THE EUROPEAN LANGUAGE PORTFOLIO: THE STORY SO FAR (1991–2011)

David Little, Francis Goullier and Gareth Hughes

European
Language

PORTFOLIO

Européen
des Langues

COUNCIL   CONSEIL
OF EUROPE   DE L'EUROPE

Contents

Executive summary

The ELP was first proposed at the Rüschlikon Symposium in 1991 together with the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR). The CEFR provides tools for the development of language curricula, programmes of teaching and learning, textbooks, and assessment instruments. The ELP is designed to mediate to learners, teachers and schools, and other stakeholders the ethos that underpins the CEFR: respect for linguistic and cultural diversity, mutual understanding beyond national, institutional and social boundaries, the promotion of plurilingual and intercultural education, and the development of the autonomy of the individual citizen.

In 1997 the Council of Europe published the second draft of the CEFR together with a collection of preliminary studies that explored how the ELP might be implemented in different domains of language learning. From 1998 to 2000 ELP pilot projects were conducted in 15 Council of Europe member states and by three INGOs. In 2000 the then Education Committee of the Council of Europe established the ELP Validation Committee with a mandate to receive draft ELPs and determine whether or not they were in conformity with the ELP Principles and Guidelines, also established by the Education Committee.

In 2001, the European Year of Languages, the ELP was launched at the first European ELP Seminar, held in Coimbra, Portugal. By December 2010, 118 ELPs had been validated from 32 Council of Europe member states and 6 INGOs/international consortia (a complete list is appended to this document). ELPs have been designed and implemented for all educational domains: primary, lower and upper secondary, vocational, adult, further and tertiary. In his report for 2007, the Rapporteur General estimated that 2.5 million individual ELPs had been produced/distributed. Although 584,000 learners were estimated to be using an ELP, however, the average number of copies in use per validated ELP model was only 6,600: evidence that sustained use of the ELP on a large scale in individual member states remained elusive.

The reports prepared by the Rapporteur General, the impact study carried out on behalf of the Validation Committee, and the eight European ELP Seminars held between 2001 and 2009 confirm that the ELP has proved itself an innovative and practical tool. It embodies a set of principles – reflective learning, self-assessment, learner autonomy, plurilingualism, intercultural learning – which stimulate good practice in a multitude of educational contexts and help to develop skills of life-long learning. These principles challenge traditional beliefs and practices, however, and this helps to explain why the adoption and implementation of the ELP has still not reached the levels hoped for when it was first launched.

While celebrating the ELP's success, it is important to recognise that Europe's linguistic fabric has changed beyond recognition since the ELP was first conceived in the early 1990s. At that time the emphasis was still mainly on second and foreign language learning, as the ELP Principles and Guidelines remind us. Now, largely as a result of new waves of migration, "natural" plurilingualism has become an increasingly common phenomenon in many European societies, and this challenges us to find new ways of extending the reach of the principles that underlie the ELP. It seems appropriate, for example, to adopt a portfolio approach to the development of competence in the language of schooling, whether or not it is the individual learner's home language, and to focus more closely on languages learnt outside school. This does not necessarily mean expanding the scope of the ELP as such, for to do so would risk making it unwieldy. Finding a solution to this challenge is one of the tasks that confront the Languages in/for Education project, which seeks to promote plurilingual and intercultural education for all.

In April 2011 the validation and accreditation of ELPs was replaced by an online registration process based on the principle of self-declaration. The website designed for this purpose provides step-be-step instructions on how to develop an ELP using generic elements developed by the Validation Committee. These generic elements were shaped by the accumulated good practice of the past ten years. They should allow educational authorities, institutions and organisations to assemble their own high-quality ELPs without committing themselves to a major developmental effort. The registration process is managed and monitored by the secretariat of the Language Policy Division.

The European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML), a Council of Europe institution based in Graz, Austria, functions as a catalyst for reform in the teaching and learning of languages. The ECML's second medium-term programme (2004–2007) included two projects focused on the ELP. *Impel – ELP implementation support* designed a web site to support ELP implementation projects, and *ELP-TT – Training teachers to use the European Language Portfolio* developed a kit of ELP-related training materials, trialled the materials at a central workshop, and used them selectively at national training events in 17 ECML member states. The ECML's third medium-term programme (2008–2011) included three ELP projects. *ELP-TT2* extended the work of *ELP-TT*, contributing to training events in 10 further ECML member states; *ELP-WSU – The ELP in whole-school use* coordinated projects in 10 ECML member states; and *ELP-TT3* developed a new platform to support ELP implementation.

The number of validated ELPs confirms the success of the ELP project at European level, as does the general growth of interest in self-assessment, learner autonomy and reflective language learning. What is more, the ECML's ELP-WSU project confirms that, when it is used on a whole-school basis, to support the learning of all second and foreign languages in the curriculum and to stimulate reflection on the language of schooling and other languages taught or present in the school, the ELP goes a long way towards achieving the core language education goals of the Languages in/for Education project. The development of new ELPs and the revision of existing models will continue; the registration process will capture this ongoing work and make it available to the international community; and the ECML will continue to provide support for ELP implementation in all educational sectors. It is for the Languages in/for Education project to explore ways of extending the ELP's pedagogical principles and procedures into new areas of language education.

David Little, Francis Goullier and Gareth Hughes
February 2011

1 What is the European Language Portfolio and where did it come from?

1.1 Description

The Council of Europe's European Language Portfolio (ELP) has three obligatory components:

- a *language passport*, which summarises the owner's linguistic identity by briefly recording second/foreign languages (L2s) learnt, formal language qualifications achieved, significant experiences of L2 use, and the owner's assessment of his/her current proficiency in the L2s he/she knows;

- a *language biography*, which is used to set language learning targets, monitor progress, and record and reflect on specially important language learning and intercultural experiences;

- a *dossier*, which can serve both a process and a display function, being used to store work in progress but also to present a selection of work that in the owner's judgement best represents his/her L2 proficiency.

1.2 Functions

The ELP has a reporting and a pedagogical function. In its reporting function it supplements the certificates and diplomas that are awarded on the basis of formal examinations by presenting additional information about the owner's language learning experience and concrete evidence of his/her L2 proficiency and achievements. In addition, it allows the owner to document language learning that has taken place outside as well as inside formal education. In its pedagogical function the ELP is designed to promote plurilingualism, raise cultural awareness, make the language learning process more transparent to the owner, and foster the development of learner autonomy. The reporting and pedagogical functions merge in the ongoing process of self-assessment that is fundamental to effective ELP use.

1.3 Origins

Although its essential shape was determined by the Council of Europe's modern languages project *Language learning for European citizenship* (1989–96), the ELP bears the unmistakable mark of earlier Council of Europe projects. Its reporting function arises from the concerns that animated attempts in the 1970s to develop a European unit/credit system for L2 learning by adults (e.g., Council for Cultural Cooperation, 1979); while its pedagogical function reflects the Council of Europe's commitment to cultural exchange and the ideals of lifelong learning and learner autonomy (see especially Holec 1979).

The decisive impetus to develop the ELP came from the Rüschlikon Symposium of 1991 ("Transparency and coherence in language learning in Europe"), hosted by the Federal Swiss authorities in collaboration with the Swiss Conference of Cantonal Directors of Education. In its conclusions the symposium recommended that the Council for Cultural Cooperation should promote the development of a Common European Framework of reference for language learning and set up a working party to consider possible forms and functions of a European Language Portfolio. The purpose of what was to become the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR; Council of Europe 2001) would be to "promote and facilitate cooperation among educational institutions in different countries; provide a sound basis for the mutual recognition of language qualifications; [and] assist learners, teachers, course designers, examining bodies and educational administrators to situate and coordinate their efforts" (Coun-

cil for Cultural Cooperation 1992: 37). The ELP "should contain a section in which formal qualifications are related to a common European scale, another in which the learner him/herself keeps a personal record of language learning experiences and possibly a third which contains examples of work done. Where appropriate entries should be situated within the Common Framework" (ibid.: 40).

The terms of this latter recommendation clearly anticipate the ELP's tripartite structure and the relation between the ELP and the CEFR. As we have seen, using the ELP necessarily engages the owner in self-assessment; and the basis for self-assessment is provided by the common reference levels of the CEFR. These define L2 proficiency in relation to five communicative activities at six levels. The communicative activities are LISTENING, READING, SPOKEN INTERACTION, SPOKEN PRODUCTION and WRITING; the six levels are A1 and A2 (Basic User), B1 and B2 (Independent User), C1 and C2 (Proficient User). The "can do" descriptors that define the common reference levels were arrived at on the basis of empirical research funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (see North 2000, Schneider & North 2000). The overall scheme is summarised in the so-called self-assessment grid (Council of Europe 2001: 26–27; Appendix 1).

The project *Language learning for European citizenship* produced two drafts of the CEFR (Council for Cultural Cooperation 1996a, 1996b) and a set of proposals for the development of ELPs for different categories of language learner (Council for Cultural Cooperation 1997a). The final report on the project included the recommendations that the CEFR should be piloted and the ELP further developed and introduced "at first on an experimental basis, to be followed by its evaluation and finalisation in time for large-scale launching in the European Year of Languages to be planned for 2001" (Council for Cultural Cooperation 1997b: 73).

2   The pilot projects (1998–2000)

2.1 Scope

Between 1998 and 2000 versions of the ELP were developed and piloted in fifteen member states of the Council of Europe: Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, The Netherlands, Portugal, Russia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom; also in private language schools under the auspices of EAQUALS (European Association for Quality Language Services) and in universities in various countries under the auspices of CercleS (Confédération Européenne des Centres de Langues de l'Education Supérieure) and the European Language Council. Between them the pilot projects covered all educational sectors: primary, lower secondary, upper secondary, vocational, university, adult. In some cases they focussed on particular issues, for example, the introduction of foreign languages into the lower grades of primary school, the need to integrate large numbers of immigrant pupils in mainstream schooling, the use of a portfolio approach to language learning as a tool for whole-school curriculum development, or the particular language problems and needs that arise in the border areas of nation states.

The pilot projects varied greatly in size and scope. Thanks to careful preparation and a high level of official support, the Swiss project was by far the largest, involving perhaps as many as 10,000 of the estimated 30,000 learners who took part in pilot projects overall (these and other statistics reported in this paragraph are taken from Schärer 2000). Between them the two French projects (primary and upper secondary/vocational) involved about 5,000 learners, as did the Dutch project (primary/lower secondary/upper secondary/vocational). Other projects were

much smaller. For example, the Finnish project (lower secondary/upper secondary/vocational) involved 360 learners, the Russian project (primary/lower secondary/upper secondary/university/teacher education) 290 learners, and the Swedish project (vocational/adult) 135 learners.

There was similar variation in the design and scope of the ELPs used in the pilot projects. Much of the ELP-related work that preceded the Rüschlikon Symposium was carried out in Switzerland, and (as noted above) the parallel development of the CEFR was supported by a Swiss research project. As a result the Swiss pilot project was based on a fully elaborated ELP that was very explicitly related to the CEFR and included detailed self-assessment checklists for the five communicative activities at all six common reference levels (for an account of the development of the Swiss ELP, see Schneider 2000). This model served as an indispensable reference for all the pilot projects. Other ELPs were much simpler, especially those designed for younger learners (for examples of different ELP designs used in the pilot projects, see Schneider & Lenz 2001).

During the two and a half years of the pilot phase seven seminars were held (in Switzerland, Finland, Germany, The Netherlands, Hungary, Slovenia, and France) at which project co-ordinators came together to share experiences, discuss common problems, and plan future developments. It was no doubt inevitable that the seminars should focus more on the ELP's pedagogical than on its reporting function; for in order to be useful as a reporting instrument the ELP must first establish itself as an aid to language learning. The one pedagogical issue that stood out above all others was self-assessment, apparently for two reasons. First, the majority of ELPs developed for piloting lacked the detailed self-assessment checklists that were central to the Swiss model, and teachers as well as learners found it difficult to relate learning progress in the short and medium term to the general descriptors of the CEFR's self-assessment grid (Appendix 1). Secondly, self-assessment proved difficult in pedagogical traditions that were strongly teacher-led and did not encourage learners to share in the setting of learning targets and the evaluation of learning progress. This remains one of the principal pedagogical challenges to the large-scale implementation of the ELP.

The great variety of ELP designs produced by the pilot projects reflected the Council of Europe's ideal of unity in diversity but threatened to reduce the ELP to a collection of local variations on a European theme. This prompted the development of a standard language passport for adults, which was recommended for use with all learners of 15 years and over (for a rationale and description, see Flügel 2000).

2.2 Findings

Feedback from the pilot projects was positive overall, though it varied from project to project. According to the official report (Schärer 2000), the ELP led teachers and learners to reflect on the reasons for learning languages, the language learning process, and the criteria by which learning might be evaluated. 68% of learners felt that the time they spent keeping an ELP was time well spent. 70% of teachers found that the ELP was a useful tool for learners, while 78% found that it was a useful tool for teachers. Learner self-assessment was considered an important innovation, and learners found it motivating to assess their own L2 proficiency against the common reference levels of the CEFR. 70% of learners found that the ELP helped them to assess their own proficiency, and 70% found it useful to compare their teacher's assessment with their own; 62% of teachers thought their learners were capable of assessing their own L2 proficiency. At the same time, the concept and practice of self-assessment prompted considerable discussion and in some cases controversy.

As regards the ELP's reporting function, learners and teachers wanted the status of the ELP to be clarified. They wanted to know how self-assessment might be used in the final evaluation of language learning achievement, how the ELP would relate to traditional exams, and whether self-assessment would be accepted as valid by employers. They asked for professionally validated evaluation tools and transparent links between the ELP and national exams and diplomas. There was widespread agreement that both learner and teacher training are essential if the ELP is to be used effectively in both its functions and learners are to become more autonomous and develop a capacity for accurate self-assessment.

2.3 Reference documents and guides

As the pilot phase neared its end, two key reference documents were drawn up, *Principles and Guidelines* governing the design and implementation of ELPs (Council for Cultural Cooperation 2000a) and *Rules for the accreditation of ELP models* (Council for Cultural Cooperation 2000b); and guides were written for ELP developers (Schneider & Lenz 2001) and for teachers and teacher trainers (Little & Perclová 2001).

3 Beyond the pilot projects: validation and implementation

3.1 The ELP Validation Committee

In October 2000 the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education of the Council of Europe adopted a resolution recommending large-scale implementation of the ELP. At the same time the Education Committee of the Council for Cultural Cooperation established a Validation Committee with responsibility for validating and accrediting ELP models. Only accredited ELPs could be designated *European Language Portfolio* and use the Council of Europe's ELP logo.

In 2001, the European Year of Languages, the ELP was launched at the first European ELP Seminar, held in Coimbra, Portugal. Between 2001 and 2009 seven further European seminars were held, in Turin, Luxembourg, Istanbul, Madrid, Moscow, Vilnius and Graz. During the same period the Council of Europe published a number of supports for ELP developers, including a bank of "I can" descriptors for use in self-assessment checklists (available at www.coe.int/portfolio); a collection of nine case studies of ELP implementation projects (Little 2003); regular reports by Rolf Schärer, rapporteur general, on the progress of the ELP at European level (available at www.coe.int/portfolio); and *Enhancing the pedagogical aspects of the European Language Portfolio (ELP)* by Viljo Kohonen and Gerard Westhoff (available at www.coe.int/ portfolio). The one-page "European Language Passport" that is part of the European Union's Europass[1] was developed in consultation with the Validation Committee and accepted as standard in online versions of the ELP.

When the validation process came to an end in December 2010, 118 ELPs had been validated, from 32 Council of Europe member states and eight INGOs/international consortia (for a complete list, see Appendix 2). In his report for 2007, the rapporteur general estimated that 2.5 mil-

---

[1] Europass consists of five documents. Two of them, the Europass curriculum vitae and Europass Language Passport, can be downloaded and completed by the user; the three other documents, the Europass Certificate Supplement, the Europass Diploma Supplement and Europass Mobility, are completed and issued by competent organisations. Europass is designed to help citizens to make their skills and qualifications clearly and easily understood in Europe (European Union, EFTA/EEA and candidate countries) and thus to support mobility (see http://europass.cedefop.europa.eu).

lion individual ELPs had been produced/distributed (Schärer 2007). Although 584,000 learners were estimated to be using an ELP, the average number of copies in use per validated ELP model was only 6,600: evidence that sustained use of the ELP on a large scale in individual member states remained elusive.

3.2 The role of the European Centre for Modern Languages

The European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML), a Council of Europe institution based in Graz, Austria, functions as a catalyst for reform in the teaching and learning of languages. The ECML's second medium-term programme (2004–2007) included two projects focused on the ELP. *Impel – ELP implementation support* designed a web site to support ELP implementation projects, and *ELP-TT – Training teachers to use the European Language Portfolio* developed a kit of ELP-related training materials, trialled the materials at a central workshop, and used them selectively at national training events in 17 ECML member states. The ECML's third medium-term programme (2008–2011) included three ELP projects. *ELP-TT2* extended the work of *ELP-TT*, contributing to training events in 10 further ECML member states; *ELP-WSU – The ELP in whole-school use* coordinated projects in 10 ECML member states; and *ELP-TT3* developed a new platform to support ELP implementation.

4 The impact of the ELP

4.1 The challenge of diversity

As we noted in section 3.1, by the end of 2010 there were 118 validated and accredited ELPs. Between them they targeted all age groups, from pre-primary to adult. Some of them were specifically designed for learners with special needs – migrants, the blind and visually impaired, those learning languages for vocational purposes. And although validation required conformity with the ELP *Principles and Guidelines*, developers nevertheless had plenty of scope to tailor their models to the needs and traditions of specific contexts. In other words, the "European Language Portfolio" is not a single entity but a large family of more or less closely related realisations of a set of guiding principles.

The scope of ELP implementation has been similarly diverse: in some cases whole education systems have been targeted, while in others implementation has been limited to a single institution. And there has been no single focus of implementation. Sometimes the ELP has been used to develop learner autonomy, and self-assessment has complemented more traditional methods of assessment; sometimes it has been used to promote a whole-school approach to developing the plurilingualism of pupils, in an attempt to overcome the traditional compartmentalised approach to language teaching; and sometimes it has been used as a means of tailoring language provision to the needs of individual learners or specific learner groups.

And then there is the question of time. How long does a phenomenon like the ELP need in order to make an impact on education systems, language teachers and language learners? Some countries have developed a family of ELP models to accompany the successive stages of education, from pre-school or primary level through to the end of secondary. It will take more than ten years for the first cohort of learners to work with each ELP, and only when that has happened will it be possible to gauge the impact of the ELP family on language learning generally and the transitions between the different stages of schooling in particular.

In other words, the ELP is so many different things and it is being used in so many different contexts and so many different ways that an overall assessment of its impact is very difficult to make; though it is arguably some measure of the power of the ELP concept that it has spawned such a variety of models and such diversity of use.

The *Interim report on the ELP project for the period 2001-2004* and annual reports for 2005, 2006 and 2007 were compiled by Rolf Schärer, rapporteur general, using information gathered through a standard questionnaire sent to the national ELP contact persons. The statements and statistics he collected provide an initial measure of the ELP's impact in quantitative terms. In 2009 the Validation Committee commissioned three of its members to prepare *The European Language Portfolio: an impact study* (Stoicheva, Hughes and Speitz 2009), which focused on the ELP's qualitative impact: What difference had it made to the processes of language teaching and learning in the different contexts in which ELP projects had been conducted? Had the expectations of the ELP developers been met? What challenges, expected and unexpected, had been encountered, and had they been overcome? The survey was conducted by telephone with 12 ELP Contact Persons and ELP project members in nine different countries across a range of educational contexts.[2]

4.2 The impact of ELP projects

Most ELPs have been developed and implemented within the context of a project, and the majority of ELP projects that led to the development and validation of ELP models for various age groups have been initiated or supported by Ministries of Education. The impact of these projects tends to be strongest while the project is running and project team members are committed and resourced. There have been a number of reports of a decline in interest once the initial project has been completed. In addition, most ELPs were developed on a one-off project basis by national authorities, training institutions and educators and researchers, while the implementation of the validated ELPs required different types of work organisation and the involvement on a regular basis of a number of stakeholders. A smooth transition from the initial project to launch the ELP to sustained support for it has not always been achieved. There have, however, been contexts where national authorities have secured the ELP in their longer-term strategy. In such cases, ELP models that were validated early in the validation process have been revised on the basis of the results of piloting; electronic models have been developed to reach out to greater numbers of learners; and the ELP has been integrated into the national curriculum. In general, it has been found that the ELP will have its greatest impact when it is fully integrated into the learning and teaching programme in which it is being used.

The overwhelming initial reaction to the ELP from both learners and teachers in all the different contexts for which models were developed was positive. Learners reported that they found the ELP motivating. They found the ways in which it described the different components of communicative competence clear and illuminating. They enjoyed the possibilities for self-assessment and goal-setting that the ELP provided. They appreciated the opportunity to reflect on their plurilingual and pluricultural experience. Teachers, too, observed the benefits of the ELP. Where the ELP was introduced as an "extra", however, as in contexts where curriculum goals had not yet been formulated in terms that could easily be related to the CEFR, or where

---

[2] When the impact study was published and distributed to the ELP contact persons' network in September 2009, member states with accredited ELP models were invited to submit further assessments of the impact of the ELP. At the time of writing, reports had been received from two countries and one of the university-based INGOs.

the formal assessment of learning was not yet based on language use rather than linguistic knowledge, the criticism was often made that although using the ELP was interesting, it took up too much time and effort that would otherwise be devoted to achieving formal curriculum goals. By contrast, where the ELP fully reflected curriculum goals and where self-assessment and other aspects of learner autonomy were being fostered, the ELP was perceived as providing a valuable mediating tool between teachers and learners and between the classroom and the curriculum.

One of the most valued and widely acknowledged effects of the ELP project as a whole is its genuinely European character – between 2000 and 2010 118 models were developed and validated as a result of cooperation across a broad range of European countries, cultures and educational contexts. This has brought benefits to the language education professionals who have been involved in ELP projects and have thus profited from the exchange of ideas and experience that accompanies ELP development and use. The European dimension has also been appreciated by many young learners who are proud to possess a truly European product such as the ELP.

4.3 Impact on textbooks

In many countries the CEFR and the ELP have had a strong influence on the content of L2 textbooks. The CEFR has directly influenced curriculum design, which in turn has had an impact on textbooks. But the ELP has also influenced textbook design, inspiring the inclusion of checklists, reflection on learning, the use of a dossier, and so on.

In countries and educational sectors where textbooks reflect the influence of the ELP, there are reports that this has had positive, disseminating effects but also "reducing" ones. On the positive side, an ELP-influenced textbook can support the ELP in its pedagogical function by introducing some of its underlying principles, notably self-assessment on the basis of clearly formulated, action-oriented objectives, and reflection on learning and intercultural experience. This helps to bring the portfolio idea into mainstream practice. On the other hand, textbooks do not usually reflect other ELP principles, notably the development of plurilingualism. The ELP is designed to recognise and value all of a learner's languages, wherever they were learnt, whereas a textbook normally has room for only one language. The EVC did not validate ELP models that were restricted to a single language or took account only of curriculum languages the official curriculum.

4.4 Impact on assessment

In many educational systems at present there seems to be little relation between official assessment tools (tests and examinations) and the self-assessment checklists in the ELP. This leads to the perception that the ELP is an optional extra or that it is concerned only with project-based activity. Put another way, the ELP can be said to have the most impact in situations where it plays a central role in goal-setting, assessing learning and so on. The 2009 impact study found evidence that examinations that have been linked to the CEFR levels can help to familiarise teachers with those levels.

In his discussion of the ELP's role in the assessment process, David Little (2009) argues that the full potential of the ELP as a companion piece to the CEFR will not be realised until an as-

sessment culture has been established that integrates the instruments used for self-assessment (checklists, etc.) with those used for other forms of assessment, including official exams.[3]

Some examination bodies, notably those institutions that belong to the Association of Language Testers in Europe (ALTE), have been following the development of the ELP with close interest. ALTE has been involved in the development of the ELP from the outset, and together with EAQUALS, an agency that validates quality in private-sector language training programmes, developed one of the first ELP models to be validated and subsequently relaunched it in an electronic form.

4.5 Wider impact

When discussing the ELP people often mention impact that would more appropriately be attached to the implementation of the CEFR (for example, the checklists with their "can do" approach to describing language use, or the use of the CEFR scales). This is understandable given the close link between the two instruments. L2 curricula in Europe are increasingly linked to the CEFR proficiency levels, and some ELP developers report that the ELP has been important in helping teachers to mediate the broader curricular aims to learners through the use of the checklists.

Another important area of potential impact is teacher education. Some universities and institutes of teacher education have been involved in the development of ELP models. Others, however, have remained outside initiatives involving the CEFR and the ELP. In the 2010 Impact Study, respondents reported that while large numbers of teachers have attended workshops or other training sessions to introduce them to the ELP and its underlying principles, they remain unsure how to use it to support teaching and learning in their classrooms. Too few teachers or student teachers have been afforded the time and the support to explore the ELP in depth through using it to document their own language learning and proficiency. The impact of the CEFR and the ELP has also been felt at a pan-European level through the work of the European Commission, whose language education activities explicitly incorporate the CEFR and the ELP. As noted in section 3.1 above, the ELP language passport has also been adapted for use as part of Europass

Although the ELP was developed by the Council of Europe for use within its member states, this has not stopped countries and organisations from outside Europe from developing their own ELP models. In some cases, institutions based in Europe are using ELP models in the wider world, for example universities with constituent colleges in Asia, or international chains of language schools. In other cases, institutions outside Europe have developed language portfolios inspired by the ELP.

4.6 Continuing challenges

In all the reports and studies of the impact of the ELP, no really negative opinions have been recorded. Concerns have been expressed, however, about teacher opposition caused by worries that the ELP might require substantial changes to their teaching practices. Concerns have also been expressed about a possible lack of support at national and/or institutional level. Uncer-

---

[3] It is worth reminding ourselves of the full title of the CEFR, namely *Common European Framework of Reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. While the ELP's role in learning and teaching has been well established in many contexts, the part it can play in all aspects of assessment (self-assessment, peer assessment, teacher assessment, school reports, formal examinations, etc.) has been far less explored.

tainty regarding long-term funding support and official commitment to the ELP are often cited by ELP developers and practitioners as their main concern. In the case of paper-based ELP models, the question of the availability of the model is an issue. In some projects, no provision was made for the future printing of the model after the initial piloting phase. This helps to explain why some accredited ELPs are no longer available and why electronic solutions, either web-based or downloadable in various formats, are increasingly being favoured.

The ELP's impact can be measured in terms of how it has been introduced into schools, colleges, etc. and how it is being used there. We can try to establish how many learners possess an ELP and how many use it on a regular basis. We can also look at how many schools or educational systems make direct use of the ELP in their teaching and their assessment procedures. These data are not easy to obtain, and to date we have only a partial picture of what is happening in Council of Europe member states. Nevertheless, thanks to the European ELP seminars that were organised between 2001 and 2009 and the regular contacts between members of the Validation Committee and different ELP projects throughout Europe, a picture is emerging of how the ELP can affect learners and teachers of languages. In his 2007 report (Schärer, 2007) the rapporteur general, summarised the impact of the ELP in the following terms:

- The ELP is an effective learning and reporting tool in a wide variety of contexts.
- The ELP fosters dialogue and cooperation in the learning process beyond language learning.
- The ELP fosters learner autonomy and positively affects motivation.
- The ELP is an effective tool of reflection and helps develop self-assessment competence.
- The ELP reflects key educational concerns such as communicative, partial and intercultural competence.
- The underlying principles of the ELP promote unity in diversity without being prescriptive.

He also made the following points:

- Not all learners and teachers favour a learner-centred approach which shifts responsibility to the learner.
- The ELP is not a viable proposition if it is used mechanically to check progress.
- The ELP has to yield tangible benefits for learners, teachers and schools if it is to remain attractive.
- Too wide a gap between the demands of the curriculum and ELP principles is difficult to manage.
- Space in the working routine is needed to make good use of the ELP.
- The status of the ELP needs to be defined on the broad educational level as well as in the local context.
- Sustained learner and teacher support is needed to achieve the desirable long-term effects.

In 2010, the EVC summarised the added value of the ELP for teachers as follows:[4]

- The ELP encourages learners to take responsibility. (Learners accept that they share responsibility for the success of the course.)
- The ELP helps the teacher to cope with heterogeneous groups. (The ELP helps learners understand their individuality, and helps them in achieving personal goals within the group.)

---

[4] This summary of how the ELP can bring added value to the language classroom is to be found on the ELP website: www.coe.int/portfolio.

- The ELP promotes communication within the class by providing a common language. (The CEFR's approach to describing competence in terms that learners can understand and the ELP's approach to reflection on learning, facilitates a true dialogue about learning among the learners themselves and with the teacher.)
- The ELP helps make progress visible and increases satisfaction. (The descriptors are relatively easy for learners to understand, so they can both see what they're aiming at and when they have achieved it. If learners can see that they are making progress, they are more likely to be satisfied.)
- The ELP helps make achievement visible and comprehensible for employers, for other schools, etc. (If learners need to show their current levels of proficiency in one or more languages, the ELP does this in a clear and comprehensible way.)
- The ELP puts learning into a wider European context. (For some learners, the European recognition of the ELP and the level system is important and attractive.)
- The ELP facilitates mobility. (The CEFR's provides a transparent and coherent system for describing communicative proficiency across Europe.)

In 2011 the validation of ELPs was replaced by online registration based on the principle of self-declaration. To support this development, the Language Policy Division has made available a full set of templates and other resources that future ELP developers can draw on to construct new models. The ELP will continue to thrive and develop, however, only if its effect on the learning, teaching and assessment of language skills can be convincingly shown to be positive. The evidence gathered so far has been very encouraging, but more is required. Some of the ways for measuring impact that have been suggested are:
- research projects that explore one or more aspects of ELP implementation with a view to producing a research report;
- an individual research project undertaken by a postgraduate student, either for a thesis leading to a higher degree or for the dissertation component of a partly taught master's degree programme;
- action research undertaken by an individual teacher or by a group of teachers who are collaborating on ELP implementation;
- an online impact survey (a questionnaire on websites of institutions involved in ELP implementation);
- case studies;
- studies of the involvement of teacher training institutions in ELP implementation, research into the ELP and in the organisation of ELP seminars;
- desk research based on the Council of Europe's Language Education Policy Profiles;
- a survey of how many ELP models have actually been developed – with or without validation – as local, regional and international projects (including EU-funded projects)

It is important that the results of such projects and studies are made as widely available as possible. The relaunched ELP website provides a European platform to support ELP development and implementation, and it is hoped that it will become the natural home for the results of all ELP-related research. At the same time, it is essential that language educators continue to engage with the key pedagogical and policy challenges that the ELP embodies. For that reason the next two sections are devoted to (i) self-assessment and reflective learning and (ii) plurilingualism and the intercultural dimension.

5 The pedagogical challenge of the ELP

5.1 Self-assessment

Self-assessment is fundamental to effective ELP use; as we have seen, it was also a cause of concern and controversy in the piloting phase. Some teachers doubted that their learners were capable of assessing their own proficiency accurately, and some suspected that learners might be tempted to overstate their achievements. There are three ways of responding to these worries (Little, 1999). First, as regards learners' ability to assess themselves, it should be pointed out that the basis for self-assessment in the ELP is provided by "can do" statements that describe communicative behaviour – for example, "I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know" (A1 SPOKEN PRODUCTION). On the whole learners are likely to know whether or not they can perform the tasks specified by such descriptors. Secondly, as regards learners' honesty, it should be easy to detect serious discrepancies between learners' self-assessment and either their examination grades (recorded in the language passport) or the materials collected in the dossier. Thirdly, worries about self-assessment tended to focus on its summative function, which is only part of the picture. It is true that whenever the ELP owner updates the language passport he/she must engage in a form of self-assessment that performs much the same function as an exam at the end of a phase of learning. But the self-assessment that comes into play when the language biography is used to set learning goals or monitor progress is formative rather than summative: it supports and guides learning as it takes place. Of course, whether its function is summative or formative, self-assessment draws on the same complex of knowledge, self-knowledge and skills, which means that the more the ELP owner engages in formative self-assessment, the better he/she should become at summative self-assessment. The implication of this argument is that effective use of the ELP must be rooted in reflective teaching and learning. (For a fuller discussion of these issues, see Little 2009.)

5.2 Reflective teaching and learning

The Council of Europe's educational projects generally and its modern languages projects in particular have always emphasised the importance of learner autonomy. Learners may be said to be autonomous when they (i) explicitly accept responsibility for their own learning and (ii) exercise that responsibility in a continuous effort to understand what, why and how they are learning, and with what degree of success (see, for example, Holec 1979, Boud 1988, Little 1991). As this working definition implies, learner autonomy depends crucially on reflection and self-assessment. We do not make learners autonomous at a stroke by telling them that they are in charge of their learning; they gradually become autonomous by developing and exercising the reflective skills of planning, monitoring and evaluating their learning. That is the essence of reflective teaching/learning.

The ELP's emphasis on self-assessment and the reflective processes that gather around it invites the question: Will learning how to learn languages get in the way of language learning? After all, the time learners spend reflecting on what they can do in their target language(s) is time that they cannot spend learning to do more. But this is a valid objection only if the processes of reflection and self-assessment are carried out in the learners' first language(s). If they are carried out in the target language, they are an integral part of language learning. As such they play an essential role, for if learners do not gradually develop the capacity to engage in reflection and evaluation in their second languages, we cannot expect them to progress to the more advanced levels of proficiency, which presuppose such a capacity. It is worth noting that this argument has implications for ELP design: in order to facilitate the use of the target language for reflection and self-assessment, self-assessment checklists should ideally be available in each of the ELP owner's second languages.

6   Plurilingualism and the intercultural dimension

During the political forum organised by the Language Policy Division in Strasbourg in February 2007 ("The *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) and the development of language policies: challenges and responsibilities"; a report on the forum is available at www.coe.int/lang) it was pointed out that although the CEFR has been very widely adopted in Europe, there is a considerable imbalance between how it is used for assessment purposes on the one hand and how far it is seen to contribute to the general educational aspects of language teaching and learning on the other. It seemed essential to repeat that the Council of Europe's values should give meaning and coherence to *all* use that is made of the CEFR. Almost exactly the same could be said about the development and use of the ELP. There is nothing surprising about this when the conceptual and organic link between the two tools is borne in mind.

However, there are important differences between them. The ELP does not suffer from the CEFR's tension between responding to the expectations and needs of training and assessment systems on the one hand and providing tools, references and aids to learners on the other. The ELP explicitly takes account of the individual learner's sociolinguistic and (inter)cultural reality, circumstances of language learning and use, and needs as a learner. It is the learner's property. This latter point is not insignificant. It may partly explain why the ELP and the CEFR, though very closely linked, have not enjoyed equal success in language education policies or in their impact on different users, including policy makers.

6.1 Imbalance between the perception and use of the various ELP components

The take-up rate of the ELP in everyday classroom practice and the ways in which it is used depend on how far it satisfies the felt or expressed needs of the education system in question. This is clear from the form and content of the ELP models devised by various institutional and private course designers.

Examination of the ELP's first ten years clearly shows that expectations have varied from place to place and from situation to situation, but that ELP models have undergone definite development. They were first understood, constructed and used as a way of contributing to a positive language-neutral assessment which could be compared in all European countries and regions. This explains the importance of self-assessment check lists in the language biography, which constituted the only serious component of this part of the ELP in many of the first ELP models presented and validated. The priority given to competence descriptors also corresponds to the chief use of this tool, i.e. for teaching or learning a particular language. Many of the expectations about the ELP have stemmed and continue to stem from this situation. Even though, as mentioned in section 5.1 above, the relevant use of self-assessment implies a pedagogical approach consistent with self-assessment purposes, it was the assistance that the ELP provided with (self-)assessment that first attracted the attention of teachers, schools and other educational establishments.

It therefore comes as no surprise that those aspects of the ELP furthest from mainstream practice in the teaching, learning and assessment of particular languages and their associated cultures have had the greatest difficulty in being noticed and employed. This was obviously the case with plurilingual and intercultural education.

The tension typical of the ELP lies between the quest to improve the educational provision on the one hand and to make appropriate allowance for the learner's perspective on the other.

6.2 Two ways in which ELPs take account of plurilingualism

The ELP has always been presented as a tool that supports the development of learner autonomy, plurilingualism and intercultural education. These goals have been stressed repeatedly in texts, presentations and actions connected with ELP development. Since it started its work, the Validation Committee has refused to validate any ELP model which was designed as an aid to teaching or learning a particular language or which did not invite learners to examine the extent of their plurilingual repertoire. A study of the models developed over the past ten years clearly reveals the difficulties and hesitations in getting users accustomed to the concept of plurilingualism inherent in the CEFR and ELP. Attitudes to plurilingualism can be summed up in two approaches adopted by ELP developers, the first having gradually been superseded by the second:

1. Plurilingualism is seen as a social fact which should be valued and encouraged by a tolerant education system. It may be the natural result in the learner of an improvement in language teaching and learning but does not directly impinge on language learning methods and therefore requires no specific treatment in the ELP.
2. Like learner autonomy and intercultural learning, plurilingualism provides us with a specific way of viewing language learning and use. Thus every ELP should give a large place to plurilingual learning and devote all means at its disposal to making ELP users aware of the resources of plurilingualism and helping them to profit from the dynamic between different types of language knowledge and learning. Seen thus, the development

of plurilingual and intercultural competence is an objective of every part of the ELP; it "dissolves" in the overall approach and cannot be confined to certain ELP elements.

The first of these two approaches is reflected in different ways in different ELP models:

- Some models show their designers' commitment to plurilingualism as linguistic and cultural diversity by presenting headings, explanations, items and illustrative terms in different languages. This approach may justify the use of the ELP by a learner who wishes to document his/her learning of a language which is more uncommon in his/her educational context or which is not highly prized by society or his/her environment.
- Other ELPs have recognised the importance of learning several languages by drafting whole sections of the language biography in each of the languages taught in a particular context or establishment. This can lead to repetition of the same pages in different languages and a substantial increase in the model's total size.
- Others again have encouraged learners to set learning targets, assess themselves and reflect on learning in relation to individual languages, which means reproducing the same pages several times or inviting the learner to photocopy or download them as often as necessary.
- Finally, some models have designed a special section of the language biography to accommodate reflection on the plurilingual repertoire, its value and the situations in which the languages and cultures concerned are used, thus enabling the learner to recognise the possibilities made available by different types of language learning.

The second approach to the development of plurilingual competence, which has been present in some ELP models for a long time but is now occurring more often, assumes very different forms from the one described above. For example:

- The same self-assessment checklists are used for all the languages that the user knows or is learning, which enables him/her to become aware of the complementarity of the skills available in his/her repertoire as well as the differences, and to set learning targets.
- Reflection on learning methods is common across all languages and includes all of the user's learning experience. It also explicitly invites the user to take advantage of points of similarity between languages and of transferable or transversal competences, whether at the grammatical, pragmatic or methodological level, to try them out and test their resources and limits.
- Use of the plurilingual repertoire is the subject of extensive reflection, and language-related mediation activity or polyglot dialogue find a specific place. This allows learners to become aware of their social importance, reflect on their characteristics and the prerequisites for optimum success, and perhaps also to evaluate their ability to adapt to multilingual communicative situations.

6.3 The intercultural dimension

Inclusion of the intercultural dimension in ELPs, even though it cannot be separated from plurilingual competence, has also taken markedly different forms. At a fairly early stage in the history of the ELP, space was set aside for this dimension and its presence constituted a condition for validation. To help designers, examples of pages produced in previous models were collected and made available as downloadable documents on the dedicated ELP website. In most cases these pages sought to make users aware of the presence of cultural diversity in their immediate environment and to help them identify some of its signs and develop a positive attitude towards them and, indirectly, towards their own cultural perspectives.

This approach encouraged users to ask themselves questions about their attitudes and reactions to otherness. It assumed that they would be supported in their analysis and would gradually develop an intercultural competence based on suitable knowledge and attitudes. A reflection process of this kind cannot simply take note of the aspects identified or behaviour observed, however, and it soon emerged that this took up a lot of space in the ELP's language biography. In due course this led to the development of the Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters, which is designed to support individual and/or collective analysis of situations of direct or indirect, harmonious or conflictual, contact with otherness in the immediate environment or further afield. Because intercultural education poses a major challenge in our multicultural societies, it was not desirable to confine this tool to the ELP. It was therefore decided to make it available in an independent form so that it can be used in all educational contexts, not just those that are concerned with language learning. Inclusion of the intercultural dimension in ELP models must ensure complementarity between the specific spaces dedicated to it in the ELP and the use of the Autobiography of Intercultural Encounters (www.coe.int/lang).

6.4 Increased inclusion of plurilingualism

The development of different approaches to the inclusion of plurilingualism in ELPs has already been discussed. Two moments may be mentioned as key stages in the affirmation of the importance of plurilingual competence. First, at the European ELP seminar held in Madrid in 2004 a plenary presentation and workshop discussion focused on how to ensure more effective inclusion of plurilingual competence. Then, in 2010 the Language Policy Division published a *Guide for the development and implementation of curricula for plurilingual and intercultural education* (available at www.coe.int/lang). This document examines possible ways of implementing language curricula which truly take account of the complementarities between knowledge and competences in different languages. This document marks the beginning of a new phase in the work of the Council of Europe: a phase that will accord a central role to plurilingualism issues, the needs and abilities of all learners, and the linguistic dimension of all learning. These focuses should lead to new ways of using the ELP.

Between 2004 and 2010 gradual but noticeable developments took place, including:
- increased emphasis on the plurilingual dimension by the Validation Committee;
- modification of the standard adult passport to provide a more differentiated summary of the owner's deployment of his/her plurilingual repertoire;
- the development of ELP models for countries or regions where the plurilingualism project is integral to the aims of the education system and/or where a particular sociolinguistic situation prevails. These models tend to include a concern for mediation (facilitating communication between individuals and groups who are unable to communicate with one another directly) as a necessary component of learning and focus for reflection;
- rapid changes in European societies that have increased awareness not only of the need for plurilingualism but also of the possibility of valuing and relying on learners' increasingly extensive plurilingualism.

These developments also have consequences which were not explicitly anticipated in the initial ELP project. By definition, intercultural education involves teachers and learners of all disciplines; it cannot be the sole responsibility of languages and the ELP. Conversely, the coherence of plurilingualism has led naturally to the inclusion of languages of origin and language(s) of schooling in individual language repertoires – an extension which is reflected in the name of the Language Policy Division's project *Languages in/for Education* and which raises questions about the future form of the ELP.

The steps taken to include plurilingual and intercultural competence in the ELP can only enhance its dissemination and impact. Like intercultural competence, plurilingualism appears to be one of the few aspects of the Council of Europe's educational project which cannot be fully dealt with by tools associated with the teaching and learning of a particular language. The ELP provides a stimulus to reflection on the connexions between linguistic disciplines and between those disciplines and the range of personal experiences that underpin plurilingual and intercultural competence. In this sense, it also forms a valuable aid to all educational projects that pursue plurilingual and intercultural objectives. It should also help to promote co-ordination and co-operation between language teachers in the same educational establishment.

7 Future prospects

The European Language Portfolio is at a crossroads. On the one hand, experience over the past ten years provides a solid basis for the development of new models of appropriate quality. The project is now mature enough to progress from the procedure whereby models are validated by an ad hoc committee to an approach that is much closer to the traditional relation between the Council of Europe and its member states. ELP designers can draw inspiration from experience in other countries and regions; and when registering their models they can undertake to respect certain principles and values and share responsibility for upholding them with the Council and other parties concerned. On the other hand, the inclusion of all types of language learning, all competences and all experience of learning and using languages – foreign, classical and regional/minority languages, languages of origin, languages of schooling – raises questions about the role, content and form of the *European Language Portfolio*.

7.1 The ELP in the **Languages in/for Education** *project*

Reflection on plurilingualism in the modern languages field has become tied in with reflection on the linguistic dimension of success across the school curriculum. These two focuses reinforce each other and are mutually coherent and complementary without overlapping. The need to take better account of the points of similarity in the learning of modern languages, to achieve curricular economy through the co-ordination of such learning, and to bring coherence to progression, aims, content and methods, remains a priority requiring specific action based on the CEFR and the ELP. Although the pedagogical approach necessitated by these objectives may result in classroom activity that does not use the ELP, the latter is a hard-to-replace means of ensuring overall coherence and exercising a unifying influence over teamwork in a school. After an initial phase in which the stress was placed mainly on the quality of ELP models, a new period in ELP history is opening up in which priority must be given to training teachers to use the ELP, pooling experience gained in its use, and encouraging its use at the level of the school rather than the individual language. It is no coincidence that three projects in the Third Medium-term Programme of the European Centre for Modern Languages (2008–2011) are concerned with these issues.

7.2 Future expansion of ELP content

Saying that the ELP must be maintained and developed does not, of course, mean that it should not at the same time evolve and expand. Three possibilities come to mind. The first concerns mediation activity, which already exists in some models but which can now be allocated a more significant place as a result in particular of the work carried out by the Swiss HARMOS

project. This has led to progress on the question of self-assessment of the ability to play the role of mediator using different channels (oral and written), different activities (reception and production), and different languages and cultures.

A second possibility concerns the necessary extension of existing ELP models to include all languages known and learnt by users and the wealth of situations in which those languages are encountered and used. Two examples will suffice to illustrate this point. Individual progress in home language(s) and language(s) of schooling should now be incorporated in ELP models, which means providing space for users to report and reflect on what they have learnt. Even though the CEFR competence descriptors cannot completely capture the role of those languages in developing personal identity and educating the individual and citizen, experience shows that certain school populations, for example immigrant children, gain from such descriptors and think in terms of progress in communicative competence in those languages. The use of competence descriptors for all users must certainly be differentiated according to the particular school population and educational culture, but their contribution, even if limited, must be taken into account, if not for assessment purposes, at least as reference points for defining the progression to be achieved or encouraged.

A third possibility for ELP expansion lies in the work of the Language Policy Division on the role of language in knowledge construction and the achievement of success across the curriculum. Foreign languages can, of course, benefit from reflection here but can also contribute to it, notably through bilingual education. There is a need for tools that would help ELP users to reflect on language learning and use in bilingual programmes and to assess their own progress. However, rather than increase the number of descriptors and risk taking excessive liberties with the CEFR reference levels, it seems preferable to construct self-assessment checklists from a restricted number of descriptors. Those descriptors can then be illustrated with reference to the age and specific educational context of the learners concerned. This approach could usefully be adopted generally provided it meets two requirements for effective implementation of the ELP, namely taking account of the age, learning context and specific projects and experience of users, and on the other hand, maintaining the pan-European value of the common reference levels and the self-assessment descriptors.

In any case, ensuring that the diversity of languages involved in an individual plurilingual repertoire is taken into account more effectively in the ELP should not mean that each component of that repertoire is treated separately. This would be contrary to the very idea of plurilingual competence and would undermine the ELP's main contribution to plurilingual and intercultural education.

7.3 Portfolio approaches to questions related to languages of schooling

Affirming the need to maintain and develop the ELP with its special and explicit relationship with the CEFR obviously does not mean depriving other aspects of the *Languages in/for Education* project of the clear advantages of portfolio approaches. Existing studies and work on the role of languages of schooling demonstrate the benefits of such an approach, which encourages personal reflection on learning targets, the learning process and learning outcomes. Such reflection should, however, take specific forms for two reasons:

- the questions to be dealt with are of a particular kind: appropriate competence descriptors; linguistic functions (describing, comparing, obtaining information, etc.), which on the one hand are transversal and on the other are linked to cognitive activities rooted in different subject areas, different types of language use, etc.;

- increasing the size of the ELP in an ill-considered manner might make it unusable and could damage its increasing visibility in the field of modern languages.

The possibility of including "Portfolio approaches" in the language dimension of curriculum subjects will certainly vary according to the age of the learners concerned. The creation of a specific tool, perhaps incorporating the ELP, seems possible for primary education. One of the major characteristics of this educational level is the interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary positioning of teachers, which is particularly favourable to the holistic and integrated inclusion of linguistic variation, subject-specific discourse genres and types of text encountered by users and/or expected of them. However, in secondary education, the relatively extensive specialisation of lessons in the different disciplines tends to favour the creation of subject-specific tools, which, of course, must be made mutually coherent.

8   Conclusion

The European Language Portfolio reflects all of the major concerns of Council of Europe modern languages projects since the 1970s. It is based on the belief that language learning should have a communicative purpose; it provides a means of reporting L2 proficiency that transcends the limitations of national systems of grading; it encourages learners and authorities of all kinds to value partial competences; it emphasises the importance of plurilingualism and cultural exchange; and it supports the development of learner autonomy, partly out of a commitment to democracy in education and partly because learner autonomy is the most likely guarantee of lifelong learning.

The end of the "validation" period of the ELP's history coincides with the launch of a new dynamic in Language Policy Division projects. No one can predict the consequences of the improvements that will be introduced by future ELP models, and no one can predict the form that will be taken by portfolio approaches that seek to address questions specific to languages of schooling. But there is no doubt that the rich history of the ELP over the years of its gestation, development and implementation will make a special contribution to these new projects; and there is no doubt either that the ELP itself will gain from the application of the portfolio approach to fields of study other than foreign languages, even if the latter remain its central concern.

References

Boud, D. (ed.) (1988). *Developing student autonomy in learning*. (Second edition.) London: Kogan Page.

Council for Cultural Cooperation (1979). *A European unit/credit system for modern language learning by adults: report of a symposium held at Ludwigshafen-am-Rhein, Germany, 7–14 September 1977*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Council for Cultural Cooperation (1992). *Transparency and coherence in language learning in Europe: objectives, evaluation, certification*. Report on the Rüschlikon Symposium. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Council for Cultural Cooperation (1996a). *Common European Framework of reference for language learning and teaching. Draft 1 of a Framework proposal*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe (CC-LANG (95) 5 rev. III).

Council for Cultural Cooperation (1996b). *Modern Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. A Common European Framework of reference. Draft 2 of a Framework proposal*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe (CC-LANG (95) 5 rev. IV).

Council for Cultural Cooperation (1997a). *European Language Portfolio: proposals for development*. With contributions by I. Christ, F. Debyser, A. Dobson, R. Schärer, G. Schneider/B. North & J. Trim. Strasbourg: Council of Europe (CC-LANG (97) 1).

Council for Cultural Cooperation (1997b). *Language learning for European citizenship. Final report (1989–96)*. Compiled and edited by John Trim, Project Director. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Council for Cultural Cooperation (2000a). *European Language Portfolio (ELP): principles and guidelines*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe (DGIV/EDU/LANG (2000) 33). (Available at www.coe.int/portfolio.)

Council for Cultural Cooperation (2000b). *European Language Portfolio (ELP): rules for the accreditation of ELP models*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe (DGIV/EDU/LANG (2000) 26 rev.).

Council of Europe (2001a). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Available at www.coe.int/lang.)

Council of Europe (2001b). *Cadre européen commun de référence pour les langues: apprendre, enseigner, évaluer*. Paris: Didier. (Available at *www.coe.int/lang/fr*)

Dam, L. (1995). *Learner autonomy 3: from theory to classroom practice*. Dublin: Authentik.

Flügel, C. (2000). Der standardisierte paneuropäische Sprachenpass für Erwachsene. *Babylonia* 4/00, 7–8.

Gierlinger, E. (ed.) (1999). *Sharing the European language classroom: a project in international classroom action research*. Linz: Universitätsverlag Rudolf Trauner. (Schriften der Pädagogischen Akademie des Bundes in Oberösterreich 3.)

Holec, H. (1979). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Published 1981 by Pergamon, Oxford.)

Kohonen, V. (1999). Authentic assessment in affective foreign language education. In J. Arnold (ed.), *Affect in language learning*, 279–94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kohonen, V. & Kaikkonen, P. (1997). Exploring new ways of inservice teacher education: an action research project. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies* 7.3, 42–59.

Kohonen, V. & Westhoff, G. (2001). *Enhancing the pedagogical aspects of the European Language Portfolio (ELP).* Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Available at www.coe.int/portfolio.)

Little, D. (1991). *Learner autonomy 1: definitions, issues and problems*. Dublin: Authentik.

Little, D. (1999). The European Language Portfolio and self-assessment. Strasbourg: Council of Europe (DGIV/EDU/LANG (99) 30).

Little, D. (ed.) (2003). *The European Language Portfolio in use: nine examples*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Available at www.coe.int/portfolio.)

Little, D. (2009). The European Language Portfolio: where pedagogy and assessment meet. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Available at www.coe.int/portfolio.)

Little, D. & Perclová, R. (2001). *European Language Portfolio: guide for teachers and teacher trainers*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Available at www.coe.int/portfolio.)

North, B. (2000). *The development of a Common Framework scale of language proficiency*. New York: Lang. (Theoretical Studies in Second Language Acquisition 8)

Schärer, R. (2000). *European Language Portfolio: final report on the pilot project*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Available at www.coe.int/portfolio.)

Schärer, R. (2007). *European Language Portfolio: Interim Report 2007*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Available at www.coe.int/portfolio.)

Schneider, G. (2000). Die Entwicklung der Schweizer Version des ELP. *Babylonia* 4/00, 15–20.

Schneider, G. & Lenz, P. (2001). *European Language Portfolio: guide for developers*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Available at www.coe.int/portfolio.)

Schneider, G. & North, B. (2000). *«Dans d'autres langues, je suis capable de ...» Échelles pour la description, l'évaluation et l'auto-évaluation des compétences en langues étrangères. Rapport de valorisation*. (Programme national de recherche 33: L'efficacité de nos systèmes de formation.) Berne et Aarau : Centre suisse de coordination pour la recherche en éducation (CSRE).

Stoicheva, M., Hughes, G. & Speitz, H., 2009: *The European Language Portfolio: an impact study*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. (Available at www.coe.int/portfolio.)

Acknowledgement

Appendix 1 – Self-assessment grid

		A1	A2	B1	B2	C1	C2
U N D E R S T A N D I N G	**Listening**	I can understand familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surroundings when people speak slowly and clearly.	I can understand phrases and the highest frequency vocabulary related to areas of most immediate personal relevance (e.g., very basic personal and family information, shopping, local area, employment). I can catch the main point in short, clear, simple messages and announcements.	I can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. I can understand the main point of many radio or TV programmes on current affairs or topics of personal or professional interest when the delivery is relatively slow and clear.	I can understand extended speech and lectures and follow even complex lines of argument provided the topic is reasonably familiar. I can understand most TV news and current affairs programmes. I can understand the majority of films in standard dialect.	I can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly. I can understand television programmes and films without too much effort.	I have no difficulty in understanding any kind of spoken language, whether live or broadcast, even when delivered at fast native speed, provided I have some time to get familiar with the accent.
	Reading	I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences, for example on notices and posters or in catalogues.	I can read very short, simple texts. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material such as advertisements, prospectuses, menus and timetables and I can understand short simple personal letters.	I can understand texts that consist mainly of high frequency everyday or job-related language. I can understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters.	I can read articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which the writers adopt particular attitudes or viewpoints. I can understand contemporary literary prose.	I can understand long and complex factual and literary texts, appreciating distinctions of style. I can understand specialised articles and longer technical instructions, even when they do not relate to my field.	I can read with ease virtually all forms of the written language, including abstract, structurally or linguistically complex texts such as manuals, specialised articles and literary works.
S P E A K I N G	**Spoken Interaction**	I can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help me formulate what I'm trying to say. I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics.	I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities. I can handle very short social exchanges, even though I can't usually understand enough to keep the conversation going myself.	I can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. I can enter unprepared into conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest or pertinent to everyday life (e.g., family, hobbies, work, travel and current events).	I can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible. I can take an active part in discussion in familiar contexts, accounting for and sustaining my views.	I can express myself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. I can use language flexibly and effectively for social and professional purposes. I can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate my contribution skilfully to those of other speakers.	I can take part effortlessly in any conversation or discussion and have a good familiarity with idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. I can express myself fluently and convey finer shades of meaning precisely. If I do have a problem I can backtrack and restructure around the difficulty so smoothly that other people are hardly aware of it.
	Spoken Production	I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know.	I can use a series of phrases and sentences to describe in simple terms my family and other people, living conditions, my educational background and my present or most recent job.	I can connect phrases in a simple way in order to describe experiences and events, my dreams, hopes and ambitions. I can briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans. I can narrate a story or relate the plot of a book or film and describe my reactions.	I can present clear, detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects related to my field of interest. I can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.	I can present clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects integrating sub-themes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion.	I can present a clear, smoothly-flowing description or argument in a style appropriate to the context and with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points.
W R I T I N G	**Writing**	I can write a short, simple postcard, for example sending holiday greetings. I can fill in forms with personal details, for example entering my name, nationality and address on a hotel registration form.	I can write short, simple notes and messages. I can write a very simple personal letter, for example thanking someone for something.	I can write simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. I can write personal letters describing experiences and impressions.	I can write clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects related to my interests. I can write an essay or report, passing on information or giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view. I can write letters highlighting the personal significance of events and experiences.	I can express myself in clear, well-structured text, expressing points of view at some length. I can write about complex subjects in a letter, an essay or a report, underlining what I consider to be the salient issues. I can select a style appropriate to the reader in mind.	I can write clear, smoothly-flowing text in an appropriate style. I can write complex letters, reports or articles which present a case with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points. I can write summaries and reviews of professional or literary works.

© Council of Europe

Appendix 2 – List of validated/accredited ELPs

1.2000   Switzerland – Model for young people and adults

2.2000   France – Model for children, accompanied by a Guide for Users (available in French only)

3.2000   Russian Federation – Model for learners in upper secondary education

4.2000   Germany – North Rhine–Westphalia – Model for learners in lower secondary education

5.2000   France – Model for young learners and adults

[5.2000 rev. 2006]

6.2000   EAQUALS/ALTE – Model for adult learners

[6.2000 electronic version]

7.2001   Czech Republic – Model for learners in lower secondary education (11–15 years)

8.2001   United Kingdom – Model for children

9.2001   United Kingdom – Model for adults (with a particular, but not exclusive, focus on the learner of languages for vocational purposes)

[9.2001 rev. 2006]

10.2001   Ireland – Model for learners in post-primary education

11.2001   Ireland – Model for use in primary education with a specific target group: immigrants learning the language of the host country

[11.2001 rev. 2004]

12.2001   Ireland – Model for use in post–primary education with a specific target group: immigrants learning the language of the host country

[12.2001 rev. 2004)]

13.2001a   Ireland – Model for adult immigrants newly arrived, learning the target language of the host country (superseded by 37.2002)

13.200b   Ireland – Model for adult immigrants who have already spent some time in the country and are learning the target language of the host country (superseded by 37.2002)

14.2001   Ireland – Model for adult immigrants preparing for mainstream vocational training and employment

15.2001   Hungary – Model for learners in secondary education

16.2001   Hungary – Model for learners in primary education

17.2001   Hungary – Model for adults

18.2001   The Netherlands – Model for learners in upper secondary vocational education

19.2001   Sweden – Model for learners in upper secondary and adult education including vocational education

20.2001   Portugal – Model for learners aged 10–15 years old

21.2001   Portugal – Model for learners in upper–secondary education

21.2001-Port.IIUM/UCP – Portugal - Portuguese Catholic University and Macau Inter-University Institute - Model for adult learners

22.2001   Czech Republic – Model for learners up to 11 years old

23.2001   Czech Republic – Model for learners in upper–secondary education

24.2001   Austria – Model for learners in upper secondary education

25.2002   Italy (Umbria) – Model for learners in lower secondary education

26.2002   Italy (Piedmont) – Model for learners in primary education

27.2002   Russian Federation – Model for language teachers, translators and interpreters

28.2002   Russian Federation – Model for learners in primary education

29.2002   CERCLES (European Confederation of Language Centres in Higher Education) – Model for learners in higher education

[29.2002 – CZ]

[29.2002 – SK]

[29.2002 – IT]

30.2002   Italy (Lombardy) – Model for learners in lower secondary education

31.2002   Russian Federation – Model for learners in lower secondary education

32.2002a   Germany – Thüringen – Model for learners in primary education

32.2002b   Germany – Thüringen – Model for learners in grades 5–9

32.2002c   Germany – Thüringen – Model for learners in grades 10–12

33.2002   The Netherlands – Model for learners aged 9–12

34.2002a   The Netherlands – Model for learners aged 12–15

34.2002b   The Netherlands – Model for learners aged 15+

35.2002   European Language Council – Model for learners in higher education

[35.2002 – DE]

[35.2002 – DK]

[35.2004 – SP]

36.2002   The Netherlands (CINOP) – Model for adult second language learners

37.2002   Milestone – Model for learners of the host community language

38.2003   French speaking Community of Belgium – Model for children in primary education

39.2003   French speaking Community of Belgium – Model for learners in upper secondary education

40.2003   Italy – Model for learners in higher education

41.2003   Northern Ireland – Model for learners in primary school

42.2003	Slovak Republic – Model for learners aged 11–15
43.2003	Greece – Model for learners aged 12–15.
44.2003	France – Model for learners in lower secondary education
45.2003	Georgia – Model for learners aged 15+
46.2003	Germany – City of Hamburg – Model for learners in lower secondary education
47.2003	Turkey – Model for learners aged 15–18
48.2003	Model for learners in vocational sectors developed by Sofia University with partners in 5 European countries. The five language versions were issued with the following numbers:

[48.2003 – BG]

[48.2003 – EN]

[48.2003 – FR]

[48.2003 – DE]

[48.2003 – IT]

49.2003	Italy – Model for learners in primary education (an Italian version of 8.2001)
50.2003	Spain – Model for learners aged 3–7
51.2003	Spain – Model for learners aged 8–12
52.2003	Spain – Model for learners aged 12–18
53.2003	Bulgaria – Model for learners aged 6–10
54.2003	Italy – Turin – Model for learners aged 15+ and adults
55.2004	Czech Republic – Model for adult learners
56.2004	Turkey (Ankara University) – Model for adult learners
57.2004	Slovenia – Model for learners 11–15
58.2004	Austria – Model for learners aged 10–15
59.2004	Spain – Model for adult learners
60.2004	Sweden – Model for learners aged 6–11
61.2004	Sweden – Model for learners aged 12–16
62.2004	Poland – Model for learners aged 10–15
63.2004	Austria (Cernet) – Model for learners aged 10–15
64.2004	Italy – Puglia – Model for learners aged 14–20
65.2004	Italy – Bolzano – Model for learners in primary education
66.2005	Ireland: Model for learners in primary education
67.2005	Switzerland – CDIP - Model for learners in lower secondary education

[67.2005 rev. 2007]

68.2005	Austria - *Pädagogisches Institut Wien* – Model for learners aged 14–18
69.2005	Italy (Bolzano) – Model for learners in lower secondary education
70.2006	UK – CILT, National Centre for Languages - Model for junior learners

[70.2006 downloadable version]

71.2006	Croatia – Ministry of Science Education and Sports - Model for young learners (11-15)
72.2006	Poland – Ministry of National Education – Model for young learners (6-10)
73.2006-	Lithuania – Ministry of Education and Science – Model for upper-secondary learners
74.2006	Iceland – Ministry of Education, Science and Culture – Model for lower-secondary learners
75.2006	Iceland – Ministry of Education, Science and Culture – Model for upper-secondary learners
76.2006	Poland – National In-service Teacher Training Centre – Model for learners age 16 +
77.2006	Thüringen – *Thüringer Volkshochschulverband* - Model for adults
78.2006	Croatia – Ministry of Science, Education and Sports - Model for learners aged from 15 to 19
79.2006	Turkey – Bilfen Schools - Model for learners aged from 10 to 14
80.2006	Turkey – Ministry of National Education - Model for learners aged from 10 to 14
81.2006	Croatia – Ministry of Science, Education and Sports - Model for learners aged from 7 to 10
82.2006	Slovenia – Ministry of Education and Sport - Model for upper-secondary school learners aged 15–19
83.2006	Cyprus – Ministry of Education and Culture of Cyprus - Model for learners aged 12–15
84.2006	Latvia – Public Service Language Centre (PSLC) - Model for adults
85.2007	Turkey – Bilfen Schools – Model for learners aged 5–9
86.2007	Armenia – Yerevan State Linguistic University – Model for learners aged 6–10
87.2007	Poland – National In-service Teacher Training Centre – Model for learners aged 3–6
88.2007	Austria - *Österreichisches Sprachenkompetenz Zentrum* (OSZ) - Model for learners aged 15+
89.2007	Netherlands – National Bureau for Modern Languages - electronic ELP model for all language learners
90.2007	Germany (Hessen) – *Verbundprojekt 'Sprachen lehren und lernen als Kontinuum' Koordinierungsstelle* - Model for lower-secondary learners (grades 3–10)
91.2007	Austria – *Verband Österreichischer Volkshochschulen* - Model for adult learners
92.2007	Latvia – State Language Agency - Model for young learners aged 7–12
93.2007	Estonia – Model for lower-secondary learners aged 12–16
94.2008	Austria - Vienna Board of Education – European Language Portfolio for the Central European Region - Model for primary school learners aged 6–10
95.2008	Switzerland – CDIP - Model for learners aged 7–11, including *Portolino* for learners aged 4–7
96.2008	Albania – Ministry of Education and Science - Model for upper-secondary learners aged 15+

29

97.2008	Norway – Directorate for Education and Training - Model for lower and upper secondary learners
98.2009	Spain – University of Madrid - Model for academic and professional purposes
99.2009	Austria – *Österreichisches Sprachenkompetenz Zentrum* (OSZ) - Model for learners aged 6–10
100.2009	Norway – Directorate for Education and Training - Model for learners aged 6–12
101.2009	Italy (Autonomous Province of Bolzano–South Tyrol, Autonomous Region of Val d'Aoste) - Model for learners aged 14–19
102.2009	Belgium, *Secrétariat flamand de l'enseignement catholique (VSKO) asbl Formation dans l'enseignement catholique* – Model for young learners aged 10-14 ans
103.2009	Albania - Ministry of Education and Science - Model for students aged 18+
104.2010	France – Editions Didier - Model for learners aged 6–10
105.2010	Spain – Ministry of Education and Science, *Organismo Autonomo* electronic ELP *Programas Educativos Europeos* - e-ELP web application for learners aged 14+
106.2010	Albania – Ministry of Education and Science - Model for learners aged 11–14
107.2010	Lithuania – Ministry of Education and Science - Model for learners aged 11–15
108.2010	e-ELP model for Blind and Visually Impaired learners aged 16+, Euroinform, Bulgaria (electronic ELP)
109.2010	Slovenia – Ministry of Education and Sport - Model for adult learners
110.2010	Greece – Hellenic Pedagogical Institute - Model for learners aged 9–12
111.2010	Montenegro – Bureau for Education Services - Model for learners aged 12–15
112.2010	Italy – *Università degli Studi Guglielmo Marconi* - Model for students (electronic ELP)
113.2010	Norway – Directorate for Education and Training - Model for adult migrants
114.2010	Turkey – İTÜ Development Foundation Schools - Model for learners aged 7–9 (electronic ELP)
115.2010	Turkey – İTÜ Development Foundation Schools - Model for learners aged 10–14 (electronic ELP)
116.2010	Portugal – *Direcção Geral de Inovação e de Desenvolvimento Curricular* - Model for learners aged 6–10
117.2010	France – *Université Montesquieu-Bordeaux IV* - e-ELP model for university students
118.2010	Slovenia – Ministry of Education and Sport - Model for learners aged 6–10

Appendix 3 – EVC members and consultants, 2001–2010

First Mandate, 2000-2004

2000 – Meetings 1 and 2

Members

Ms Radka PERCLOVÁ	Czech Republic
Mr Viljo KOHONEN	Finland
Mr Francis GOULLIER	France
Mr Eike THÜRMANN	Germany
Mr Gábor BOLDIZSÁR	Hungary
Ms Glória FISCHER	Portugal
Ms Irina KHALEEVA	Russian Federation
Mr Christoph FLÜGEL	Switzerland
Mr Lid KING	United Kingdom

2001 – Meeting 3	Mr Pavel CINK replaced Ms Radka PERCLOVÁ
2001 – Meeting 4	Mr Peter LENZ replaced Mr Christoph FLÜGEL
2002 – Meeting 5	Ms Ulla PAJUKANTA replaced Mr Viljo KOHONEN
2002 – Meeting 6	Mr Viljo KOHONEN replaced Ms Ulla PAJUKANTA

2003 – Meetings 7 and 8	As above
2004 – Meetings 9 and 10	As above

Invited experts

2000

Mr Rolf SCHÄRER	General rapporteur
Mr Robin DAVIS	EAQUALS
Mr David LITTLE	Trinity College Dublin
Mr Wolfgang MACKIEWICZ	Freie Universität Berlin
2001–2004	The above +
Mr Gareth HUGHES	MGB – Coordination Office of the Club Schools/International Certificate Conference, replaced Mr Robin DAVIS

Second mandate, 2005-2006

2005 – Meetings 11 and 12

Members

Mr Francis GOULLIER	France (Chair)
Mr Gabor BOLDIZSAR	Hungary
Mr David LITTLE	Ireland (Vice Chair)
Ms Gisella LANGÉ	Italy
Mr Dick MEIJER	Netherlands

Ms Barbara GŁOWACKA   Poland
Ms Irina KHALEEVA   Russian Federation
Mr José Joaquin MORENO ARTESERO   Spain
Mr Peter LENZ   Switzerland
Consultants
Mr Rolf SCHÄRER   General rapporteur
Mr Gareth HUGHES   MGB – Coordination Office of the Club Schools/ International Certificate Conference
Mr Wolfgang MACKIEWICZ   Freie Universität, Berlin
2006 – Meetings 13 and 14   As above
Third mandate, 2007-2008
2007–2008, Meetings 15–18
Members
Ms Maria STOICHEVA
Mr Francis GOULLIER (Vice Chair)

Mr Wolfgang MACKIEWICZ
Mr David LITTLE (Chair)
Mr Dick MEIJER
Ms Heike SPEITZ
Ms Barbara GŁOWACKA
Ms Irina KHALEEVA
Mr Gareth HUGHES
In attendance
Mr Rolf SCHÄRER (General rapporteur)

Fourth mandate, 2009-2010
2009–2010 Meetings 19–22
As above

Observer at meetings 16–22
Ms Irena MASKOVA, Member of ECML Governing Board

Appendix 4 – Participants in the European ELP seminars, 2001-2009

2001
Portugal (Coimbra), 28–30 June

Albania
Mr Sezai ROKAJ

Andorra
Ms Francesca JUNYENT MONTAGNE

Austria
Ms Edith MATZER

Azerbaijan
Mr Fakhraddin VEYSALOV

Belarus
Ms Tatiana LEONTYEVA

Belgium
Mr Gilbert De SAMBLANC
Ms Chris VAN WOENSEL

Bosnia-Herzegovina
Ms Naida SUSIC MEHMEDAGIC

Bulgaria
Ms Lubov DRAGANOVA

Croatia
Ms Anera ADAMIK

Cyprus
Mr Charalambos TIMOTHEOU

Czech Republic
Ms Radka PERCLOVÁ

Denmark
Ms Eva KAMBSKARD

Estonia
Ms Kristi MERE

Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
Ms Biljana LAJOVIC

Finland
Mr Viljo KOHONEN
Ms Lilia KOHONEN

France
Ms Christine TAGLIANTE

Germany
Ms Martina ADLER

Georgia
Ms Marika ODZELI

Greece
Ms Evangelia KAGA-GKIOVOUSOGLOU

Hungary
Ms Zsuzsa DARABOS

Iceland
Ms Adda Maria JOHANNSDOTTIR

Ireland
Dr Ema USHIODA

Italy
Mr Luigi CLAVARINO

Latvia
Dr Ieva ZUICENA

Lithuania
Ms Zita MAZUOLIENE

Luxembourg
Ms Gaby KUNSCH

Malta
Mr Ray CAMILLERI

Netherlands
Mr Peter BROEDER

Norway
Mr Kjell GULBRANDSEN

Poland
Ms Barbara GLOWACKA

Romania
Mr Dan Ion NASTA

Russian Federation
Ms Kira IRISKHANOVA

Slovakia
Ms Anna BUTASOVA

Slovenia
Ms Branka PETEK

Spain
Ms Ana GARCIA FERRER

Sweden
Mr Kurt STENBERG

Switzerland
Mr Christoph FLÜGEL

"Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"
Ms Doréana HRISTOVA

Turkey
Prof. Dr Özcan DEMIREL

Ukraine
Mr Sergey SELIVANOV

United Kingdom
Mr John THOROGOOD

Canada
Ms Yohanna LOUCHEUR

DIALANG
Mr Sauli TAKALA

Portugal
Maria Antónia LARANJO
Rosa Lídia da Silva MOTA
Maria Alice PAIS
Maria do Carmo LEITÃO
Olívia Mateus da SILVA
Maria Arminda Bragança de MIRANDA
Maria Jesus FILIP
Natália NUNES
Anália GOMES
Maria Guadalupe PORTELINHO
Isabel GRAÇA
Olga MACHADO
Ana Isabel Ribeiro PEREIRA
Manuela VIEIRA
Armando CUNHA
Isabel VIDEIRA
Maria José SÁ CORREIA
Margarida OLIVEIRA
José PASCOAL
Maria João SERRA

Portuguese organisers
Ms Maria Helena CORREIA
Ms Glória FISCHER
Ms Manuela TUNA

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
Language Policy Division
Ms Johanna PANTHIER

General Rapporteur
Mr Rolf SCHÄRER

Seminar Co-ordinator
Mr David LITTLE

Vice-Chair of the European Validation Committee
Mr Francis GOULLIER

_____

2002
Italy (Turin), 15–17 April

Andorra
Ms Francesca JUNYENT MONTAGNE

Armenia
Ms Melanya ASTVATSATRYAN

Austria
Mr Gunther ABUJA

Azerbaijan
Mr Natiq YUSIFOV

Belarus
Ms Tatiana LEONTYEVA

Belgium
Flemish Community
Ms Chris Van WOENSEL
French Community
Mr Gilbert De SAMBLANC

Bosnia-Herzegovina
Ms Naida SUŠIĆ MEHMEDAGIĆ

Bulgaria
Ms Lilia DULGEROVA

Croatia
Ms Anera ADAMIK

Czech Republic
Ms Vera ŠPRUNGLOVÀ

Denmark
Ms Christine HØSTBO
Ms Eva KAMBSKARD

Estonia
Ms Ülle TÜRK

State of Serbia and Montenegro
Republic of Serbia
Ms Biljana LAJOVIĆ
Republic of Montenegro
Mr Dragan BOGOJEVIĆ

Finland
Mr Viljo KOHONEN

Germany
Mr Eike THÜRMANN

Georgia
Ms Marika ODZELI

Greece
Ms Roy CHOURDAKI
Ms Evangelia KAGA-GKIOVOUSOGLOU

Hungary
Ms Zsuzsa DARABOS

Iceland
Ms Oddný SVERRISDÓTTIR

Ireland
Ms Barbara LAZENBY SIMPSON

Latvia
Ms Evija PAPULE

Liechtenstein
Mr Wilfried MÜLLER

Lithuania
Ms Zita MAZUOLIENE

Luxembourg
Mme Gaby KUNSCH

Malta
Mr Raymond CAMILLERI

Moldova
Ms Eugenie BRINZĂ

Netherlands
Mr Dick MEIJER

Norway
Mr Kjell GULBRANDSEN

Poland
Ms Barbara GLOWACKA

Portugal
Ms Gloria FISCHER
Ms Maria Helena CORREIA

Romania
Mr Dan Ion NASTA

Russian Federation
Ms Kira IRISKHANOVA

Slovakia
Ms Anna BUTASOVA

Spain
Ms Gisela CONDE MORENCIA

Sweden
Ms Ingela NYMAN

Switzerland
Mr Hans Ulrich BOSSHARD

Turkey
Mr Özcan DEMIREL

Ukraine
Ms Oksana KOVALENKO

United Kingdom
Mr Lid KING

EAQUALS/ALTE
Mr Peter BROWN

International Certificate Conference
Mr Gareth HUGHES

General Rapporteur
Mr Rolf SCHÄRER

Seminar Co-ordinator
Mr David LITTLE

Experts
Mr Peter LENZ
Ms Pia GILARDI FRECH

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
Language Policy Division
Mr Joseph SHEILS
Ms Johanna PANTHIER

European Centre for Modern Languages
Mr Joseph HUBER

_____

2002
**Luxembourg (Montdorf-les-Bains),
17–19 October**

Albania
Ms Tatiana VUÇANI

Armenia
Ms Melanya ASTVATSATRYAN

Austria
Mr Gunther ABUJA

Azerbaijan
Mr Bilal ISMAILOV

Belarus
Ms Tatiana LEONTYEVA

Belgium
Flemish Community
Ms Chris VAN WOENSEL
French Community
Mr Gilbert De SAMBLANC

Bulgaria
Ms Liliana Vladimirova DULGEROVA

Croatia
Ms Anera ADAMIK

Cyprus
Mr Charalambos TIMOTHEOU

Czech Republic
Ms Radka PERCLOVÁ

Denmark
Ms Eva KAMBSKARD

Estonia
Ms Kristi MERE

State of Serbia and Montenegro
Republic of Serbia
Ms Biljana LAJOVIĆ
Republic of Montenegro
Mr Igor LAKIC

Finland
Mr Viljo KOHONEN

France
Ms Christine TAGLIANTE

Germany
Mr Eike THÜRMANN
(Observer)
Mr Johann GREIMED

Georgia
Ms Marika ODZELI

Greece
Ms Evangelia KAGA-GKIOVOUSOGLOU

Hungary
Ms Zsuzsa DARABOS

Iceland
Ms Oddný SVERRISSDÓTTIR

Ireland
Ms Barbara LAZENBY SIMPSON

Italy
Ms Alessandra DI AICHELBURG

Latvia
Ms Ieva ZUICENA

Lithuania
Ms Stase SKAPIENE

Malta
Mr Raymond CAMILLERI

Moldova
Ms Eugénie BRINZĂ

Netherlands
Mr Dick MEIJER

Norway
Mr Kjell GULBRANDSEN

Poland
Ms Barbara GLOWACKA

Portugal
Ms Glória FISCHER

Romania
Mr Dan Ion NASTA

Russian Federation
Ms Kira IRISKHANOVA

Slovakia
Ms Anna BUTASOVA

Slovenia
Mr Janez SKELA

Spain
Ms Gisela CONDE MORENCIA

Sweden
Mr Eric KINRADE

Switzerland
Ms Irène SCHWOB

Turkey
Mr Özcan DEMIREL

Luxembourg
Ms Betty BECK-BELAIS
Ms Pascale BECKER
Mr Marc BELCHE
Ms Geneviève BENDER
Mr Guy BENTNER
Ms Mylène BERGAMI
Ms Anne-Marie BERNY
Ms Edmée BESCH
Ms Ingeborg BIHR
Mr Robert BOHNERT
Mr José DE PAUW
Ms Maggy DOCKENDORF-KEMP
Mr Pascal DUSSAUSAYE
Ms Michaela FRANZEN
Mr Jim GOERRES
Ms Marie-Anne HANSEN-PAULY
Ms Martine HAVET-LANGLET
Mr Jean-Baptiste KREMER
Mr Michel LANNERS
Ms Jeanne LETSCH
Ms Muriel MEYERS
Ms Marie-Paul ORIGER-ERESCH
Mr Pierre REDING
Mr Charel SCHMIT
Mr J.P. Roger STRAINCHAMPS
Ms Christiane TONNAR
Mr Aly TRAUSCH
Ms Francine VANOLST

European Language Council
Ms Brigitte FORSTER VOSICKI

International Certificate Conference
Mr Gareth HUGHES

EAQUALS (European Association for Quality Language Services)
Mr Peter BROWN

ALTE (Association of Language Testers in Europe)
Ms Barbara STEVENS-RIVETT

General Rapporteur
Mr Rolf SCHÄRER

Seminar Co-ordinator
Mr David G. LITTLE

Experts
Mr Peter LENZ
Mr Günther SCHNEIDER

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
Language Policy Division
Ms Johanna PANTHIER

NATIONAL ORGANISERS
Mr Gérard PHILIPPS
Ms Stéphanie NIPPERT
Mr Jeannot HANSEN
Ms Gaby KUNSCH
Ms Anne-Marie ANTONY
Mr Sara D'ELICIO
Mr Steve SCHLECK
Ms Sonny LICHTEN

_____

2003
Turkey (Istanbul), 23–25 October

Albania
Ms Tatjana VUÇANI

Andorra
Ms Francesca JUNYENT MONTAGNE

Armenia
Ms Melanya ASTVATSATRYAN

Austria
Mr Gunther ABUJA

Belarus
Ms Tatiana LEONTYEVA

Belgium
Flemish Community
Ms Christiane VAN WOENSEL
French Community
Mr Gilbert de SAMBLANC

Bosnia and Herzegovina
Ms Naida SUŠIC MEHMEDAGIČ

Bulgaria
Ms Vesselina POPOVA

Croatia
Ms Anera ADAMIK

Cyprus
Mr Charalambos TIMOTHEOU

Czech Republic
Ms Jana DAVIDOVA

Denmark
Ms Eva KAMBSKARD

Estonia
Mr Tõnu TENDER
Ms Ülle TÜRK

Finland
Mr Viljo KOHONEN

France
Mr Francis GOULLIER

Germany
Ms Gabriele TÄNZER

Georgia
Ms Marika ODZELI

Greece
Ms Evagelia KAGA-GKIOVOUSOGLOU

Hungary
Mme Zsuzsa DARABOS

Iceland
Ms Oddný SVERRISSDÓTTIR

Ireland
Ms Eibhlín NI SCANNLAIN

Latvia
Ms Dace DALBINA

Lithuania
Ms Zita MAZUOLIENE

Luxembourg
Mme Gaby KUNSCH

Malta
Mr Frank GATT

Moldova
Ms Elisaveta ONOFREICIUC

Netherlands
Ms Ellie LIEMBERG

Norway
Mr Kjell GULBRANDSEN

Poland
Ms Barbara GLOWACKA

Portugal
Ms Glória FISCHER

Romania
Mr Dan Ion NASTA

Serbia and Montenegro
Serbia
Ms Ljiljana DJURIC
Montenegro
Mr Dragan BOGOJEVIĆ
Mr Igor LAKIC

Slovakia
Ms Anna BUTASOVA

Slovenia
Ms Zdravka GODUNC

Spain
Ms Ana MADROŇERO-PELOCHE
Ms Gisela CONDE MORENCIA

Sweden
Ms Ingela NYMAN
Mr Eric KINRADE
Ms Cecilia NIHLÉN

Switzerland
Mr Hans Ulrich BOSSHARD

Ukraine
Ms Oksana KOVALENKO

United Kingdom
Mr Louis GREENSTOCK

ALTE (Association of Language Testers in Europe)
Ms Barbara STEVENS

EAQUALS (European Association for Quality Language Services)
Mr Peter BROWN

European Language Council (ELC)
Ms Maria Giovanna TASSINARI

International Certificate Conference
Mr Gareth HUGHES

Sofia University "St Kliment Ohridski"
Ms Maria STOICHEVA

General Rapporteur
Mr Rolf SCHÄRER

Seminar Co-ordinator
Mr David G. LITTLE

Experts
Ms Gisella LANGÉ
Mr Dick MEIJER
Mr Günther SCHNEIDER
Ms Barbara LAZENBY SIMPSON

NATIONAL ORGANISERS
Mr Özcan DEMIREL
Tolga YAĞIZATLI

TURKISH PARTICIPANTS
Assoc. Prof. Emin KARİP
Münevver ELÇİ NAKİP
Ceyda ÜÇYILDIZ
Nuray KARABİBER
Dilek SERT
Sitare AYAZ
Kadir TAN
Tuncay SAVTAK
Nilgün EROĞLU ÜSTÜN
Necmettin K. SEVIL
İlknur EGEL (Dr.)
Bengü AKSU
Tülin YALMAN
Buket DÜZYOL
Meltem AKTAŞ
Gülzemin ÖZRENK AYDIN
Serdar AYDIN
Philip GLOVER

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
Language Policy Division
Mr Joseph SHEILS
Ms Johanna PANTHIER

_____

2004
Spain (Madrid), 30 September– 2 October

Albania
Ms Tatjana VUÇANI

Andorra
Ms Francesca JUNYENT MONTAGNE

Armenia
Ms Melanya ASTVATSATRYAN

Austria
Mr Gunther ABUJA

Azerbaijan
Mr Bilal ISMAYILOV

Belarus
Ms Tatsiana LIAVONTSYEVA

Belgium
Flemish Community
Ms Christiane VAN WOENSEL
French Community
Mr Gilbert de SAMBLANC

Bosnia and Herzegovina
Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina
Ms Naida SUSIC MEHMEDAGIC
Republika Srpska
Ms Snežana DJORDJEVIC

Bulgaria
Ms Vesselina POPOVA

Croatia
Ms Anera ADAMIK
Ms Alida MATKOVIC

Cyprus
Ms Androniki PAPA-PAPADOPOULOU

Czech Republic
Ms Radka PERCLOVÁ

Denmark
Ms Eva KAMBSKARD
Ms Hanne THOMSEN

Estonia
Mr Tõnu TENDER
Ms Ülle TÜRK

Finland
Mr Viljo KOHONEN

France
Mr Francis GOULLIER

Germany
Mr Eike THÜRMANN

Georgia
Ms Marika ODZELI

Greece
Ms Evagelia KAGA-GKIOVOUSOGLOU

Hungary
Ms Zsuzsa DARABOS

Iceland
Ms Aldis YNGVADOTTIR

Ireland
Ms Barbara LAZENBY SIMPSON

Italy
Ms Francesca BROTTO

Latvia
Ms Evija PAPULE

Lithuania
Ms Zita MAZUOLIENE

Luxembourg
Ms Gaby KUNSCH

Moldova
Ms Eugénie BRINZĂ

Netherlands
Mr Dick MEIJER

Norway
Mr Kjell GULBRANDSEN
Ms Heike SPEITZ

Poland
Ms Maria GORZELAK

Portugal
Ms Glória FISCHER

Romania
Mr Dan Ion NASTA

Russian Federation
Ms Irina KHALEEVA
Mr Vladimir SHLEG

Serbia and Montenegro
Serbia
Ms Dusica BLAZIC
Montenegro
Mr Igor LAKIC

Slovakia
Ms Anna BUTASOVA

Sweden
Mr Eric KINRADE
Ms Eva ENGDELL

Switzerland
Mr Hans Ulrich BOSSHARD

Turkey
Mr Özcan DEMIREL

Ukraine
Ms Oksana KOVALENKO

United Kingdom
Mr Alan DOBSON

ALTE (Association of Language Testers in Europe)
Ms Barbara STEVENS

EAQUALS (European Association for Quality Language Services)
Mr Peter BROWN

European Language Council (ELC)
Ms Brigitte FORSTER VOSICKI

International Certificate Conference (ICC)
Mr Gareth HUGHES

Sofia University "St Kliment Ohridski"
Ms Maria STOICHEVA

CIEP
Ms Catherine CLEMENT

Experts
Ms Neus FIGUERAS CASANOVAS
Ms Barbara GŁOWACKA
Mr Peter LENZ
Mr David LITTLE – Coordinator, European ELP seminars
Mr Rolf SCHÄRER – ELP General Rapporteur

SPANISH PARTICIPANTS

Ministry of Education
Mr Emilio GARCÍA
Ms Ana MADROÑERO PELOCHE
Ms Yolanda ZARATE MUÑIZ

ELP Developers
Azucena CORREDERA GONZALEZ
Virginia FERNANDEZ RUIZ DE ARANA
Elisa VÁZQUEZ GONZÁLEZ
Eva MARTINEZ PEREZ
Carmen PEREZ
Carmen ALARIO TRIGUEROS

ELP Representatives from the Regional Authorities
Junta de Andalucía
Antonio FERNÁNDEZ BERMUDO
Diputación General de Aragón
Miguel BALLESTÍN CALVO
Principado de Asturias
Pilar CORTEJOSO
Illes Balears
Pilar JAEN MERCADAL
Gobierno de Canarias
Nestor CASTRO
Comunidad Autónoma de Cantabria
Azucena GOZALO
Junta de Comunidades de Castilla La Mancha
Paul MITCHELL
Junta de Castilla y León
Francisco Javier LOPEZ ALVAREZ
Generalitat de Catalunya
Maria Dolors SOLE VILANOVA
Junta de Extremadura
Diego GALVEZ DÍAZ
Xunta de Galicia
Ana M. ALZATE
Comunidad Autónoma de La Rioja
José María PEREZ RIVAS
Comunidad de Madrid
Carmen BURGOS GONZALEZ
Comunidad de Murcia
Ascensión LOPEZ CANOVAS
Diputación Foral de Navarra
Teresa DE CARLOS
Gobierno del País Vasco
Ainhoa IMAZ GAZTELURRUTIA
Generalitat Valenciana
Agustí PÉREZ FOLQUÉS
Ceuta
Eva MELGUIZO BERMÚDEZ
Melilla
Begoña MORENO CHAVES
Instituto Cervantes
Juan Luis MONTOUSSÉ
Elena VERDÍA LLEÓ

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
Language Policy Division
Mr Joseph SHEILS
Ms Johanna PANTHIER
Mr Christopher REYNOLDS

2005
Russian Federation (Moscow), 29 September–1 October

Albania
Ms Tatjana VUÇANI

Armenia
Ms Melanya ASTVATSATRYAN

Austria
Mr Gunther ABUJA

Azerbaijan
MrBilal ISMAYILOV
MsTarana BAYRAMOVA

Belarus
Ms Tatsiana LEONTYEVA

Belgium
Flemish Community
Ms Chris VAN WOENSEL
French Community
MrGilbert de SAMBLANC

Bosnia and Herzegovina
MsDzevahira ARSLANAGIC
MrDinko JURIC

Bulgaria
MsVesselina POPOVA

Croatia
Ms Yvonne VRHOVAC

Cyprus
MsAndroniki PAPA-PAPADOPOULOU

Czech Republic
Ms Radka PERCLOVÁ

Denmark
Ms Eva KAMBSKARD

Estonia
Mr Tõnu TENDER
Ms Ülle TÜRK

Finland
Mr Viljo KOHONEN

"Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"
Ms Marija NIKOLOVA

France
Mr Francis GOULLIER

Georgia
Ms Marika ODZELI
Ms Salome SHARASHENIDZE

Greece
Ms Evagelia KAGA-GKIOVOUSOGLOU

Hungary
Ms Zsuzsa DARABOS

Ireland
Ms Barbara LAZENBY SIMPSON

Italy
Ms Gisella LANGÉ

Latvia
Ms Inita VĪTOLA
Ms. Dace DALBIŅA

Lithuania
Ms Zita MAZUOLIENE

Luxembourg
Ms Gaby KUNSCH

Netherlands
Mr Dick MEIJER

Norway
Ms Jorunn BERNTZEN
Ms Heike SPEITZ

Poland
Ms Maria GORZELAK

Portugal
Ms Glória FISCHER

Romania
Ms Miorita GOT

Serbia and Montenegro
Serbia
Ms Milica GOLUBOVIC-TASEVSKA
Montenegro
Mr Dragan BOGOJEVIC

Slovakia
Ms Anna BUTASOVA
Ms Darina DE JAEGHER

Slovenia
Mr Janez SKELA

Spain
Ms Yolanda ZÁRATE

Sweden
Ms Carin SÖDERBERG

Switzerland
Mr Hans Ulrich BOSSHARD

Turkey
Mr Özcan DEMIREL

United Kingdom
Mr Lid KING

ALTE (Association of Language Testers in Europe)
Ms Barbara STEVENS

EAQUALS (European Association for Quality Language Services)
Mr Peter BROWN

European Language Council (ELC)
Ms Maria Giovanna TASSINARI

International Certificate Conference (ICC)
Mr Mike MAKOSCH

Sofia University "St Kliment Ohridski"
Ms. Maria STOICHEVA

Experts
Prof Michael BYRAM
Mr David LITTLE – Coordinator, European ELP seminars
Mr Rolf SCHÄRER – General rapporteur

RUSSIAN ORGANISERS
Ms Irina KHALEEVA
Mr Vladimir SHLEG

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
Language Policy Division
Mr Joseph SHEILS
Mr Christopher REYNOLDS

_____

2006
Lithuania (Vilnius),
28–30 September

Albania
Ms Tatjana VUÇANI

Andorra
Ms Maria Teresa BONET CABALLERO

Armenia
Ms Melanya ASTVATSATRYAN

Austria
Mr Gunther ABUJA

Belarus
Ms Tatsiana LEONTYEVA

Belgium
Flemish Community
Ms Chris VAN WOENSEL
French Community
Ms Nadine FRANÇOIS

Bosnia and Herzegovina
Ms Dzevahira ARSLANAGIC

Bulgaria
Mme Vesselina POPOVA

Croatia
Ms Cvjetanka BOŽANIĆ

Cyprus
Ms Efrosyni TOFARIDOU

Czech Republic
Ms Jitka TUMOVA

Estonia
Mr Tõnu TENDER
Ms Ülle TÜRK

Finland
Mr Viljo KOHONEN

"Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"
Ms Marija NIKOLOVA

France
Ms Geneviève GAILLARD

Germany
Mr Eike THÜRMANN

Georgia
Ms Marika ODZELI

Greece
Ms Evagelia KAGA-GKIOVOUSOGLOU

Hungary
Ms Zsuzsa DARABOS

Iceland
Ms Erna ÁRNADÓTTIR
Ms Aldís INGVADOTTIR

Ireland
Ms Barbara LAZENBY SIMPSON

Italy
Ms Francesca BROTTO

Latvia
Ms Inita VĪTOLA
Ms Dace DALBIŅA
Ms Silvija KARKLINA
Ms Rita KURSITE
Ms Eli LUFTA

Lithuania
Mr. Justinas BARTUSEVIČIUS
Ms. Nijolė BAZARIENĖ
Ms Irena BUDREIKIENĖ
Ms Nida BURNEIKAITĖ
Ms Ona ČEPULĖNIENĖ
Ms Laimutė JANKAUSKIENĖ
Ms Aušra JANULIENĖ
Ms Lina JUKNELIENĖ
Ms Rūta KRAUJALYTĖ
Ms Zita MAŽOLIENĖ
Ms Olga MEDVEDEVA
Ms Tatjana PAVLOVSKAJA
Ms Inga ROZGIENĖ
Ms Stasė SKAPIENĖ
Ms Virginija STANEVIČIENĖ
Ms Eglė ŠLEINOTIENĖ
Ms Loreta ŽADEIKAITĖ

Luxembourg
Ms Gaby KUNSCH

Moldova
Ms Eugénie BRINZĂ

Montenegro
Mr Dragan BOGOJEVIC

Netherlands
Mr Dick MEIJER
Ms Daniela FASOGLIO

Norway
Ms Heike SPEITZ

Poland
Ms Maria GORZELAK

Portugal
Ms Maria Anália GOMES

Romania
Ms Maria Virginia GOT

Russian Federation
Ms Irina KHALEEVA (EVC member)
Ms Kira IRISKHANOVA

Serbia
Ms Tasevska GOLUBOVIC

Slovakia
Ms Darina DE JAEGHER

Slovenia
Mr Janez SKELA

Spain
Ms Yolanda ZÁRATE MUÑIZ
Ms Victoria HERNANDEZ

Sweden
Ms Eva ENGDELL
Ms Carin SÖDERBERG

Switzerland
Mr Hans Ulrich BOSSHARD

Turkey
Mr Özcan DEMIREL

Ukraine
Ms Angela GERGEL

United Kingdom
Mr Lid KING

CERCLES
Ms Fiona DALZIEL

EAQUALS (The European Association for Quality Language Services)
Mr Peter BROWN

Eropean Language Council (ELC)
Ms Brigitte FORSTER VOSICKI

International Certificate Conference (ICC)
Mr Mike MAKOSCH

Experts
Ms Maria STOICHEVA
Mr Richard WACH

European Validation Committee
Mr Francis GOULLIER
Ms Barbara GŁOWACKA
Ms Gisella LANGÉ
Mr David LITTLE – Coordinator, ELP Seminars
Mr José Joaquin MORENO ARTESERO
Mr Rolf SCHÄRER – General rapporteur

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
Language Policy Division
Ms Johanna PANTHIER
Ms Corinne COLIN

European Centre for Modern Languages
Mr Adrian BUTLER

_____

2009
Austria (Graz), 29 September–
1 October

Albania
Ms Tatjana VUÇANI

Andorra
Ms Maria Teresa BONET CABALLERO

Armenia
Ms Melanya ASTVATSATRYAN

Austria
Mr Gunther ABUJA
Ms Elisabeth FEIGL-BOGENREITER
Ms Nadin GOLDBERGER
Ms Romy HÖLTZER
Ms Angela HORAK
Ms Anita KEIPER
Mr Franz MITTENDORFER
Ms Margarete NEZBEDA
Ms DINAH ORNIG-MEYER
Mr Franz SCHIMEK

Belarus
Ms Iryna KRYUKO

Belgium
Flemish Community
Mr Hugo Van HEESWIJCK
French Community
Ms Carine BRUWIER SINI

Cyprus
Ms Eleni KIMONIDOU

Czech Republic
Ms Jitka TŮMOVÁ

Estonia
Mr Tõnu TENDER

France
Mr Francis GOULLIER

Germany
Mr Wolf SCHWARZ

Georgia
Ms Marika ODZELI

Greece
Ms Evangelia KAGA-GKIOVOUSOGLOU
Ms Chrysanthi TZIORTZIOTI

Hungary
Ms Zsuzsa DARABOS

Ireland
Ms Karen RUDDOCK

Italy
Ms Gisella LANGÉ

Latvia
Ms Silvija KARKLINA

Lithuania
Ms Irena RAUDIENE

Moldova
Ms Evghenia BRINZĂ

Montenegro
Ms Natasa PERIC

Netherlands
Ms Daniela FASOGLIO

Norway
Ms Tone ASTORP

Poland
Ms Justyna LESISZ

Portugal
Ms Maria Anália GOMES

Romania
Mr Dan Ion NASTA

Russian Federation
Ms Irina KHALEEVA

Slovakia
Ms Denisa ĎURANOVÁ

Spain
Ms Yolanda ZÁRATE MUÑIZ

Sweden
Ms Carin SÖDERBERG

Switzerland
Ms Sandra HUTTERLI

Turkey
Mr Nadir Engin UZUN
Ms Olga SANLI GERGER

Ukraine
Ms Oksana KARPIUK

United Kingdom
Mr Lid KING

ALTE (Association of Language Testers in Europe)
Mr Martin NUTTALL

CercleS
Ms Mary RUANE
Ms Fiona DALZIEL

EAQUALS (The European Association for Quality Language Services)
Mr Peter BROWN

European Language Council (ELC)
Ms Brigitte FORSTER VOSICKI

International Certificate Conference (ICC)
Ms Christel SCHNEIDER

Experts
Ms Nicola CHAPMAN
Dr. David NEWBY
Mr Rolf SCHÄRER – General Rapporteur
Ms Nikolina VALENTINOVA TSVETKOVA

ELP Validation Committee
Mr David LITTLE – Chair
Mr Francis GOULLIER – Vice Chair
Ms Barbara GŁOWACKA
Mr Gareth HUGHES
Ms Irina KHALEEVA
Mr Wolfgang MACKIEWICZ
Mr Dick MEIJER
Ms Heike SPEITZ
Ms Maria STOICHEVA

AUSTRIAN ORGANISERS
Federal Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture
Mr Anton DOBART
Verein EFSZ – Austrian Association for the ECML
Ms Ursula NEWBY

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
Language Policy Division
Mr Joseph SHEILS
Mr Christopher REYNOLDS

European Centre for Modern Languages
Mr Waldemar MARTYNIUK
Ms Susanna SLIVENSKY