences of an ageing population in Europe and meeting the economy's need for labour.

Migration has implications for northern as well as southern countries. Every year people from southern and eastern countries set off in search of better living conditions or to escape conflicts or injustice at home. The challenge now for the international community is to manage this complex phenomenon in such a way as to harness it in support of development and North-South or East-West dialogue.

The countries of origin and destination are by no means making the most of the opportunities offered by migration because most migration policies are still based on a fragmented and purely reactive approach. These policies urgently need to be embedded in a comprehensive and coherent vision, underpinned by respect for human rights and a concern for long-term interests.

It is also crucial that policies be widened to include the issue of development, because the challenge is twofold: deal with emergency situations and, at the same time, address the problems that drive people to emigrate in the first place, such as poverty and disregard for human rights.

In the CDMG's view, if countries are to develop a coherent and effective migration policy, they must take account of the international environment in this area, meaning worker protection and well-being as well as the positive impact of labour migration for the countries of origin and host countries alike. Migration will only benefit host countries and countries of origin if a comprehensive approach is adopted. This approach, in each of the countries concerned, must take account of economic, social, cultural, environmental and political aspects. Effective governance of migration demands co-ordinated, complementary, concomitant action and regular evaluation of the mechanisms and measures put in place.

As regards evaluation and integration indicators, the CDMG has produced a user's manual for policy makers and service providers working in the field of integration which, even though it was compiled

back in 2004, is more relevant than ever. The indicators that it contains can be used to evaluate existing situations and the effectiveness of the measures already taken, and also to devise new measures. This manual, which looks at integration indicators, focuses on eight key areas of human existence: employment, income, housing, health care, nutrition, education, information and culture.

The CDMG publication entitled “social cohesion, integration and development: towards an integrated approach” presented at the ministerial conference on migration issues held in Kyiv in September 2008 is worth reading in this regard.

I would also like to draw your attention to the subject of the latest recommendations prepared by the European Committee on Migration (CDMG) and which have been adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, and also to the two most recent recommendations which are still in preparation:

- recommendation Rec(2007)10, adopted on 12 July 2007, on co-development and migrants working for development in their countries of origin;
- recommendation Rec(2007)9, adopted on 12 July 2007, on life projects for unaccompanied migrant minors;
- recommendation Rec (2008)10, adopted on 10 July 2008, on improving access of migrants to employment;
- recommendation Rec(2008)4, adopted on 12 February 2008, on strengthening the integration of children of migrants and of immigrant background.

Two recommendations are still in preparation and are due to be presented to the Committee of Ministers at the end of this year, namely:

- a recommendation on validating migrants’ skills;
- a recommendation on preventing the risk of vulnerability in elderly migrants and improving their well-being.

One last project focuses on occupation and looks at new approaches to integration and more specifically the sense of belonging through positive interaction.

During the Belgian presidency of the European Union, in November 2010, a seminar organised with the participation of the CDMG on “Transversal policies and local plans for the integration of foreign citizens: what strategies to implement?” will present and discuss these new approaches.

As you can see, therefore, there is an ongoing concern, in all of the CDMG’s work, to integrate migrants as smoothly as possible, with due regard for their specific features, identities and roots, but also by promoting dialogue, participation and building a future together.

Thank you for your attention, and all the best for this conference. I hope it will provide you with some useful information and demonstrate the importance of continuing to address issues related to the integration of migrants at the Council of Europe, at a time when budgetary constraints and the need to make strategic choices are beginning to make themselves felt.

***John Greenway, Chair, Committee on Migration, Refugees and Population,
Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe [PACE]***

The work of the Parliamentary Assembly touches on migration issues in many different ways; for example, this week has seen the opening of a photographic exhibition on the theme of ‘home’. PACE

has adopted my committee's reports on migrants and the treatment of Roma, and is due to discuss further our work on unaccompanied minors. It welcomes the work of the coordinating group that has prepared this conference, the timing of which could not be more appropriate: immigration has been a major issue in a number of recent national elections.

PACE is doing its best to foster intercultural dialogue and promote integration across the Council of Europe's member states, including those that do not belong to the European Union. Some countries are introducing language and knowledge-of-society tests. Practice differs widely, which prompts the thought that perhaps the Council of Europe should produce clear guidelines.

Inevitably education plays a central role in integration, and if migrants are to participate in society at all levels, they need to learn the language of their host country. Language skills are necessary in order to develop social ties; they also make employment easier; and when migrants have language skills they can participate in democratic processes. PACE thinks that special attention should be devoted to the language skills of female migrants, who are often excluded from social involvement precisely because they lack proficiency in the language of the host community. PACE is due to produce a report on strengthening the rights of female migrants, in which language will play a central role. It is also important that border guards and officials have the language needed to cope with those they must deal with professionally.

The principle of providing migrants with language support is unarguable, but especially at a time when resources are under great pressure, we must make the most of the resources we have. The Council of Europe should take a leading role in this domain on the basis of its human rights principles. Five questions that seem to me particularly urgent are:

1. Should courses be voluntary or compulsory, and should they be taken before or after entry to the receiving country?
2. Who should provide the courses?
3. How should courses be funded? Should there be financial incentives?
4. What sanctions can be reasonably applied?
5. How should courses and tests be validated?

Teresa Condeço, European Commission

The European Union has 500 million citizens, 27 member states, 23 official languages, 3 alphabets, 175 nationalities, 60 regional and minority languages, and it is estimated that around 450 languages are spoken within its borders. The languages of host countries are taught to very large numbers of migrants; at the same time the Union has untapped linguistic resources in the form of heritage languages. As Amin Maalouf has put it, writing on behalf of the Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue: 'Linguistic diversity is a challenge for Europe but, in our view, a rewarding challenge.'

Multilingualism is at the centre of many European concerns: culture and respect for diversity; intercultural dialogue and tolerance; education and lifelong learning; workers' mobility and training; trade and competitiveness; our common foreign policy and security; and immigration and the need to promote solidarity. The European Union's role in relation to multilingualism is to help develop quality education, encourage co-operation between member states, and support and supplement the actions of member states. In pursuing these goals it respects member states' cultural and

linguistic diversity and their responsibility for the organisation of education systems and the content of teaching.

In 2002 the Barcelona meeting of the European Council approved the policy objective that all citizens should learn two languages in addition to their mother tongue. In the longer term the Union's goal is to promote multilingualism for intercultural dialogue and social cohesion. In particular it supports the teaching of the host country's language to immigrants as a means of furthering their integration and making it easier for them to gain employment. It also values migrants' linguistic competences for the contribution they can make to intercultural dialogue and economic competitiveness.

The European Union recently announced its strategy for the next ten years. Better integration of migrants in the work force and the development of a comprehensive labour migration policy are included in its plan for sustainable and inclusive growth. One of the strategy's key targets is to reduce poverty, and the European Platform against Poverty is to develop a new agenda to support integration and enable migrants to take full advantage of their potential.

The European Pact on Immigration and Asylum (2008) seeks to promote harmonious integration by balancing migrants' rights and duties, including specific measures to promote language learning. It encourages respect for the identities of the European Union and its member states, combats discrimination against migrants, and aims to develop measures to evaluate families' capacity to integrate on the basis of their knowledge of the host country's language.

The Green Paper on Migration and Mobility recognises that language is a key factor. It stresses the importance of ensuring that children and adolescents from migrant backgrounds are proficient in the language of schooling, but also of promoting the learning of heritage languages. In order to achieve these goals it is necessary to develop adequate policies for teaching the language of the host country, to train teachers to manage linguistic diversity, and to explore the possibility of developing migrants' skills in their mother tongue.

Georges Lemaitre, International Migration Division, OECD

Language proficiency is the elephant in the room. We all know that it is important, yet often we seem to pretend that it is not. The introduction of the Blue Card raises four pressing questions: Is intra-European mobility a realistic possibility if skilled immigrants lack polyglot fluency? Can employers recruit directly into jobs from abroad when their national language is rarely spoken outside the country? Is the proverbial taxi-driver with a PhD a problem of non-recognition of qualifications or of language proficiency? And why did so many young and highly educated EU enlargement migrants take on lesser skilled jobs?

Language proficiency is needed in order to make full use of one's other skills and competences. It may be less necessary for lesser skilled jobs, but health and safety issues in the workplace still require a minimum level of proficiency. It is also needed to 'function' adequately in society, and most of all, it is needed to help one's children 'navigate' the educational system and society.

The 2006 PISA scores for science show that 15-year-old children of immigrants who do not speak the language of the host country at home perform less well than those who do, and that children in this

latter category perform less well than native-born children. The OECD's International Adult Literacy Survey (1995–1998) yielded similar results. Such findings prompt the question: Is it possible for an immigrant to attain full proficiency in the language of the host country? Research suggests that it is relatively easy to achieve a minimum level, whereas good proficiency takes much longer, depends on 'language distance', and varies from person to person.

Good language proficiency among immigrants is clearly a public good and should be publicly funded for all immigrants. According to OECD reviews of the education of children of immigrants, immigrant parents need good proficiency to facilitate the integration of their children, which implies a need for early family reunification, early exposure to the language of the host country, and enhanced language instruction.

The OECD's Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies will assess adult 'literacy' and identify the skills used in the workplace. Data will be collected in 2011–2012, and the data file will be available in 2013. PIAAC aims to be *the* cross-country data source on immigrant skills and labour market outcomes.

Introduction to the conference

David Little (rapporteur)

This conference is a follow-up to the intergovernmental seminar that the Council of Europe organised in 2008. Its aim is to address language issues related to family reunification, permanent residence, nationality/citizenship, and access to the labour market. In doing so we shall also consider key issues in the evaluation of policy and practice in these areas.

There are two reasons why it is appropriate to turn our attention to evaluation at this stage. First, taking account of shared values, member states need ways of measuring the impact of their policies on migrants but also on the host society; and secondly, especially in a period of economic recession, they need to know whether or not policy implementation gives value for money. Evaluation needs to focus on the extent to which policies that concern linguistic integration have clear, principled objectives; on whether account is taken of migrants' linguistic and educational background; on whether language programmes are based on an analysis of migrants' needs and the action-oriented approach on which the CEFR is founded; on how the status of language programmes (obligatory or optional) impacts on learner motivation and learning outcomes; on whether programmes are cost-effective and subject to quality assessment; on whether formal tests conform to international standards of good practice; and on whether consideration has been given to using alternative forms of assessment.

An essential underlying question is: How can the Council of Europe help member states to meet the challenges posed by the linguistic integration of adult migrants? Possible answers include: by helping member states to carry out a self-evaluation of language policy and practice; by supporting national, regional or European events concerned with (aspects of) the linguistic integration of adult migrants; by regularly updating the survey of language requirements and language training provision for adult migrants; and by developing a set of guidelines for the evaluation of policy and practice regarding the linguistic integration of adult migrants.

Language requirements for adult migrants in Council of Europe member states: report on a follow-up survey

An overview of the data – Claire Extramiana

This survey⁵ is the second of its kind and is a follow-up to an initial survey carried out at the end of 2007 and presented at the intergovernmental conference in June 2008. As with the first survey, the objective, as set by the co-ordination group, was to:

- identify the major trends in the policies implemented by member states in the field of the linguistic integration of migrant adults;
- to note any changes that occurred between the end of 2007 and the end of 2009.

The survey was conducted by means of a questionnaire sent in the autumn 2009 to the delegates of the European Committee on Migration who represent 44 member states (3 member states – Andorra, Malta and Monaco – are not officially represented). The questionnaires were analysed with the help of a student from Aix-Marseille University, Emilie Mathieu, as part of a Master's 2 traineeship at the Ministry of Culture in Paris.

The questionnaire focused on proficiency in the language of the host country as a condition for admission to the country (A), permanent residence (B) and acquisition of citizenship (C): the legal and regulatory framework, integration programme, language and knowledge of the host society courses, tests, levels required, course content, costs borne by migrants and sanctions. Unlike the previous survey, the 2009 version asked about quality assurance in courses and the evaluation of the training and programmes put in place by member states. There was also a question about the use of information technologies.

In 2007 27 member states out of 45 replied. In 21 states, language proficiency was a requirement for at least one of the three categories referred to, i.e. people applying for admission, residence or citizenship. In 2009, 31 member states out of 47 replied and language proficiency was a requirement in 23 of them. There are 8 new countries and language proficiency is a requirement in 5 of them. In 2009, the 23 countries concerned consisted of 17 EU countries, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland, Armenia, Turkey and Ukraine.

12 out of 24 states said that changes had been made or were planned. The breakdown in terms of A – admission to the country, B – permanent residence and C – acquisition of citizenship, is as follows:

- For the 6 member states that in 2007-2008 already had a host-country language proficiency programme: Denmark and the United Kingdom were planning to extend the existing arrangements for people applying for permanent residence or citizenship to include those wishing to enter the country for family reasons; the planned measures have gone ahead in Denmark (A1- + KOS⁶ with a test for 2010) while in the United Kingdom, they have been postponed until 2011. Estonia has introduced the CEFR, the level required is currently B1 instead of A1-A2 (considered to be an elementary level) in 2007. Austria is planning to raise the level required from A2 to B1 for permanent residence and citizenship in 2011; the United Kingdom is planning to introduce new measures in 2011 for people applying for citizenship;

⁵ The list of questions included in the survey sent to member states is reproduced in Appendix 3

⁶ Knowledge of society (KOS)

Norway and Finland are considering new measures for permanent residence and citizenship.

- Among those states which did not have a compulsory programme related to language proficiency (A, B, C):
 - The Czech Republic has introduced as planned, level A1 for B with a language test; for C, there is no longer a set level, even though there were plans to introduce level A2.
 - Luxembourg has made preparations for the introduction of a programme for A, B, C: level A1.1 Letzeburgesch⁷, German and French for A and B and Letzeburgesch for C.
 - In Liechtenstein, A = A1, B = A2, C = B1, with a review planned in 2010.
 - In 2009 Italy promulgated a law on a language + KOS test for levels A1 to B1, to be implemented from 2011.
 - Slovenia has introduced a B1 language test for C.
 - And lastly, Poland has promulgated a law introducing levels B1, B2 and C1 for C.

Two different rationales can be discerned depending on whether the countries are in western or eastern Europe (in the wide sense). In the case of the 13 western European countries, permanent residence (B) represents the hard core: the legislation indicated in brackets pre-dates the legislation on acquisition of citizenship (C), with the conditions related to admission to the country (A), which is itself related to permanent residence, coming after or before permanent residence (B) as the case may be. Consider the case of Denmark: B in 2003, C in 2006 and A in 2010. or Germany: B in 2005, A in 2007, C in 2008. The courses provided by the public authorities – central, regional (or the cantons in the case of Switzerland) or local government – are mostly compulsory for people seeking permanent residence.

The average level required for permanent residence is around A2/B1 on the CEFR scale (6 replies for A2, 3 replies for B1); the level required for admission to the country is lower, however: A1 minus (Netherlands and Denmark) or A1.1 (France, Luxembourg) and A1 (Germany, United Kingdom, Liechtenstein).

Introduced after the measures relating to permanent residence, the measures concerning admission call for, in addition to the language course and/or test, a course and/or test on the values of the host society (“knowledge of society” or “KOS” for short, “values of the Republic” in France), as for people seeking permanent residence.

The level required for acquisition of citizenship, when reference is made to the CEFR, is either the same as that required for permanent residence or higher. Consider the case of Finland or Austria: B and C B1 and A2 (B1 in 2011); or Liechtenstein: A – A1, B – A2, C – B1.

Like France, Luxembourg requires a minimum level of A1.1 for A and B, in the three official languages, namely French, German and Letzeburgesch; for persons seeking citizenship, however, a higher level of proficiency of the language of identity, Letzeburgesch, is required (oral expression A2, oral comprehension B1).

⁷ Letzeburgesch is the national language of Luxembourgers.

It will also be observed that the level of language proficiency required is higher in northern than in southern countries, a reflection of the fact that there is a more government intervention in the North than in the South.

Rather than requiring a single level of proficiency, some countries have taken a different approach: in Denmark, for example, there are three recognised learning profiles (learners with little education, some education and full education) for whom levels A2, B1 and B2 are required respectively. Germany offers B1 and A2-level courses, depending on the students, while in the Netherlands a distinction is made between new arrivals (new migrants = A1/A2) and more established migrants (A2). The United Kingdom assesses commitment to integration according to the progress made by foreigners who have not reached B1 (progression from one level to the next, e.g. from A2 to B1). Norway, meanwhile, does not think in terms of level but rather in terms of tuition hours, with one course representing between 300 and 3,000 hours and the minimum attendance requirement being 300 hours.

For people who have received little education in their countries of origin, developing written skills can be a challenge, something that is recognised by a number of countries. France and Luxembourg have accordingly opted for level A1.1, and a literacy module has been introduced in Luxembourg, Austria, Sweden and Liechtenstein. Similarly, the length of the courses may be longer for less educated students: 300 hours in addition to the standard 900 hours in Germany, 40 weeks in addition to the standard 20 to 30 weeks in Finland, and up to 3,000 hours of instruction in Norway.

In eastern Europe, language proficiency tends to be required for acquisition of citizenship rather than for permanent residence, as was the case in 2008. Of the 10 countries concerned, only three make permanent residence conditional upon language proficiency (Estonia/Russian minority level B1, Lithuania and the Czech Republic since 2009). Language proficiency is usually assessed in an administrative interview, by means of a test on the Constitution (Hungary, Armenia), with Turkey requiring a language certificate. Estonia, Lithuania and Slovenia have introduced a language test, and Slovenia also tests people's knowledge of society. Poland is planning to follow suit. Courses, where they exist, are optional, except in Lithuania.

Language courses are compulsory in western Europe in 8 cases out of 12. Language testing is obligatory in 9 countries: Germany, Austria, Liechtenstein, Denmark, Netherlands, United Kingdom and Finland for permanent residence, and in some cases also for admission and citizenship; in France and Greece, it is compulsory for people seeking permanent residence. In Luxembourg a test in Letzeburgesch is required for citizenship but not for permanent residence and admission to the country, although courses are compulsory. Lastly, Italy is planning to introduce a compulsory language test for permanent residence.

In most cases in western Europe (France, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Luxembourg, Greece), courses and/or language testing are free of charge if they are compulsory (8 cases out of 11). The costs are partially borne by the migrant in Austria (course fees are partially reimbursed) and in Finland (free, compulsory courses, fee-based test). They are borne by the migrant in the Netherlands and Liechtenstein (there are no government-funded courses and the test is fee-based), as they are in the United Kingdom (optional courses and compulsory testing, both fee-based).

In eastern Europe 4 countries out of 10 have a language test for permanent residence and citizenship, namely Lithuania (compulsory courses), Estonia (no courses), the Czech Republic (optional courses) and Slovenia (for citizenship only; courses are optional). The courses, like the tests, may have to be paid for by the migrant.

Sanctions and incentives: these are based on students' class attendance and whether or not they pass the test, and are mainly a feature of western European countries. The sanctions may be of a financial nature, with a reduction in benefits or 100% liability for course fees. The incentives may take the form of a partial reimbursement of course or test fees.

In countries where language proficiency is not obligatory, specific courses, funded by the government, are often available:

- Belgium/Wallonia: Social advancement/ "Lire et Écrire" association
- Ireland: refugees, report in preparation for developing a policy
- Sweden: municipalities, private schools
- Hungary: Budapest School of International Languages, English teaching for immigrants who are permanent residents
- San Marino: Ministry of Education and Culture
- Serbia: asylum seekers and migrant workers.

In some cases migrants may have access to mainstream training provision, as in the United Kingdom and Spain.

Quality assurance is a concern for those western European countries which have introduced a linguistic integration policy. Once language proficiency becomes a requirement, courses are introduced by the public authorities (central, regional or local government) or funded by them if the training is delivered by the private sector or associations/NGOs. The key issues here are:

- course accreditation,
- oversight of training agencies,
- teaching qualifications.

All of the respondents tended to answer in the affirmative to these questions. The programme or course curriculum is prescribed in only a few instances (Germany, Denmark, Netherlands, etc.), even though the CEFR is widely used as a benchmark.

As regards evaluation, there may have been some confusion in certain replies between course-specific evaluation, evaluation of the training agency and evaluation of the programme as a whole. In some countries, course-specific evaluation, where it exists, may be carried out on an occasional basis. Evaluation of what students have learnt may be considered to be the answer, as in the case of Norway for example: "Through performance measures and evaluations, results are measured". Evaluation of the training agency may be carried out by:

- an outside agency: e.g. the *l'Institut national des langues* in Luxembourg: external assessment of the INL according to specifications approved by the Minister (Section 8 of the Act of 22 May 2009)
- an independent inspectorate: "Colleges are subject to performance reviews on each subject area they deliver by an independent inspectorate" in the United Kingdom

- the public authorities: in France, on-the-spot inspections may be carried out by the DAIC and by the OFI, while in the UK: “Some detailed changes going through UK Parliament in March/April 2010 to emphasise need to demonstrate progress and to provide protection against exploitation by some unscrupulous private sector colleges”.

As for evaluating the programme as a whole, external assessments of programmes have been introduced (Germany, Denmark, Greece) – statistics on the number of people sitting tests and the results but also satisfaction levels among students and employers. In the case of Denmark “General assessment of the 2003 Act was carried out in 2007 concluding that the language education had become considerably more efficient partly as a result of the measures introduced by the 2003 Act. Furthermore, statistics are carried out each year with details on the number of students passing each module and final exams, progression rates, the satisfaction level among students with the Danish courses, satisfaction level among employers with the students’ proficiency in Danish etc. The local language schools are also benchmarked every year on their effectiveness.” In Italy: ‘Ministry of Labour has been monitoring activities. Promoters are required to send intermediate and final reports’.

As regards the use of information technologies, in western Europe, ICTs have been introduced in training provision in only 5 countries (Denmark, Finland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, United Kingdom) for people seeking admission, residence and citizenship. Among the other countries, some are planning to make use of ICTs (Germany, France, Greece, Norway). In eastern Europe, the Slovak Republic and Ukraine are planning to make use of ICTs while in Lithuania, tests can be taken on line.

Some observations on the survey results – Piet Van Avermaet

In 2009 as in 2007, 75% of the countries responding to the survey included a language requirement in their integration regulations. However, the *number* of countries reporting such a requirement was greater in 2009 than in 2007 (23/31 compared with 21/27). Overall the increase applied to all the three categories (A – prior to entry, B – for permanent residence, and C – for citizenship), though there were clear differences between western European countries on the one hand and eastern and south eastern European countries on the other. Language requirements for A and B were markedly more common in western countries, whereas language requirements for C were somewhat more common in eastern and south eastern countries.

In 2007 62% of responding countries (13/21) provided official language courses, and in 46% of those countries (6/13) the courses were obligatory. In 2009 82% of responding countries (19/23) provided language courses, and in 42% of those countries (8/19) the courses were obligatory. In 2009 a language test was obligatory in 65% of countries (15/23), mainly for permanent residence and citizenship. In 84% of western European countries (11/13) quality assurance procedures were in place and in 38% (5/13) there were official guidelines for curriculum design and/or standardisation. In eastern and south eastern countries quality was considered to be assured via teachers’ qualifications in 6/10 countries, courses were accredited in 2/10 countries, and guidelines for curriculum design had been issued in 3/10 countries.

In 2007 48% of reporting countries (10/21) had knowledge-of-society courses and tests, often integrated with a language programme, whereas in 2009 87% of reporting countries (20/23) had

knowledge-of-society requirements (courses and/or tests). In 90% of the countries with such requirements (18/20) courses were provided, mainly for immigrants seeking permanent residence or citizenship. In about 60% of cases knowledge-of-society provision was an integral part of other (mainly language) programmes. The number of hours was often rather low, for example, one day, 10 hours or 50 hours.

Challenges and some possible responses

How can we take into account the diversity of migrants' educational and cultural backgrounds? How can we meet migrants' and society's specific and functional language needs?

- By analyzing migrants' language needs with reference to the societal domains in which they are active
- By using the outcomes of needs analysis to develop proficiency descriptors and specify learning outcomes and curricula
- By designing tailor-made courses that
 - are outcome-oriented
 - take account of differences between second language and foreign language teaching
 - adopt a task-based approach
 - encourage cooperative learning

How can we encourage migrant learners to complete their courses?

- By providing tailor-made courses that are flexible in their structure and integrated in societal domains that are relevant to the learners
- By ensuring that courses incentivize learners by
 - explicitly meeting their language needs
 - providing them with continuous and positive feedback
 - acknowledging and understanding their language and educational background
 - promoting the use of plurilingual repertoires
 - forming part of a larger system of guidance
 - receiving formal recognition
 - increasing migrants' chances of finding a job
 - creating real opportunities to build social networks

An impact study carried out in Flanders yielded information that is relevant to this challenge. Immigrants who were taking a course at the time of the study saw the course and accompanying certificate as useful and necessary; by attending the course they hoped to increase their chances of finding employment. Immigrants who had finished an integration programme at least a year prior to the survey were rather negative about the value of the certificate if they had not found a job, but mainly positive if they had. Those who had taken a course at some stage in the past, said that the language they were taught did not really help them in the workplace.

Most employers did not ask for a certificate of proficiency in Dutch and did not officially test applicants' proficiency. One employer said: 'I have a conversation with them and on that basis I can see whether their proficiency in Dutch is low, average or high.' Employment agencies said that a certificate from an integration programme or some other Dutch language course had only limited

value: 'They don't have to prove that they took a course in Dutch or followed an integration programme.' Employers took the view that economics governs language: 'In the cleaning industry employers often do not have linguistic demands. Also, most of the families speak English or French'; 'Because electricians are in high demand most companies are prepared to accept applicants who have less than 100% mastery of Dutch'; 'The most important thing is a vocational qualification and practical skills. There is a shortage of welders. Polish immigrants can fill that need. Language is not a problem in that case.'

How can we increase migrants' multi-literacy?

- By using ICT in teaching and learning
- By exploiting migrants' plurilingual repertoires in language learning and by taking account of those repertoires in assessment

How can we professionalise teachers?

- By developing their knowledge of language teaching and their skill in dealing with cultural, social and educational diversity as well as diversity of learning styles
- By improving their working conditions
- By providing them with examples of good practice (e.g. video samples)
- By showing them how to identify needs within a group of learners
- By providing training on how to refer to the framework (national or CEFR)
- By showing them how to encourage their learners to take advantage of opportunities for informal learning outside the course (social networks, contacts with their children's school, etc.)
- By providing structures that permit more flexible course delivery to take account of learners' needs and their family, job and social commitments

How can we assure quality of assessment?

- By ensuring that the test purpose reflects the real world needs of test takers
- By taking account of test takers' linguistic needs
- By determining a level or profile appropriate to the test takers
- By producing test specifications
- By ensuring that test specifications are met in practice (test criteria, pre-testing, administration, reliability, validity, etc.)
- By using forms of continuous assessment as an alternative to tests: portfolios, self-assessment, peer assessment

To what extent can an integration policy be facilitative and not just a matter of requiring conditions to be fulfilled?

When policy is chiefly concerned with the fulfilment of conditions:

- Courses and tests tend to be uniform in format and content because the same level of language proficiency is required of everyone
- There is a danger that learner commitment will be low and instrumentally oriented ('Take the course and pass the test')
- There is a danger that the policy will be used for purposes of 'gate-keeping' and exclusion

When policy sets out to be facilitative:

- It is more encouraging than discouraging

- Courses and tests are likely to be more flexible and needs-based
- Proficiency levels can vary according to the needs of individual migrants and the linguistic requirements of the domains in which they want/need to function

How can we help migrants to overcome the language barriers that remain after they have taken official courses and passed the necessary tests?

- By ensuring that language portfolios and certificates of proficiency in the language of the host country are officially recognized, so that they have legitimacy and social value
- By linking migrants' language learning achievements with further education and job requirements
- By helping migrants to build social networks
- By providing appropriate job orientation
- By making all citizens aware that social cohesion and integration involve a great deal more than attending a language course and passing a test

How do we encourage the integration process to continue after migrants have completed official programmes?

- By recognising that although language is crucial for integration, proficiency is not necessarily only a condition for integration: sometimes it is the product of integration
- By recognizing that integration is a reciprocal process that also has social, cultural and professional dimensions
- By building social networks that facilitate socio-cultural integration:

What kind of research should we promote?

- Needs analysis
- Research into drop-out and motivation
- Research that investigates effectiveness in relation to
 - attendance and pass rates
 - programme types and open frameworks
 - contextualised learning
 - learner feedback
 - the use of ICT
 - feedback from other stakeholders in society
- Impact studies that seek answers to questions like:
 - To what extent do immigrants benefit in the long term?
 - What is the effect on local policies?
 - What is the impact on the perceptions and attitudes of the majority group?
 - Do these policies achieve their intended objectives: greater social inclusion, more multicultural social networks, less discrimination, more chances to get a job?

How can we contribute to an open and welcoming multicultural society?

- By investing in awareness raising and the dissemination of information and by fostering communication between different stakeholders
- By creating networks that allow professional stakeholders to exchange experience, materials, etc.
- By never losing sight of the human rights perspective

Presentation of national/regional projects

During the lunch break [national/regional projects](#) were presented as follows (some presentations are available online – see annotated Programme):

Aspects of the ILLIAD Project (Intercultural Language Learning for Illiterate Adults) – Joseph E. Chryshochoos (Greece)

Twelve countries are involved in this project, which is co-ordinated by Bulgaria.

Linguistic integration abroad: a ‘contradictio in terminis’? – Eva Merckx (The Netherlands)

In 2006, the Netherlands introduced the Civic Integration Abroad Act, which requires those seeking family reunification to pass a language and knowledge-of-society test before entering the Netherlands. This presentation summarised the results and consequences of the 2009 evaluation of the Act and indicated some policy changes for the future.

The Dutch case: a tailor-made approach in integration exams – Suzanne Hafidi (the Netherlands)

A key feature of the Dutch civic/linguistic integration exams is the tailor-made approach which allows migrants to choose their own accents in the exam. This workshop described this feature and the way in which the results and quality of linguistic integration programmes are monitored.

France’s language policy for new arrivals who sign the Reception and Integration Contract (CAI – “Contrat d’accueil et d’intégration”), non-signatories of the CAI and people undergoing a process of naturalisation – Christine Candide (France).

Language training: a new challenge for integration policies? The right to language and public policies in the field of language training for adult immigrants – Gaelle Donnard (France)

What are the social, legal and policy issues at stake in language training for adult immigrants? What is the situation at national and regional level? What institutions and associations are involved in this field in France? This publication addresses these questions and is intended for everyone (elected representatives, professionals in the fields of integration, social cohesion and prevention of discrimination, students, researchers, etc.) wishing to gain a greater insight into these issues.

Topics for discussion: Day 1

Richard Rossner

Before the conference intending participants were asked to indicate the five key challenges in their context from the perspective of evaluation. Their responses were grouped together in five categories as follows:

1. Curricula and training programmes

- Developing training modules for the effective teaching of migrants; developing textbooks and teaching materials
- Sharing and analysing language teaching materials to develop an improved resource base for all teachers

- Developing a well thought-out approach to literacy (for instance, with regard to basic administrative documents), and to migrants' competence in speaking and writing

2. *Applying the principles of the CEFR*

- Developing curricula and programmes, and aligning these with the CEFR and national qualifications frameworks
- Aligning programmes with the levels of the CEFR
- Adapting language tests so that the results are aligned with the levels of the CEFR

3. *Dealing with differing needs*

- Meeting the needs of different immigrants and taking account of the changing profile of immigration
- Making language training relevant to the needs of individual learners
- Giving proper attention to intercultural skills
- Ensuring that language learning is continued even after the course has been completed

4. *Teacher training and development*

- Providing in-service training in the the skills needed to teach migrants, and promoting the exchange of good practice
- Continuing teacher training in order to improve the quality of language teaching
- Supporting and improving the training and qualification of teachers of migrants, defining a specialised training plan for them

5. *Quality assurance*

- Setting minimum quality standards for training courses for migrants, and accrediting the courses
- Securing good quality language teaching in all parts of a given country
- Improving quality by providing open and distance training opportunities
- Developing a network of accredited language training centres and institutions

The Coordination Group identified the following related themes in the conference document *The linguistic integration of adult migrants: evaluating policy and practice*:

- The role and objectives of language support for adult migrants (pp.4 and 6)
- Individual migrants' educational and language background, and their situation (p.8)
- Language support programmes – needs, approach and content (p.11)
- The CEFR (p.12)
- Quality Assurance (p.20)

Plenary feedback from the discussion groups: round table with rapporteurs

(chair: Jean-Claude Beacco)

Developing curricula and training programmes

Group 1 (rapporteur: Gaby Kunsch) recognised that the first task is to carry out a needs analysis. A Swiss project is currently producing a frame of reference based on the needs of adults, and existing frames of reference for several languages provide a starting point for this kind of development. For example, there is one in Spanish for all levels, though not specifically for migrants. Belgium is in the process of developing procedures for comparing the various training programmes that are offered; literacy is a particular issue and resources are distributed via an internet platform. In general there is a need for feedback from participants in training programmes.

The chair noted that using the CEFR always implies adaptation and transposition; it is a matter of creating open rather than closed tools. He also noted that we lack reference frameworks for teacher training in this domain.

Applying the principles of the CEFR

Group 2 (rapporteur: Kathrin Otte) agreed that one of the main challenges in this domain is that the CEFR was not developed for migrants. How the CEFR is used differs from country to country. Sometimes it is used in test development, sometimes in curriculum design, and sometimes in both. An important question is: How can we ensure that course providers link their teaching to the CEFR? The group wondered whether the Council of Europe might publish guidelines for the development of language programmes that are aligned with the CEFR. Such guidelines could usefully include descriptors for migrants.

For Group 1 a key linguistic question was: Is my B1 the same as your B1? The group discussed whether the CEFR privileges one particular teaching method over others and concluded that it does not. It also wondered whether the CEFR is usable in all contexts. Members of the group recognised that there is a need for articulation between the levels of the CEFR and different sectors; also that knowledge of the CEFR is no more widespread in the world of work than in society at large. The group concluded that assessment should be based on learning goals, which may be linked to the CEFR but should also take account of the needs of learners.

The chair pointed out that the question of descriptors is quite complex. The Council of Europe's project Languages in/for Education has published texts (available on the Language Policy Division's website⁸) that explore the nature of descriptors themselves. Much work remains to be done in this domain.

Dealing with different needs

Group 3 (rapporteur: Helga Arnesen) was unable to agree whether the focus should be on individual or group needs, but it did agree that needs, incentives and motivation belong together. In general

⁸ In particular the *Platform of resources and references for plurilingual and intercultural education* : www.coe.int/lang

the group was concerned with migrants with low literacy skills, and this prompted the question: Might the Council of Europe develop a tool that describes the language needs of migrants below level A1 and another tool that supports needs analysis?

Group 1 recognised that different needs arise from different migration profiles, with highly qualified learners at one end of the spectrum and those with little or no schooling at the other. The group discussed evaluation grids as one way of taking account of individual needs; it also asked whether courses in neighbouring languages are provided in border areas. The group argued that there is a need for coordination between different sectors (education, social services, etc.) in order to meet the needs of isolated migrants, e.g. mothers. Although courses themselves should take account of learners' needs, this can be difficult when attendance is patchy. The group heard about the ILLIAD Project (Intercultural Language Learning for Illiterate Adults), which involves 12 countries, is co-ordinated from Bulgaria, focuses particularly on the development of literacy skills, and emphasises the importance of the linguistic resources that migrants bring with them. The group agreed that diverse needs require diverse programmes and that it is necessary to take account of *real* needs and not just wants. Moreover, courses should seek to promote a coherent linguistic development, which sometimes conflicts with the idea that they should respond to learners' individual needs.

Group 2 thought it was important to provide different courses not only for different social categories but for those with different learning backgrounds. Pre-entry tests were necessary in order to assign migrants to appropriate courses. At the same time the group recognised that needs change as learning proceeds, so it should be possible for migrants to move between courses. The group also considered possible responses to the challenge of ensuring sustainability and encouraging migrants to continue learning after their course finishes. The Netherlands provide internet-based learning materials, Germany has introduced internships, and Estonia is using courses themselves to establish social networks. Some members of the group thought that success depends on use of the learners' home language as medium of instruction, whereas others thought that the target language should be used. The group wondered whether the Council of Europe could develop guidelines on needs analysis and help to promote the exchange of good practice.

The chair suggested that it would be helpful to produce a document that brings together all the parameters that describe migrants and migrant groups. Such a document would take account of dimensions like culture, education and social organisation, and users would have to decide which parameters should be privileged in their particular context. It is important that language courses are explicitly in harmony with the needs of learners.

Teacher training and development

Group 3 discussed what special skills are required to teach the language of the host country to migrants, coming to the conclusion that there is a need for specialized training. The group wondered whether the Council of Europe might develop a framework for self-assessment, rather like the ELP, but for teachers rather than learners. It was suggested that the needs of teachers and their specialist skills should be assessed in much the same way as the needs of adult migrants. A description of the principal skills required to teach languages in this domain would provide a focus for training and development programmes. It is important to bear in mind that there are many ways in which

teachers can develop besides taking a course – for example, mentoring, peer observation, independent learning.

Group 2 agreed that teachers in this domain require special training. Which agency is responsible for course provision differs from country to country, as do the amount of training required and the kinds of training available. Above all, teachers need to be able to manage diversity in their classrooms; perhaps they should learn the migrants' mother tongue to give them a sense of perspective. Some members of the group thought that because teacher quality is of the greatest importance, it would be good if the Council of Europe could do more work in this area, for example by facilitating the exchange of good practice.

The chair stressed the importance of intercultural education for teachers if they are to manage diversity in their classes. If teachers are not open to diversity, this has a negative impact on the learners.

Quality assurance

Group 3 agreed that quality is an important topic, but we need standards in order to define and measure quality in curricula and teacher qualifications. The group wondered whether the Council of Europe might develop guidelines on how to measure quality and how to make use of the results of quality assurance. The group felt that quality is the concept that brings together all the topics discussed.

In the general discussion that followed the reports from the working groups, it was noted that France has defined criteria for the assessment of quality in teacher training and the management of diversity; it might be useful to compare them with procedures and practice in other countries. It was also pointed out that a certain number of indicators exist already which could be re-evaluated in a dynamic way. A question for Friday's discussion might be: We have the stick, but where's the carrot?

Concluding the session, the chair reminded the conference that places where the language of the host country is learnt are also places where learners explore their new identities. Teachers play a central role in this process; hence the importance of ensuring that they have appropriate intercultural training and orientation.

FRIDAY 25 JUNE

Topics for discussion: Day 2

Piet Van Avermaet

As for the first round, the topics for the second round of discussion were derived from participants' responses to the pre-conference questionnaire (page references are to the conference document [*The linguistic integration of adult migrants: evaluating policy and practice*](#)):

1. Evaluating effectiveness and impact

- What do we mean by 'integration'?
- Gauging the impact of courses and assessment on integration

- Formal recognition of learning and attainment
- Access to the labour market
- Social cohesion
- Etc.

2. Incentivising migrants to take advantage of training

- Getting them to engage fully with their courses (p.14)
- Maintaining motivation and participation (p.14)
- Reaching out to more migrants
 - long term residents
 - those who are hard to reach
 - Etc.

3. After courses, what then?

- Understanding the limits of formal learning
- Preparing for and providing other routes to and resources for informal learning
 - Facilitating access to social groups and support networks for social interaction
 - Working with mentors and peers
- Involving other stakeholders in the integration process, e.g. employers, neighbours, etc.

Overarching issues

- Evaluating policy and provision from an ethical and human rights perspective (p.4)
- Making best use of new learning technologies and environments – and understanding their limitations

Plenary feedback from the discussion groups: round table with rapporteurs

(chair: Claire Extramiana)

Evaluating effectiveness and impact

Group 1 (rapporteur: Gaby Kunsch) recognised that although definitions of integration are often subjective, from a political point of view it is necessary to have an agreed definition in order to evaluate policy. Integration involves familiarity with legal requirements and the fundamental values of the host society and respect for cultural differences. Switzerland has introduced a law that defines integration in terms of local language, respect for the constitution and the law, readiness to develop, and knowledge of customs.

Group 3 (rapporteur: Ingun Westlund) recognised that because integration is a two-way process, it is necessary to educate the host society as well as migrants. Measures are needed to reduce differences between migrants and the native population, and it is important to ask migrant communities whether they feel integrated at an emotional level. In some countries the economic crisis has had an impact on provision for migrants. There are different views on whether integration is possible without learning the language of the host country. Some countries measure the effectiveness of integration in terms of the extent to which migrants make progress in the work place, whether or not they participate in society, and so on. The group discussed whether social

participation depends only on migrants and whether it is in part a function of the individual migrant's socio-economic background. Perhaps the Council of Europe could produce guidelines for measuring the impact of courses and encouraging greater levels of participation.

Group 1 agreed that language courses help to launch the integration process: language is essential for the workplace, social interaction, the assertion of one's opinions and rights, and gaining access to essential services; while certification validates the learning process. Recognition of qualifications gained in the country of origin remains an important issue. The group discussed the relation between success and socio-economic status and between proficiency in the language of the host country and success in the workplace. It recognised that the Council of Europe has played a pioneering role in the development of indicators – work that was initiated by the Committee of Ministers. Noting that a study of indicators of integration is currently in progress in France, the group nevertheless acknowledged that talk of indicators can lead to reductive approaches.

Incentivising migrants to take advantage of language training

Group 2 (rapporteur: Kathrin Otte) came to the conclusion that in countries where language classes are free, motivation is often low, whereas it tends to be better in countries where courses must be paid for. The group emphasised that it is essential to teach migrants language they can use in their daily lives, and wherever possible courses should be linked to the labour market (some countries consider that entry to the labour market is the key to integration). Courses need to be flexible in content, flexible in the way they are scheduled, and adapted to the needs of specific groups. Some members of the group took the view that a test at the end of the course helps to maintain participation; others felt that tests may encourage the wrong kind of learning focus. One way of increasing motivation may be to shorten the period migrants must wait before they can apply for citizenship. A portfolio that provides a practical demonstration of migrants' skills may also be useful. Recognising that the host society has an important role to play in ensuring that integration succeeds, the group thought that courses designed to promote openness to diversity might be introduced into the school curriculum. The group also wondered whether the Council of Europe could draw on good practice to compile a list of incentives relative to participation in language courses.

Group 1 felt that motivation depends to a considerable extent on the quality of courses, which in turn depends on well trained teachers with a high level of intercultural competence (countries vary as regards the availability of specialized teacher training). These considerations are important because language courses are often migrants' first contact with the host society. It is especially important to address the situation of migrant women who remain at home to care for children: often they fail to recognise the importance of learning the language of the host country. In some migrant communities wives are excluded from attending regular courses on religious grounds, which raises the question whether special arrangements can be made for them. It is important that there is regular admission to courses so that migrants who want to learn the language of the host country are not kept waiting too long. Migrants may be demotivated when the qualifications they bring with them are not recognised by the host country.

It was pointed out that in France language training is compulsory and free of charge. It is also linked to sanctions: permission to remain depends on attendance at a course. This prompts the question: Why do migrants not see that it is urgent to learn French? It was suggested that there is a need for

qualitative research that explores the reasons for drop-out. Research carried out in Flanders some time ago showed that drop-out was mainly due to the quality and relevance of courses. It was also pointed out that when it comes to language learning, there are differences between different migrant groups; those without literacy in their home language pose particular challenges. Negative attitudes in the host society can have an adverse impact on migrants' motivation to learn the language. If they feel excluded they are all too likely to say: 'Why learn the language when no one wants to talk to me?' It is important to recognise that immigrants tend to lead busy lives outside the language classroom, and they did not come to the host country primarily in order to learn its language. Teachers do not always understand this.

After courses, what then?

Group 3 discussed how to integrate language training with the rest of migrants' lives, and a number of initiatives were reported: language courses in the workplace, courses that focus on language plus professional training, work experience programmes, TV-based education, and family learning. The group recognised that some immigrants lack basic skills, even though access to basic skills is a human right. It also noted that an important gender issue arises from the fact that globally women are less well educated than men. The group wondered whether the Council of Europe could help to disseminate information on these topics.

While recognising that such measures require significant resources and a great deal of time, Group 2 discussed whether it might be possible to make language courses more interactive by forging links with society at large, and to use counselling to foster integration and the continuation of language learning after courses end. The group also recognised the importance of providing courses that are explicitly oriented to different sectors of the labour market. Other possibilities discussed included the delivery of learning opportunities via the internet or computers in public libraries; the provision of hotlines for migrants with language problems; and a scheme to bring migrants together one year after the end of their course so that they can share success stories. The group wondered whether the Council of Europe could stimulate projects to find out more about 'alternative' approaches to learning the language of the host country.

The question was raised whether there is any research on the number of illiterate migrants in Europe and whether courses have been designed especially for illiterates. The chair recalled that the OECD will shortly launch a project to assess adult literacy and identify the skills used in the workplace (see the presentation by Georges Lemaitre in the opening session of the conference). It was noted that France distinguishes between those who have attended school but have not developed the literacy skills needed in everyday life ("illettrés") and those who lack literacy skills because they have not attended school ("analphabètes"); migrants may belong to either category. It was also pointed out that European societies expect their populations to master the key competences provided for in compulsory education (2006 European Parliament and Council Recommendation on key competencies for education and lifelong learning). Perhaps the Council of Europe could do more to address the problems of illiteracy among immigrants.

Human rights

The chair observed that replies to the first question took account of the human rights dimension. Group 2 concluded that tests may be helpful, but if the sanctions attached to them are too great,

they may come to dominate courses, so that migrants concentrate on passing the test, not on learning the language they need.

New learning technologies

It was pointed out that new technologies can help to extend the inclusiveness of programmes by overcoming problems of access and scheduling. In Finland there is a development programme supported by the European Social Fund to create a platform for language courses for integration. The platform can be accessed by those who plan to come to the country but have not yet done so.

Round table

(chair: Hans-Jürgen Krumm)

European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) – Barbara John

ECRI is the Council of Europe's independent human rights monitoring body. Composed of independent and impartial members, one from each member state, it is concerned with racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance. Its activities have three focuses: country-by-country monitoring, work on general themes, and relations with civil society. In its monitoring function it prepares reports on all Council of Europe member States, on an equal footing. Reports are prepared on a five-year cycle, which means that nine or ten countries are covered each year. As regards its work on general themes, it elaborates General Policy Recommendations. To date it has published twelve of these:

1. Combating racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance
2. Specialised bodies to combat racism, xenophobia, antisemitism and intolerance at national level
3. Combating racism and intolerance against Roma/Gypsies
4. National surveys on the experience and perception of discrimination and racism from the point of view of potential victims
5. Combating intolerance and discrimination against Muslims
6. Combating the dissemination of racist, xenophobic and antisemitic material via the Internet
7. National legislation to combat racism and racial discrimination
8. Combating racism while fighting terrorism
9. The fight against antisemitism
10. Combating racism and racial discrimination in and through school education
11. Combating racism and racial discrimination in policing
12. Combating racism and racial discrimination in the field of sport to assist national policy-makers

In its relations with civil society ECRI organises national round tables and seminars with national bodies whose function is to combat racism and racial discrimination.

ECRI promotes positive measures to foster integration, which is a two-way process involving effort and mutual recognition on the part of both majority and minority groups. ECRI works against the dissemination of factual inaccuracies and in favour of equal opportunities. It also encourages

positive measures in the field of language, especially the provision of language courses and translation/ interpretation services.

The past five or six years have seen a shift of emphasis, from 'right to integrate' to 'duty to integrate'. 'Duty' includes the obligation to participate in integration courses. ECRI thinks this development must be treated very cautiously, because an emphasis on duty can cause alienation and result in the stigmatisation of migrants. Discrimination may be based on nationality; for example, those who enter Germany visa-free are not required to take a language course. Sanctions should be evaluated in terms of their necessity and proportionality. Climate of opinion is also important. For instance, if the topic of integration courses is dealt with in an aggressive way, this can lead to prejudice against migrants. In Germany, integration courses are a big success story: demand is higher than expected, which has resulted in an increase in federal funding, from €80,000 to €140,000 over the past five years. Also in Germany there has been some discussion about pre-entry courses, which are not always easy to access from remoter areas. Nevertheless, some immigrants are glad to come to Germany with some knowledge of the language. But this kind of requirement needs to take account of difficult cases, exceptions, etc.

ECRI supports the idea that regulations, courses, etc. should always be under review. There is a duty on governments to reflect on what they are doing and consider its impact. Necessary precautions include evaluating the usefulness of particular measures in achieving integration, monitoring access to rights, and ensuring that testing procedures are transparent and recourse to the law is possible. As far as language requirements are concerned, it is important to respect social rights, which entails differential treatment of lawful residents and focusing on incentives; and when it comes to residence permits, migrants should be provided with assistance to pass the exam. With regard to family reunification, it is possible that holding language tests in the country of origin is counter-productive, and with regard to naturalisation, again migrants should be provided with assistance to pass required language examinations.

In response to questions, Barbara John confirmed that in ECRI's view migrants' first languages should not be suppressed; ECRI is opposed to all discrimination on linguistic grounds. However, although it does not deny the discriminatory potential of pre-entry language requirements, it does not regard them as discriminatory *per se*. The problems that arise have to do with hard cases. Barbara John explained that Turks are not freely admitted to Germany, so the fact that they may not be able to speak German is not a ground for excluding them. Asked about the application of sanctions, she said that ECRI deplores, for example, the reduction of social welfare benefits on grounds of failure to attend an integration course.

Summing up the discussion, the chair observed that language courses are good, whereas tests and sanctions are sometimes a problem.

Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC) – Laurent Dalmasso

The IGC's purpose is to stimulate policy debate and facilitate information exchange on policy and its implementation. It is not an institution but a process, informal, non-political and non-decision-making. Participation is inter-regional and inter-governmental and involves like-minded states. The

focus is on common interests and common problems across the whole spectrum of migration. Participation in meetings is restricted.

Current participants in the IGC are seventeen countries (Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States), one supra-national body (the European Union), and two international organisations (the International Organisation for Migration and the United Nations High Commission for Refugees).

The IGC has a maximum of twenty meetings each year. Its work plan is drawn up by senior officials working with a full round of participating countries, a 'mini full round' and a steering group. Implementation of the work plan is supported by experts and carried out in ad hoc meetings and consultations, working groups and workshops. The chair of the IGC, which changes annually, establishes the themes for discussion – in 2010 Citizenship and Immigration/Integration Processes, and in 2011 Humanitarian Responses to Crises with Migration Consequences. Continuity is provided by the 'troika': the current, previous and next chairs (in 2010 USA, Finland and Germany respectively). The secretariat organises and facilitates meetings, acts as a 'clearing house for information', maintains networks of policy and operational experts, and provides advice and support for policy development.

The UNHCR, IOM, European Commission and Frontex participate regularly in IGC activities, while the Council of Europe, OECD, ICAO, Europol, academics, the private sector, etc. participate on a limited and ad hoc basis. Cooperation is a matter of sharing organisational and substantive methodologies (for example, the IGC's set-up, data collection, model legislation) and holding joint meetings with other Regional Consultative Processes (for example, the Budapest Group, Asia Pacific Consultations). Information exchange takes place in full round, mini full round and steering group meetings, in working groups and workshops, and via documentation and the IGC's databases. All information is stored on a secure website.

In 2005 the IGC held a workshop on integration policies; in 2006 the conclusion of its Strategic Review formally added immigration and integration to the process; and in 2007 it organised a workshop on immigrant youth. In 2008 the Integration Working Group was created, with a focus on pre-entry and introductory programmes and tests, migrants' sense of belonging, and social cohesion; a second phase dealt with more specific issues (e.g. indicators, reception in the host community, radicalisation). In 2010 the chair's theme is citizenship – approaches to citizenship and its role on the migration/integration continuum.

The IGC's discussion of integration starts with the approaches and needs of individual countries. External speakers are included; frameworks, integration issues and policy implications are debated; and comparisons are drawn between European and non-European states. It is considered important to bring policy makers and experts together and share practice from different perspectives. Discussions are supported by meetings and other forms of informal exchange. The IGC treats language as a sub-item in relation to introductory courses, agreements and tests, the host community, citizenship, and so on.

The first discussion dedicated wholly to language was held in the spring of 2008, when the focus was on standards and tools for assessing migrants' language competences. Subsequently, in the autumn

of 2009, there was a discussion of overall approaches to linguistic integration, the determination of levels and targets, incentives, language testing and assessment, and programme evaluation. Because they have a long tradition of immigration, non-European participants in the IGC tend to have a more consistent approach, with a strong link between language and settlement services. In Europe, by comparison, integration tends to be politicised. IGC deliberations have identified differences in structures and tools that reflect differences in target groups, training programmes, incentives, assessment practices, and strategies for evaluating the effectiveness of language training programmes.

Common challenges include: addressing diversity of needs while respecting the constraints of policy and practice; encouraging participation; achieving consistency of tools, methods and outcomes; achieving effective coordination at national level; measuring the impact of language learning on further education and job trajectories; and reaching out to specific groups (e.g. those with little education, rural groups, mothers at home). There is interest in tailor-made solutions that address real-life situations; alternative forms of assessment; the role of employers; evaluation frameworks for policies and programmes; and promoting awareness of best practice in, for example, teaching methods and testing. At the same time there is a need for guidelines and reference materials to support programme design and the development of teaching methods.

In response to questions, Laurent Dalmaso said that the IGC's discussion of evaluation indicated a need to discover the impact of language acquisition on employment and the impact of various factors on language acquisition. The IGC is interested in exploring local approaches to the use of indicators. Unlike ECRI, the IGC does not have a policy regarding the proportionality of language requirements and sanctions; that is not its function.

In concluding the discussion, the chair noted that the countries with a more relaxed attitude to immigration are countries to which Europeans immigrated. He added that monitoring needs to concern itself with a great deal more than language and the percentage of immigrants who pass the test.

A Canadian perspective – Patrick McEvenue, Citizenship and Immigration Canada

(chair: Sergei Khrychikov, Migration Division)

Canada accepts 240,000 new immigrants each year, more from Asia than from Europe. They have varied backgrounds, but many are well educated. Canada is the country with the lowest proportion of residents who consider immigration a problem rather than an opportunity. One in five immigrants must fulfil a language requirement before coming to Canada; there have always been language tests for skilled workers who want to immigrate to Canada. Once in Canada, immigrants have free access to language training for as long as they feel they need it. Courses are provided by provincial governments or a consortium that brings together Nova Scotia, Manitoba and Quebec. Each year 250,000 immigrants are involved in language training. However, there are no sanctions for non-participation, and most do not take a language course. The great majority of immigrants operate at levels of proficiency that are too low to allow maximal integration. The availability of language programmes varies from place to place. There is an increasing concern with outputs and value for money.

Three projects currently under way in Canada are relevant to the themes of the conference. The first is concerned with programme evaluation: Are teachers and the materials they use of good quality? The most recent evaluation was carried out in 2009. Participants were pre- and post-tested and compared with immigrants who had not taken a language course. The full results of the evaluation will be available on the Citizenship and Immigration Canada website by the end of summer 2010. The project has not been completely successful for two reasons. First, because participation in language courses is voluntary it is very difficult to set up an adequate control group; and secondly, because Canada does not have a national testing programme, the pre- and post-testing of participants was done using a placement test that was not able to discriminate with the necessary precision.

The second project is concerned with the development of a standardized test based on the Canadian Language Benchmarks. The test will enable newcomers to demonstrate their capacities when they are seeking accreditation from professional bodies, employment or admission to education. There is great concern about the use that will be made of the test, so every effort will be made to communicate how it can and should be used. The test will be voluntary, and it will be coupled with the use of portfolios.

Portfolios are the focus of the third project, which will be launched in autumn 2010. The project borrows from Europe, but also from work on portfolio assessment in Manitoba. The portfolio is designed to engage students and teachers in discussion that will increase their understanding of learning strengths and weaknesses. The portfolio project is also intended to provide professional development for teachers, helping them to reflect on how they monitor what is going on in their language classes and how they can change the teaching culture.

Closing session

(chair: Sergei Khrychikov)

Paulina Polownia, Adviser to the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights

European states are nowadays outrunning themselves in developing and applying policies which aim to restrict or even – as it appears sometimes – entirely deter the inflow of migrants into their territories, and they are becoming more and more creative in this process. They spend vast sums of money on tightening their external borders, running large-scale border control operations, and forcibly removing non-citizens. Recently some countries have even devised a system whereby they construct and fund orphanages in countries of origin in order to justify the return of unaccompanied migrant children to some of the most violent regions of the world.

But such actions of states not only conflict with their obligations under international law; they are also futile, because the human race is mobile and the movement of people cannot really be stemmed. People move, and will continue to do so, in pursuit of a better life, sometimes fleeing persecution, but also because they want to be part of another society, and are attracted by the values and way of life of a different nation.

European societies have always been pluralistic and diverse. Migrants continue to be present in virtually all countries, living side-by-side with the nationals of their host states. When walking the streets of many European cities or towns one can easily be struck by their ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity. And we should embrace this diversity, cherish it and learn to appreciate to what extent migrants enrich our societies. They broaden our perspectives, teach us empathy and help to overcome our Eurocentric, not to say egocentric, perceptions and prejudices. Provided of course that they are genuinely given the opportunity to become a part of our society.

Instead of wasting resources on the impossible and counterproductive task of deterring the influx of immigrants, states should *genuinely* focus on assisting newcomers to integrate into their host surroundings. Integration is key to the successful coexistence of immigrants and nationals in a country, and language learning plays a crucial role. Without properly learning the language of the host state, migrants will never become a part of the society they live in, or identify themselves with their host state and the values shared by its majority population, which is indeed what so many people fear.

Luckily, European states are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of developing comprehensive language teaching policies for immigrants. There is, however, no uniform practice in this area, and while in some states policies are well-developed and have been in place for several years, in others they are just in their early phases of application. There are three aspects of language learning that should be discussed here, as they are of particular importance in the debate about integration measures: 1) the practice of using command of a language as a prerequisite for receiving a visa, residence permit or citizenship; 2) the faulty assumption that immigrants themselves carry sole responsibility for the integration process; and finally 3) the situation of asylum seekers.

In the last few years several European countries have developed a policy of applying the rather undefined, or in any event non-homogeneous, criterion of the foreigners' 'integration' into a host society. Until recently integration was a goal in itself, and extending immigrants' rights was a tool in achieving this aim, rather than a 'reward'. Nowadays, in some states migrants must first prove that they are loyal and motivated, possess a certain knowledge of the history and culture of the host country and a satisfactory command of the official language, before they can obtain a permanent residence permit or receive citizenship. A similar practice has been developed with respect to family reunification.

However, these policies *do* foster exclusion and they *are* problematic from a human rights perspective. They are frequently discriminatory in nature, as the measures are applied with respect to nationals of some countries but not of others, and because the tests may require knowledge from foreigners that many nationals of the given state do not possess and are not expected to possess. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that migrants may have difficulties with learning a foreign language as a result of – for example – poor language skills, old age, illiteracy, or lack of time and energy for learning due to exhausting work. Finally, the impediments imposed on family reunification are particularly troubling, as they may entail a violation of the human right to respect for family life. It is thus essential that states evaluate their integration policies, draw conclusions from them, and improve them in order to guarantee that they are humane and fully respect the human rights of all migrants in the integration process.

The policies currently applied by some European states are the result of a faulty assumption that immigrants themselves are solely or mostly responsible for their successful integration into the host society, which is the second issue that needs to be addressed in this context. In principle, we are all aware of the fact that integration is a two-way process, as this is not a new concept. Nevertheless, this is not always obvious from states' policies and actions.

States bear a responsibility towards all persons staying in their territory, and therefore have a duty to create an environment for newcomers that facilitates their adaptation. In order to encourage migrants to integrate, they should be granted access to employment and education, as well as permitted to participate actively in public life. The right to family reunification should be respected without imposing unnecessary impediments, and the host state should offer sufficient opportunities to learn the language, with due regard of migrants' often vulnerable position. Last but not least, society itself must be open towards newcomers – it must show understanding for their language problems, and assist them in solving their daily troubles.

Finally, the situation of asylum seekers deserves special attention. Asylum seekers seem to be neglected by states as regards access to language learning and other integration measures, because their future in the host country is uncertain, and their stay could turn out to be temporary. However, states should realise that asylum seekers are lawfully residing in their territory pending the asylum procedure, which may last between several months and several years. Asylum seekers must not be subjected to involuntary idleness, but should enjoy all their human rights, including access to employment and the host country's education system, which also entails language learning.

To conclude, I would like to cite Tenzin Gyatso, the present Dalai Lama, who said: 'A good motivation is what is needed: compassion without dogmatism, without complicated philosophy; just understanding that others are human brothers and sisters and respecting their human rights and dignities. That we humans can help each other is one of our unique human capacities.' And it really is as simple as that.

Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Director General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport, DG IV, Council of Europe

It is a particular honour for me to make a few concluding remarks at this second intergovernmental conference focusing on the linguistic integration of adult migrants.

I am pleased to see that this conference has once again been attended by many representatives of member states (and from Canada), some of whom were present at the first meeting. This makes it possible to provide a new basis for intergovernmental co-operation in managing – in conformity with the law and in an equitable way – the language issues raised by migration in our societies. I am also very appreciative of the contributions to these exchanges from the OECD and the European Commission, which are working in the same direction as the Council of Europe, and from other international organisations which are very active in this field. And it is also very gratifying to see how these problems, which cut across various sectors but at the same time are very specific, have been addressed here from different but complementary perspectives, particularly those developed within our own organisation.

I was unable to take part in all your deliberations, but I am familiar with what you have been discussing from the texts already made available, relating to the evaluation of policies on language assistance and training for adult migrants. Clearly, language teaching and learning in the host societies could be improved through certification, more transparent programmes and reliable means of assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of arrangements. Furthermore, we should not underestimate the significant efforts of active citizens, often themselves from a migration background, who make a voluntary contribution to these social integration processes as part of numerous associations, and who need technical instruments along the lines of those we are devising together.

However, while of course it is imperative to ensure that public resources are wisely spent and that the language training on offer is professional and not a mere formal concession to the “European ethos”, it is also necessary to realise that the benefits of such policies will be seen only in the long term. Budgetary expenditure is immediate and highly visible; the benefits for member states and for Europe are not always quantifiable but are priceless for social cohesion in the future.

These measures are aimed at giving new arrivals and those already settled (I am thinking in particular of unemployed women) the linguistic skills they need for their social life and occupational activities in the societies where they have chosen to live. But above and beyond these essential immediate aspects, for anyone seeking to settle definitively in a new country, the language or languages of the societies into which they are integrating and those which are already part of their individual linguistic repertoire shape their very identity, reflecting what they are and what they are to be.

You are aware that the member states have assigned to proficiency in the languages, all the languages, of the European space, the role of contributing to the construction of a more human-oriented and inclusive Europe. The 3rd Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Council of Europe, held in Warsaw in May 2005, highlighted as priorities in its plan of action, promotion of cultural diversity, democratic citizenship and harmonious co-existence through intercultural education and developing inter-faith dialogue in order to “build cohesive societies by ensuring fair access to social rights, fighting exclusion and protecting vulnerable social groups”.⁹ These subjects are not of a strictly linguistic nature and yet languages, all languages, are an essential instrument of cultural dialogue and social inclusion.

The central nature of intercultural dialogue was highlighted in the *White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue* – whose drafting I co-ordinated – launched by the Foreign Ministers of the Council of Europe member states at their 118th session (6 and 7 May 2008). The White Paper sets out various guidelines for promoting respect and mutual understanding, based on the fundamental values of the organisation.

The intercultural approach it advocates is a model for managing cultural diversity, essential for the future of multilingual and multicultural European societies, the cohesion of which it can help to secure. Migrant or immigrant populations are just one aspect of that diversity, and one of the most visible as it is seen as potentially challenging the supposed national cultural identity. Constructing the identity of a plural society concerns us all and no-one, as stated in the *White Paper*, “should be

⁹ Warsaw Declaration, §7

confined against their will within a particular group, community, thought-system or world view, but should be free to renounce past choices and make new ones – as long as they are consistent with the universal values of human rights, democracy and the rule of law.”

Languages are the building blocks of these evolving identities, those of migrants and residents alike, even though the latter may not regard languages as posing a problem. The teaching of the language or languages of the society into which people are seeking to integrate must see to it that everyone’s plurilingualism is a source of enrichment and is not experienced as a source of humiliation and marginalisation, which can be replicated from generation to generation.

In this sense, the linguistic integration of adult migrants cannot but be part of plurilingual education, in other words education in *linguistic goodwill*. Language proficiency does not necessarily guarantee human comprehension, but the latter inevitably involves words and statements in all languages. Linguistic goodwill means being curious about unfamiliar languages, and showing admiration, or at least respect, for those who use your language, tolerance if it is used imperfectly (but any competence in a language, even if limited, is worthy of respect), fraternal acknowledgement for those who choose to preserve their accent in the language they have learned as a sign of their identity.

As you know, languages are an appropriate way of expressing the uniqueness of groups, of all groups and of all individuals. We need to take action, here, to ensure that they do not become a pretext to create or recreate barriers and isolate people. The Council of Europe has opted, which may seem paradoxical from a common sense point of view, to regard languages as something that unites and through which each individual gives life to diversity, a founding principle for developing non-exclusionary attitudes which will ensure integration in the long term. I know that it is in this spirit that you have come to Strasbourg and I am confident that you will apply these democratic principles even more in your future action. For this, on behalf of the Council of Europe, and in my own name, I thank you very warmly.

Summary of conclusions

David Little

Topic 1 – Developing curricula and training programmes

Use of the CEFR to develop curricula and training programmes always implies adaptation and transposition. CEFR-related reference tools have been developed for a number of languages, but not in relation to the integration needs of migrants or the professional needs of migrants’ language teachers. However, a multi-dimensional project in this domain was recently launched in Switzerland. Account needs to be taken of feedback from participants when evaluating training programmes.

Topic 2 – Applying the principles of the CEFR

The CEFR was not developed with the needs of migrants in mind. Nevertheless, some countries use it to determine the level of tests, some use it to design curricula, and some use it for tests and curricula. How can we ensure that course providers link their teaching to CEFR levels?

- *Could the Council of Europe produce guidelines for the development of language courses for migrants that take account of the CEFR?*

- *Could such guidelines include descriptors that reflect the communicative needs of migrants?*

Topic 3 – Dealing with different needs

Diverse needs imply that provision should also be diverse. Courses should take account of the fact that needs evolve as learning progresses, which means that it may be necessary to allow learners to change courses. There may be a tension between attempting to respond to needs on an individual basis and maintaining the linguistic coherence of the programme in question.

- *Could the Council of Europe produce guidelines for needs analysis – perhaps a document that brings together all the parameters that described migrant situations and migrant groups?*
- *Migrants with low literacy skills present a special challenge: could the Council of Europe develop a tool that addresses needs below the level of A1?*

Topic 4 – Teacher training and development

Specialized training for teachers in this domain is already available in some countries; although essential it is not always easy to deliver. Such training should be shaped by an analysis of teachers' needs and should always include intercultural education to help teachers manage diversity in their classrooms. It is important to bear in mind that teachers can develop professionally in a number of ways that do not involve taking a course: mentoring, peer observation, independent learning, etc.

- *Could the Council of Europe do more in this area, perhaps by facilitating the exchange of good practice?*

Topic 5 – Quality assurance

There is a need for standards in order to describe and measure the quality of curricula, course design and delivery, and teacher training.

- *Could the Council of Europe develop guidelines on quality assurance in these areas? Such a project might entail the dynamic development and gradual refinement of existing quality indicators.*

Topic 6 – Evaluating effectiveness and impact

Integration depends on all citizens sharing in the creation of a society based on shared principles expressed as equal rights and common responsibilities.

The Council of Europe has produced a document to help member states explore the effectiveness of integration: *Measurement and indicators of integration* (available online).

- *Could the Council of Europe produce guidelines for (i) measuring the immediate impact of language programmes for adult migrants and (ii) encouraging participation in the programmes?*

Topic 7 – Incentivising migrants to take advantage of the training

Low motivation and high levels of drop-out are often serious problems. To guard against this, courses need to be adapted to learners' specific needs. Tests may help motivation, but they may also encourage the wrong kind of learning focus. Motivation may be helped by shortening the waiting period for citizenship. A portfolio that allows migrant learners to demonstrate their skills in the language of the host country could help to motivate them (the European Language Portfolio is a readily available resource). Research in Flanders showed that drop-out was due to the quality and relevance of courses. Low motivation may also result from the attitude of the host society: 'Why should I learn the language when no one wants to talk to me?'

Topic 8 – After courses, what then?

There is widespread recognition of the importance of connecting language courses with the wider context of migrants' lives: many initiatives were reported.

- *Migrants who are illiterate in their first language and/or have little education present a particular challenge: Could the Council of Europe do more to support member states in responding to this challenge?*

Some concluding reflections prompted by the CEFR

Consider these descriptors for SPOKEN INTERACTION:

- A1 I can introduce somebody and use basic greeting and leave-taking expressions
- A2 I can make simple transactions in shops, post offices or banks
- B1 I can start, maintain and close simple face-to-face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest
- B2 I can initiate, maintain and end discourse naturally with effective turn-taking
- C1 I can use the language fluently, accurately and effectively on a wide range of general, professional or academic topics
- C2 I can take part effortlessly in all conversations and discussions with native speakers

Now consider the teachability of the CEFR levels. A1 and A2 descriptors mostly refer to discrete tasks and routine scenarios that play a central role in most versions of communicative language teaching. From B1 upwards, however, descriptors refer to increasingly general and complex communicative activity. 'I can start, maintain and close simple face-to-face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest' (B1) requires an extended period of learning in which the target language is (at least) the medium of classroom interaction. 'I can initiate, maintain and end discourse naturally with effective turn-taking' (B2) requires a complex of skills that cannot be imparted by a teacher in a classroom: it requires sustained use of the target language in communication with native speakers in a variety of academic and/or professional contexts. Migrants are likely to achieve more than A2 in the language of the host country *only* if they use that language in their daily lives – in the workplace, in informal social interaction, and in further or higher education. These communicative possibilities are not open to all migrants. When after many years of residence, migrants still have low levels of proficiency in the language of the host country, that is evidence of limited integration. There are many circumstances in which this cannot be avoided, but it is not something for which the migrants themselves can be blamed.

Close of the conference

Sergei Khrychikov and Philia Thalgott

Sergei Khrychikov suggested that the key challenge is to find ways of using language support to promote effective integration. Increasingly, the integration of migrants is a transversal issue for the Council of Europe, and further action must be a matter of joint effort. Philia Thalgott reminded participants that their contribution is necessary to ensure that the process of the Conference is continued in their member states, for instance regarding initiatives based on Council of Europe tools and resources. She encouraged them to use and disseminate the documents available on the website, in particular the Concept Paper, Thematic Studies and the document '[Adult migrant integration policies: Principles and implementation](#)' containing an overview of policy principles and a summary of studies and to disseminate them to colleagues.

She recalled that the Language Policy Division offers support to member states in developing their « Language Education Policy Profile » - a forward-looking self-evaluation of policies with the assistance of Council of Europe experts: while this activity currently concerns language policies in general, it can be adapted to focus specifically on aspects related to the linguistic integration of migrants. She underlined that the Council of Europe is committed to responding to needs expressed by authorities and consequently, so as to ensure relevance for further action, member states are invited to avail of the offer to formulate concrete needs. She pointed out that the Division's website offers authorities a space where they can publish official texts and initiatives which may interest other states (or provide links to their own websites), and that it is intended to invite member states to provide examples of good practice.

Appendix 1 : Conference programme

DIRECTORATE GENERAL III <i>Migration Division</i> www.coe.int/migration	DIRECTORATE GENERAL IV <i>Language Policy Division</i> www.coe.int/lang
LINGUISTIC INTEGRATION OF ADULT MIGRANTS: TOWARDS THE EVALUATION OF POLICY AND PRACTICE <i>Intergovernmental Conference</i>	
Strasbourg, 24-25 June 2010 Council of Europe - Room G 02 - Agora	



Thursday 24 June

8.15 - 8.50	<i>Registration: Room G 02 - Agora Building, Quai Jacoutot</i>
09.00 - 10.15 <i>Chair: Philia Thalgott</i>	OFFICIAL OPENING Council of Europe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Joseph Sheils</i>, Head of the Department of Language Education and Policy, DG IV • <i>María Ochoa-Llido</i>, Head of the Migration and Roma Department, DG III • <i>Michel Villan</i>, Chair, European Committee on Migration (CDMG) • <i>Tineke Strik</i>, Committee on Migration, Refugees and Population - Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) International organisations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Teresa Condeço</i>, European Commission • <i>Georges Lemaitre</i>, OECD
10.15 - 10.45	INTRODUCTION TO THE CONFERENCE David Little, Rapporteur
10.45 - 11.15	Break
11.15 - 12.15	LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR ADULT MIGRANTS IN COUNCIL OF EUROPE MEMBER STATES: <i>REPORT ON A FOLLOW-UP SURVEY</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claire Extramiana and Piet van Avermaet Plenary discussion: <i>Comments and Questions</i>
12.15 - 14.15	Cold Lunch (provided)
[12.45 - 14.00]	[Room G 02 + G 05: Presentations of national / regional projects and discussion]
14.15 - 14.30 <i>Chair:</i> Richard Rossner	PLENARY Contextualisation of key issues from the Council of Europe viewpoint Set of key questions to assist an evaluation of effectiveness / impact
14.30 - 16.15	DISCUSSION GROUPS [Rooms G 02 / G 05 / B3-06C]
16.15 - 16.45	Break
16.45 - 17.45 <i>Chair / Moderator</i> Jean-Claude Beacco	PLENARY FEEDBACK: <i>ROUND TABLE WITH GROUP RAPORTEURS</i> Discussion

Friday 25 June

09.00 – 09.15	PLENARY
<i>Chair:</i> Piet van Avermaet	Introduction to 2nd session of group work Presentation on second set of challenging statements
09.15 – 10.45	DISCUSSION GROUPS [Rooms G 02 / G 05 / B3-06C]
10.45 – 11.15	Break
11.15 – 12.15	PLENARY FEEDBACK: <i>ROUND TABLE WITH GROUP RAPPORTEURS</i>
<i>Chair / Moderator:</i> Claire Extramiana	Discussion
12.15 – 14.00	Lunch
14.00 – 15.00	ROUND TABLE
<i>Chair:</i> Hans-Jürgen Krumm	Participants will briefly present the work of their body and respond to the issues raised during the Conference <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Barbara John</i>, European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) [www.coe.int/ECRI]• <i>Jan Niessen</i>, Migration Policy Group [www.migpolgroup.com]• <i>Laurent Dalmasso</i>, IGC (Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees) [www.igc.ch]
15.00 – 15.15	A Canadian perspective: Patrick McEvenue, Ottawa
15.15 – 15.45	CLOSING SESSION
<i>Chair:</i> Serguey Khrychikov	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Paulina Polownia</i>, Adviser to the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights• <i>Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni</i>, Director General of Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport, DG IV Summary of Conclusions: David Little, Rapporteur Close of the conference: Philia Thalgott / Sergey Khrychikov

Exhibition of material provided by participants on national / regional initiatives or projects

(Details of the organisational arrangements for the exhibition and lunch-break presentations are available at www.coe.int/lang)

Coordinating Group

- Piet van Avermaet, Director of the Centre for Diversity and Learning, University of Ghent, Belgium
- Jean-Claude Beacco, University of Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris III, France
- Claire Extramiana, Délégation à la langue française et aux langues de France (DGLFLF), Ministry of Culture and Communication, Paris, France
- Hans-Jürgen Krumm, University of Vienna, Austria
- David Little, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland, *Conference Rapporteur*
- Richard Rossner, Chief Executive, The European Association for Quality Language Services (EAQUALS)

Council of Europe Secretariat

- Joseph Sheils, Head of the Language Policy Division, DG IV
- Philia Thalgott, Administrator, Language Policy Division, DG IV - *Conference co-ordinator*
- Sergey Khrychikov, Administrator, Migration Division, DG III

Appendix 2 : Pre-conference questionnaire

→ [Compilation of Pre-Conference questionnaires](#) on “Policy and practice in states” submitted by 18 member states before the Conference

COUNTRY:.....
.....

NAME:

Working language(s) *English*: yes / no *French*: yes / no

Please read the questions below. It would be preferable for one questionnaire to be returned by each country. If *more than one* needs to be returned due to regional or other differences, please *mention the name(s)* of anyone else returning a questionnaire from your country.

1. Please describe briefly how the impact of policy and practice in your country is being evaluated
.....

2. What information have the results evaluation in your country provided with regard to impact of linguistic integration policy and practice on:
 - a. the reunification of migrants’ families:
 - b. the access of migrants to residence permits:
 - c. the access of migrants to the labour market:
 - d. their access to nationality/citizenship :

2. What changes, if any, have been made or are proposed as a result of the evaluation so far carried out?
.....

3. Please describe briefly any initiatives in your country that you consider has been successful (you may wish to present one of these during the lunchtime [exchange forum](#))
.....

4. Please also describe what you and your colleagues consider to be the main challenges in developing and implementing effective policies for the linguistic integration of adult migrants in your country
.....

Results have been collected and are available online www.coe.int/lang (section Events / Conference on Migrants 2010 / Compilation)

Appendix 3: Survey questionnaire sent to member states in November 2009

Council of Europe Survey: *Linguistic Integration of Adult Migrants*

COUNTRY

Respondent :

Name

e-mail @

Function & Institution

General information on the country:

Number of migrants entering the country per year

Ratio (in %) of migrants in total population

***General information on training and evaluation of migrants
(Sept 2008 > June 2009)***

Number of migrants taking courses

% of migrants completing a course

Number of migrants taking a test

% of migrants passing tests

NOTE:

This survey consists of 3 series of similar questions but addressing 3 different categories of migrants:

a) [Family reunion](#) (before entering host country)

b) [Permanent Residence Permit](#)

c) [Citizenship](#) (nationality).

You are invited to indicate on the top of each section (grey boxes) whether there are - or not - specific regulations for each category (if yes: please specify). A set of Guidelines accompanies this survey.*



NB: the questionnaire sent to member states contained 3 sets of 19 questions for each of the 3 categories

A. Family Reunion (before entering host country)

(one table per category)

	No	Yes, specified below	Yes, same as for Category ...
Specific regulations?			

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Tuition / test before entering host country	Integration programme	Language tuition officially offered Duration / Type of institution	Specific provision for illiterate migrants?	Tuition up to which level(s)?	Tuition cost for migrant	Sanctions if no/ low attendance	Attendance: incentive	Tuition : quality assurance
	Tuition: YES / NO Test: YES / NO	NO or OPTIONAL or OBLIGATORY	NO or OPTIONAL or OBLIGATORY	YES / NO	A1 - C2	0,00 euros (approx.)	YES / NO	YES / NO	a) course accreditation: YES / NO b) inspection: yes/no c) teacher qualification: YES / NO
[Type of answer - indicate one of the options in this line]									
ALL >									
<i>EU Residents: only fill in if special arrangements applicable</i>									
COMMENTS	Oral ? Written? Levels? urpose? ...	Areas covered? ...	Target groups? ...	Specify if provision for other groups with special needs			Please specify ...	Please specify ...	
GENERAL COMMENTS									

(continued) **Category A: Family Reunion**

	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
	Curriculum Framework / Guidelines for tuition	Is the effectiveness of programmes measured ?	Language test: level(s)?	Language test (+ cost for candidate)	Sanctions if test not taken or failed	Advantages of taking or passing a test	Knowledge of Society tuition (KoS)	KoS test & cost	Information technologies	Date of legislation
	YES / NO	YES / NO	A1 – C2	NO or OPTIONAL or OBLIGATORY approx. cost 0,00 euros	YES, inot taken YES, failed NO	YES / NO	YES, integrated YES, independent NO	NO or OPTIONAL or OBLIGATORY (in which language?) approx. cost 0,00 euros	Please refer to questions on page 7	DATE
[Type of answer:- indicate <i>one</i> of the options in this line]										
ALL >										
<i>EU Residents: only fill in if special arrangements applicable</i>										
COMMENTS	- If 'no': how are courses designed? ...	If yes, how? ...			Specify: ...	Specify: ...				
GENERAL COMMENTS										

Question 20

Are computer-based systems (connected to the Internet or not) or other digital devices used in the context of language and/or KOS education?

Please tick the appropriate box(es). Multiple YES answers are admitted

Please indicate relevant categories as appropriate:

- A (Family reunion – before entering the country)
- B (Permanent Residence)
- C (Citizenship (Nationality))

x	A or B or C?	
		1 NO and there is no official plan to use them in the near future
		2 NO but we have ideas/plans to use them in the near future
		3 YES for the language test before entering the country
		4 YES for language assessment before starting language tuition
		5 YES to provide language tuition (and/or KOS course) at a distance
		6 YES to provide language tuition (and/or KOS course) in the classroom
		7 YES to provide support to learners outside of classroom time
		8 YES for the language (and/or KOS) test at the end of the course
		9 YES to provide special training and/or support to teachers
		10 YES for other purposes. Specify: ..

Appendix 4: Evaluation of conference and feedback from participants

The evaluation questionnaire was completed by 29 participants from 18 Council of Europe member states and four other bodies.

Participants were asked to rate

- i. the relevance and added value of the conference
- ii. the helpfulness of the conference documents and the satisfactoriness of the conference preparation
- iii. the design of the conference

using a four-point scale, where 1 = *not at all relevant/helpful/satisfactory* and 4 = *very relevant/helpful/satisfactory*. The average ratings were as follows:

	Member states	Others
i. <i>How relevant was the event and what was its specific added value?</i>	3.5	3.0
ii. <i>How helpful were the conference documents and information? Was the preparation/guidance satisfactory?</i>	3.8	4.0
iii. <i>How did you find the design of the event: format, content, possibility of participation and exchange?</i>	3.8	3.2

Participants were also asked three open questions, their responses to which are summarised below:

- i. *What impact might this event have for your country?*

Participants thought that the conference

- might stimulate the evaluation of language programmes in host countries
- could help to bring the experience of EU member states to bear on decision making in Brussels
- had contributed to the building up of expertise that can be exploited in policy development and policy evaluation
- could help to inform the design of quality language programmes for adult migrants
- had provided useful information about what is happening in other countries and an opportunity to exchange ideas and experience
- could lead to a re-evaluation of current policy and practice in member states

- ii. *From your perspective, how could the Council of Europe further support your work in this area in follow-up activities to this event (among those proposed or others)?*

- Produce guidelines for the design of language programmes for adult migrants, perhaps supported by a Recommendation
- Produce quality assurance guidelines for such programmes
- Develop guidelines for the design of teacher training programmes
- Develop a portfolio to support the training of language teachers

- Develop a portfolio for adult migrants
- Develop a toolkit for analysing the language learning needs of adult migrants
- Develop a kit to support literacy development in adult migrants
- Develop guidelines on assessment and evaluation
- Coordinate the dissemination of information
- Explore gender issues relevant to the integration of adult migrants
- Organise seminars/conferences on evaluating the impact of integration procedures and language programmes for adult migrants
- Organise a follow-up conference in 2012 and local events in cooperation with the relevant ministry
- Organise annual conferences in order to provide a discussion platform for member states
- Make more materials available on the website, with links to relevant agencies, projects, etc. in member states
- Disseminate information on successful short-term projects
- Compile a directory of best practice according to the themes discussed at the conference
- Develop a framework specification below CEFR level A1 for language learners with low literacy in their home language

iii. Any other comments

- The conference was very well prepared
- The group discussions were highly relevant and intensive
- The size of the discussion groups ensured that everyone had an opportunity to contribute
- The conference documents were particularly interesting and informative

Appendix 5: List of participants

NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES / REPRESENTANTS NATIONAUX

ARMENIA / ARMENIE

Mr Robert SUKIASYAN, Head of Higher Education Department (Head of Department of Higher and Postgraduate Specialized Education), Ministry of Education and Science of Armenia, 3 Government Building, 6th floor, 0010 YEREVAN

Tel: 37477 466904 /37410 589526 / e-mail: suqias@yahoo.com (info@edu.am)

WL/LT: E

AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE

Mr Philippe KUPFER, Federal Ministry of the Interior, Directorate-General III (Legal Affairs), Branchdirectorat III-B-2, Herrengasse 7, , P.O. Box 100, A - 1014 VIENNA

Tel: 43 (0)1 53126-2353 / Fax:43 (0)1 53126-3137 / e-mail: philippe.kupfer@bmi.gv.at

WL/LT: E

BELGIUM / BELGIQUE

French Community / Communauté française

M. Michel VILLAN, Président du CDMG, Directeur, Direction de l'intégration des personnes étrangères et de l'égalité des chances, Direction générale opérationnelle 'Pouvoirs locaux, action sociale et santé', Service public de Wallonie, 100, Avenue G. Bovesse - B - 5100 NAMUR

Tel: 32.(0)81.327351 / 38733492407 / Fax: 32.(0)81.327215 / e-mail : Michel.Villan@spw.wallonie.be

WL/LT: F

Commission communautaire française de la Région de Bruxelles-Capitale

Mme Marie-Pierre DURT, Attachée principale, Services des Affaires sociales - Secteur de la Cohésion sociale, Commission communautaire française, Rue des Palais, 42, B - 1030 BRUXELLES

Tel: 3 800 81 25 / e-mail: mpdurt@cocof.irisnet.be

WL/LT: F

Mme Martine BAUWENS, Attachée principale, Service des Affaires sociales - Secteur de la Cohésion sociale, Commission communautaire française, Rue des Palais, 42, B - 1030 BRUXELLES

Tel: 32 800 84 23 / e-mail: mbauwens@cocof.irisnet.be

WL/LT: F

Flemish Community / Communauté flamande

Ms Reinhilde PULINX, Scientific researcher, Centre for Diversity and Learning, Ghent University, Sint-Pietersnieuwstraat 49, B - 9000 GENT

e-mail: reinhilde.pulinx@ugent.be

WL/LT: E

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA / BOSNIE –HERZEGOVINE

M. Mirsad BUZAR, Chef du Département de l'appui opérationnel du renseignement.

e-mail : mirsad.buzar@sps.gov.ba

WL/LT:

CYPRUS / CHYPRE

Mr Panayiotis STAVRINOS, Director, Adult Education Centres, Larnaca – Famagusta, Ministry of Education and Culture, 1434 NICOSIA

Tel mobile: 357 99 47 46 28 / Fax: 357 24 30 45 87 / e-mail: epimorfotika.lar@schools.ac.cy

WL/LT: E

CZECH REPUBLIC/ REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE

Ms Hana FRYDOVA, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport, Department for Equal Opportunities in Education, 7, Karmelitska, 118 12 PRAHA 1

Tel: 420224398233 / e-mail: hana.frydova@msmt.cz

WL/LT: E

Ms Dagmar SIMAKOVA, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport, Department for Equal Opportunities in Education, 7, Karmelitska, 118 12 PRAHA 1

Tel: 420 224 398 224 / e-mail: dagmar.simakova@msmt.cz

WL/LT: E

DENMARK / DANEMARK

Mr Mikkel Max GRUNDTVIG HAUG, Head of Section, Division for Danish Courses, Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs, Holbergsgade 6, DK - 1057 KØBENHAVN K

Tel: 33 92 33 80 / Direct: 33 92 37 54 / Fax: 33 11 12 39 / e-mail: inm@inm.dk

WL/LT: E/F

ESTONIA / ESTONIE

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

Tel: 372 7350 229 - 222/ Fax: 372 730 1080 / e-mail: maie.soll@hm.ee

WL/LT: E

FINLAND / FINLANDE

Ms Paula KUUSIPALO, Project Manager (ESF / ALPO), Ministry of the Interior / Migration Department, PO BOX 26, 00230 GOVERNMENT

Visiting address: Vuorikatu 20 A, HELSINKI

Tel: 358 71 878 8648 / Mobile: 358 50 456 2576 / Fax: 358 71 87 88655 / e-mail: Paula.Kuusipalo@intermin.fi

WL/LT: E

FRANCE

Mme Aliette FRANÇOIS, Chef de bureau de l'accueil et de l'intégration linguistique, Bureau de l'accueil en France et de l'intégration linguistique, Direction de l'accueil, de l'intégration et de la citoyenneté, Ministère de l'immigration, de l'intégration, de l'identité nationale et du développement solidaire, 101, rue de Grenelle, 75323 PARIS cedex 07

aliette.francois@iminidco.gouv.fr;

WL/LT: F

Mme Christine CANDIDE, Chargée de mission, Bureau de l'accueil en France et de l'intégration linguistique, Direction de l'accueil, de l'intégration et de la citoyenneté, Ministère de l'immigration, de l'intégration, de l'identité nationale et du développement solidaire, 101, rue de Grenelle, 75323 PARIS cedex 07

Tél: 01 72 71 68 42 / e-mail: christine.candide@iminidco.gouv.fr

WL/LT: F

GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Ms Kathrin OTTE, Deputy Head of Division, Integration Policies, Federal Ministry of the Interior, Alt-Moabit 101 D, D - 10559 BERLIN

Tel.: 49 30 18 681-2140 / Fax: 49 30 18 681-5 2140 / e-mail: kathrin.otte@bmi.bund.de

WL/LT: E

Ms Erika HOFFMANN, Section 322, Aspects of Linguistic and Political Education, Conception of Courses, Teacher Qualification, Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Frankenstr. 210, D - 90461 NUREMBERG

Tel: 0911/943 - 6118 / fax: 0911 - 943 - 5007/ e-mail: erika.hoffmann@bamf.bund.de

WL/LT: E

GREECE / GRECE

Mr Joseph E. CHRYSOCHOOS, Educational Consultant at the Pedagogic Institute, 94 Pindou Street,
GR – 18345 MOSCHATO

Tel: 30 210 6000 581 / e-mail: jchrys@otenet.gr

WL/LT: E/F

Dr George ANDROULAKIS, Associate Professor, of Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching, Department of
Primary Education, University of Thessaly, Argonafton & Filellinon, GR-38221 VOLOS

Tel: 30 24210 74653 / e-mail: androulakis@uth.gr

WL/LT: E/F

IRELAND / IRLANDE

Mr Stephen BEARPARK, National Co-ordinator, Adult Refugee Programme, Co. Dublin VEC, 1 Tuansgate,
Belgard Square East, Tallaght, DUBLIN 24.

Tel: 353 87 2196854 / 353 1 4529600 extension 188 / e-mail: stephenbearpark@codubvec.ie

[WL/LT: E](#)

ITALY / ITALIE

(Observer)

Ms Sara PISANI, Referente Sportello Albetizzazione, Consorzio Pubbico Servizio alla Persona, Comune di
Viadana (MN), Piazza Turati n. 5, I - 26041 CASALMAGGIORE, CREMONA

mobile: 39 328 3310143 / e-mail: sarapisani@excite.it

WL/LT: E

LIECHTENSTEIN / LIECHTENSTEIN

Mr Alex BIEDERMANN, dipl. betr. oec. FH, Leiter Bewilligungen und Integration ('Immigration Division'),
Ausländer- und Passamt (APA), Liechtensteinische Landesverwaltung, Städtle 38, P.O.Box 684, FL-9490
VADUZ

Tel: 423 236 61 45 / Fax: 423 236 61 66 / e-mail: Alex.Biedermann@apa.llv.li

WL/LT: E

M. René MEIER, Ausländer- und Passamt, Integrationsbeauftragter, Städtle 38, FL - 9490 VADUZ

Tel. 423 236 61 69 / Fax 423 236 61 64 / e-mail: rene.Meier@apa.llv.li

WL/LT: F

LITHUANIA / LITUANIE

Mr Ricardas TOTORAİTIS, Deputy Head of the Academic Mobility and Continuing Education, Division of the
Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Education and Science, A.Volano 2/7, LT-01516 VILNIUS

Tel: 370 5 2191158 / Fax: 370 5 2 61 20 77 / e-mail: ricardas.totoraitis@smm.lt

WL/LT: E

LUXEMBOURG

Mme Gaby KUNSCH, Directrice, Institut National des Langues, 21, boulevard de la Foire, L - 1528
LUXEMBOURG

Tel: 352 26 44 30 333 / Fax: 352 26 44 30 319 / e-mail: gaby.kunsch@insl.lu

WL/LT: F/E

Mme Christiane MARTIN, Directrice, Office luxembourgeois de l'accueil et de l'intégration (OLAI), 7-9,
avenue Victor Hugo, L-1750 LUXEMBOURG

Tel: 352 247-85777 / Fax: 352 247-85720 / e-mail: christiane.martin@olai.etat.lu

WL/LT: F

MOLDOVA

Ms Nadejda VELIȘCO, Head of the Department for Educational Technologies, Ministry of Education, 1 Piata Marii Adunari Nationale, MD-2033 CHISINAU

Tel: 373 22 232443 / Fax: 373 22 233515 / e-mail: nvelisco@yahoo.com

WL/LT: E

NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Ms Suzanne HAFIDI-GEVERS, Senior Policy advisor for integration policy, Communities and Integration, Ministerie van VROM/WWI, Postbus 30941, NL - 2500 GX DEN HAAG

Interne postcode 295 / e-mail: Suzanne.Hafidi@minvrom.nl

WL/LT: E

Ms Eva MERCKS, Policy official civic integration examination in the Netherlands, Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, Citizenship and Integration Department, PO. Box 30941, 2500 GX THE HAGUE

Tel: 070 – 3390444 / Fax: 070 – 3390619 / e-mail: eva.mercks2@minvrom.nl

WL/LT: E

NORWAY / NORVEGE

Ms Helga ARNESEN, senior adviser, Norwegian Agency for Lifelong Learning, The Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, Pb 6139 Etterstad, N - 0602 OSLO

Tel: 23 38 13 14 / 93 43 93 49 / e-mail: helga.arnesen@vox.no

WL/LT: E

Ms Ingun WESTLUND, senior adviser, Norwegian Agency for Lifelong Learning, The Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, Pb 6139 Etterstad, N - 0602 OSLO

Tel: 23 38 13 14 / 93 43 93 49 / e-mail: ingun.westlund@vox.no

WL/LT: E

SLOVAK REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE (Apologised for absence / Excusés)

Mr Lukas BERINEC, Director, Department of International Cooperation and Intergration of Foreigners, Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family, Spitalska 4-6, 816 43 BRATISLAVA

e-mail: lukas.berinec@employment.gov.sk

Mr Jan VOZAR, Department of International Cooperation and Intergration of Foreigners, Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Family, Spitalska 4-6, 816 43 BRATISLAVA

Tel: 421 2 20461606/ e-il: jan.vozar@employment.gov.sk

SPAIN / ESPAGNE

M. Miguel Angel GIL, Chef de la division du Plan d'Action, DG de l'Intégration des Migrants, Ministère du Travail et de l'immigration, c/ José Abascal, 39, SP - 28071 MADRID

Tel: 34 91 363 81 52 / Fax: 34 91 363 70 56 / e-mail: magilleal@mtin.es

WL/LT: E/F

SWITZERLAND / SUISSE

Mme Isabel BARTAL, Coordinatrice, Rahmenkonzept Sprachförderung, Département fédéral de justice et police DFJP, Office fédéral des migrations ODM, Domaine de direction Travail, Intégration et Droit du citoyen, Section intégration, Quellenweg 6, CH - 3003 BERN-WABERN

Tel: 31 323 85 52 / Fax: 31 323 43 37 / e-mail: isabel.bartal@bfm.admin.ch

WL/LT: F

TURKEY / TURQUIE

Mr Salih MORALI, Deputy Director of Foreigners, Borders and Asylum Department, Turkish National Police, Ministry of Interior, Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü, Yabancılar Hudut İltica Daire Başkanlığı, İlkadım caddesi no:89, İKMEN/ANKARA

Tel: 90 312 412 32 55 / e-mail: smorali@egm.gov.tr

WL/LT: E

Mr Engin YURUR, Deputy Director General of Consular Affairs, Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Asylum and Visa, Dr. Sadik Ahmet Caddesi No:8, 06100 BALGAT-ANKARA

Tel: 90 312 223 60 96 / e-mail eyurur@mfa.gov.tr

WL/LT: E

UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Mr Chris HEDGES, Policy Manager, UK Border Agency, Home Office, 9th Floor, B Block, Whitsift Centre, Wellesley Road, UK - CROYDON CR9 3AR

e-mail: chris.hedges2@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

WL/LT: E

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

CANADA

Mr Patrick McEVENUE, Senior Policy Analyst / Analyste principal en politiques, NHQ - Integration / AC – Intégration, Citizenship and Immigration Canada | Citoyenneté et Immigration Canada, 180 Kent Street Ottawa ON K1A 1L1, 180 rue Kent, OTTAWA ON K1A 1L1 / CANADA

Tel: 613-952-2561 Fax: 613-952-7416 : e-mail: Patrick.McEvenue@cic.gc.ca

WL/LT: E

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

PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE (PACE) / ASSEMBLEE PARLEMENTAIRE DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE (APCE) – www.assembly.coe.int

Committee on Migration, Refugees and Population / Comité sur les Migrations, les Réfugiés et la Population

Mr John GREENWAY, Chairperson of the Committee on Migration, Refugees and Population, House of Commons, Overseas Office, 7 Millbank, UK - SW1P 3JA – London

e-mail : coepa.del@parliament.uk

WL/LT: E

EUROPEAN COMMISSION AGAINST RACISM AND INTOLERANCE (ECRI) / COMMISSION EUROPEENNE CONTRE LE RACISME ET L'INTOLERANCE www.coe.int/ecri

Ms Barbara JOHN, Koordinatorin für Sprachförderung, Senatsverwaltung für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Forschung, Otto-Braun-Str. 27, D – BERLIN-MITTE

Tel: 49 30 90227 5604 / Fax: 49 30 90227 5005 / e-mail: barbara.john@senbwf.berlin.de

WL/LT: E

EUROPEAN COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION / COMITÉ EUROPÉEN SUR LES MIGRATIONS (CDMG)

M. Michel VILLAN, Président du CDMG / Chair of CDMG - e-mail : Michel.Villan@spw.wallonie.be

WL/LT: F

OTHER ORGANISATIONS / AUTRES ORGANISATIONS

European Commission / Commission européenne

Mme Teresa CONDEÇO, Coordonnateur des politiques – Langues et dialogue interculturel, Unité Politique pour le multilinguisme, Direction générale de l'éducation et de la culture, Commission européenne – EAC.C.5., MADO 16/059, B-1049 BRUXELLES

Tel: 32.2.29.67322 / e-mail: teresa.condeco@ec.europa.eu

WL/LT: F/E

OECD / OCDE

Mr Georges LEMAITRE, International Migration Division, 2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS Cedex 16

Tel: 33 1 4524-9163 / Fax: 33 1 4524-7604 / e-mail: Georges.LEMAITRE@oecd.org

WL/LT: E

Migration Policy Group (MPG)

Mr Jan NIESSEN, Director, MPG, 205 rue Belliard - Box 1 - B-1040 BRUSSELS

Tel: 32 2 230 5930 / Fax: 32 2 280 0925 / JNiessen@migpolgroup.com

WL/LT: E

Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees (IGC)

M. Laurent DALMASSO – Programme Officer (IGC), Rue de Vermont 37-39, CH-1202 GENEVA

Tel: 41 (0)22 919 6603 / Fax: 41 (0)22 919 6610 / e-mail: l.dalmasso@igc.ch / www.igc.ch

WL/LT: F/E

OTHER BODIES / AUTRES ORGANISMES

Istituto Dante Alighieri

Ms Costanza MENZINGER, Piazza Firenze, 27 - Palazzo Firenze – I - ROMA 00186

e-mail: c.menzinger@ladante.it

WL/LT: E

Ms Marisol BURGIO D'ARAGONA, Piazza Firenze, 27 - Palazzo Firenze – I - ROMA 00186

e-mail: mari21164@libero.it

WL/LT: E

Università per Stranieri di Perugia

Ms Giuliana GREGO BOLLI, Prof. Associato di Linguistica Applicata, Direttore del CVCL (Centro per la Valutazione e le Certificazioni Linguistiche), Università per Stranieri di Perugia, Palazzina Lupattelli, Via XIV Settembre 75, I - 06124 PERUGIA

Tel. 390755746719 / Tel.Cell. +393351010996 / e-mail: giuliana.bolli@gmail.com

WL/LT: E

Mr Lorenzo ROCCA, Direttore del CVCL (Centro per la Valutazione e le Certificazioni Linguistiche), Università per Stranieri di Perugia, Palazzina Lupattelli, Via XIV Settembre 75, I - 06124 PERUGIA
mobile : 39 3286256799 / mail : lorenzo_rocca@libero.it

WL/LT: E

Observatoire régional de l'intégration et de la ville (ORIV)

Mme Gaelle DONNARD, Chargée de mission, (ORIV), 1 rue de la Course, 67000 STRASBOURG

Tel: 03 88 14 35 89 / e-mail: donnard.oriv@wanadoo.fr

WL/LT: F

OBSERVERS / OBSERVATEURS

M. Jesús MARTINEZ, 30 rue Laghouat, 75018 - PARIS

Tel: 01 80 50 68 85 / e-mail: chusmar@hotmail.com

WL/LT: F

Mr Miren URTEAGA ALDALUR, Researcher in Language Politiques, Händelstrasse, 20, D - 79104 FREIBURG IM BREISGAU

Tel.: 0049 175 42 19024 / e-mail: mirenurteaga@gmail.com

WL/LT: E

COORDINATING GROUP / GROUPE DE COORDINATION

Mr David LITTLE, *Rapporteur of the Conference*, Former Head of the School of Linguistic, Speech and Communication Sciences, Trinity College, IRL - DUBLIN 2

Tel: 353 1 (608) 1505 / 677 2941 / e-mail: dlittle@tcd.ie

WL/LT: E

M. Jean-Claude BEACCO, Université de la Sorbonne nouvelle-Paris III, 34, rue Rodier, 75009 PARIS

Tel: 33 (1) 40462925 /2928/2929 / e-mail: jcb.mdg@wanadoo.fr

WL/LT: F

Mme Claire EXTRAMIANA, Délégation générale à la langue française et aux langues de France (DGLFLF), Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication, 6, rue des Pyramides, 75001 PARIS

Tel: 33 (1) 40 15 35 47 / e-mail: claire.extramiana@culture.gouv.fr

WL/LT: F

Mr Hans-Jürgen KRUMM, Institut für Germanistik, Deutsch als Fremdsprache, Universität Wien, Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A - 1010 WIEN

Tel: 43 1 42 77 42107 / e-mail: hans-juergen.krumm@univie.ac.at

WL/LT: E

Mr Richard ROSSNER, Chief Executive, EAQUALS, The European Association for Quality Language Services, 24 Sturton Street, UK - CAMBRIDGE CB1 2QA

Tel/Fax: 44 (0)1223 721863 / e-mail: rrossner@eaquals.org

WL/LT: E

Mr Piet VAN AVERMAET, University of Ghent, Centre for Diversity and Learning, St.-Pietersnieuwstraat 49, B - 9000 GHENT

Tel: 32 (0) 9 2647047 / e-mail: Piet.VanAvermaet@UGent.be

WL/LT: E

Secretariat of the COUNCIL OF EUROPE / Secrétariat du CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE – www.coe.int

DIRECTORATE GENERAL IV – EDUCATION, CULTURE AND HERITAGE, YOUTH AND SPORT /

DIRECTION GENERALE IV - EDUCATION, CULTURE ET PATRIMOINE, JEUNESSE ET SPORT

Mme Gabriella BATTAINI-DRAGONI, Director General / Directrice Générale

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

Language Policy Division – www.coe.int/lang / Division des Politiques linguistiques - www.coe.int/lang/fr

Mr Joseph SHEILS

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

Mme Philia THALGOTT

Administratrice / Administrator – Conference co-ordination / Coordination de la Conférence

Tel: 3 (0)3 88 41 26 25 / e-mail: philia.thalgott@coe.int

Mlle Corinne COLIN

Secretariat / Secrétariat

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

Mme Marguerite SIBERT

Secretariat / Secrétariat

Tel: 33 (0) 3 88 41 35 32 / e-mail: marguerite.sibert@coe.int

Mlle Alessandra GALLERANO, trainee / stagiaire

DIRECTORATE GENERAL III – SOCIAL COHESIONS / DIRECTION GENERALE III – COHESION SOCIALE

Migration Division / Division des Migrations - www.coe.int/migration

Mr Sergey KHRYCHIKOV

Administrator, / Administrateur

Tel: 33 (0)3 88 41 31 84 / e-mail: sergey.khrychikov@coe.int

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONNER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS / BUREAU DU COMMISSAIRE AUX DROITS DE L'HOMME

Paulina POLOWNIA, Adviser, paulina.polownia@coe.int

Interpreters / Interprètes

Conférence : salle G02 à partir de 9h00

Mme Maryline NEUSCHWANDER

M. Olivier OBRECHT

Groupe de travail : salle G05 à partir de 14h15

Mme Léa OUEDRAOGO (uniquement le 24/06) - o.lea@wanadoo.fr

Mme Chloé CHENTIER (uniquement le 25/06)

M. Nicolas GUITTONNEAU