7TH EUROPEAN LANGUAGE PORTFOLIO SEMINAR

Lithuania: City Park Hotel and University of Vilnius
28 – 30 September 2006

Report by David Little, Seminar Co-ordinator

Seventh European Seminar on the European Language Portfolio

Lithuania: City Park Hotel and University of Vilnius

28–30 September 2006

Report by

David Little

Seminar Coordinator

Thursday 28 September

Official opening

Jurga Strumskiene, Head of the International Cooperation and European Integration Division, Ministry of Education and Science, opened the proceedings by welcoming the participants and introducing the Vice Minister of Education and Science.

Virginija Būdinė, Vice Minister of Education and Science, began by noting that when Lithuania was restored to independence it was necessary to reform the entire education system. The guiding principles were to preserve Lithuanian culture and identity, to ensure historical continuity, and to develop a multiple culture enriched by the experience of ethnic minorities. If it is to fulfil its purpose the education system must serve the rapidly changing needs of society; one of its key goals is to help the individual to acquire cultural and social competence and become a self-reliant and responsible citizen. In language teaching Lithuania shares the objectives of the European Union and the Council of Europe. It is essential to preserve and develop the use of Lithuanian, but also to encourage citizens to learn and use as many foreign languages as possible, including the language of at least one neighbouring country. Lithuania has participated actively in the language programmes of the Council of Europe since 1993. The Lithuanian Language Education Policy Profile is the most recent fruit of this participation, and work has already begun on an action plan to implement the profile's conclusions. English, French and German are now the most popular foreign languages in Lithuania. Most students choose Russian as their second foreign language, though if English is not their first foreign language, it is almost always their second. At the same time the number of students learning Italian, Spanish, Danish, Hebrew, Norwegian, Swedish, Japanese and Polish is increasing, and more and more schools are participating in international projects like Comenius and Lingua. In 2008 primary pupils will start learning foreign languages at the age of eight, and schools will be able to teach other subjects through a foreign language. The Vice Minister said that Lithuania was very happy to host the 2006 European seminar on the European Language Portfolio, an important document not least because of the emphasis it places on plurilingualism. She wished the seminar every success and expressed the hope that participants from other countries would have an opportunity to experience something of Lithuania's languages and cultures during their short stay.

Professor Benediktas Juodka, Rector of Vilnius University, explained that Vilnius University is the oldest higher education institution in north-eastern Europe. It began life in 1570 as a Jesuit College and became Vilnius University in 1579. Today it is the largest of Lithuania's fifteen universities, with fourteen faculties and twenty-five thousand students. All academic disciplines are represented except agriculture, which has its own university. The Faculty of Philology and the Institute of Foreign Languages are responsible for languages, which have always played an important role in the university. For two centuries Latin was the language of education at Vilnius University, which explains why it was able to attract students from so many countries – the Bologna Process is nothing new for Vilnius. Professor Juodka concluded by welcoming the participants to his university and wishing them a successful seminar.

Johanna Panthier, Language Policy Division, Council of Europe, thanked the Lithuanian authorities for their warm welcome and acknowledged the significant personal contributions made by Jurga Strumskiene as Lithuania's representative on the Council of Europe's Steering Committee for Education and Stase Skapiene as the Lithuanian correspondent for language issues, including the Language Education Policy Profile mentioned by the Vice Minister. Ms Panthier noted that whereas previous seminars had been mostly concerned with the development of ELP models and supports, this one was to focus especially on the challenge of achieving widespread adoption of the ELP. She reminded participants that the ELP is only one of the Language Policy Division's projects. Other projects include: the intercultural autobiography, introduced at the 2005 seminar in Moscow, which is now being developed as a separate project in the hope that it may be used in non-language as well as language classrooms; the piloting of the manual to link language exams to the Common European Framework of Reference and the development of support materials, including calibrated examples of language use; the elaboration of the reference levels in different languages; a project on the linguistic integration of migrants; and a major project to develop something like the CEFR for languages of education. Ms

Panthier announced that in February 2007 the Language Policy Division will host a Policy Forum that will review the implementation and impact of the CEFR. Member states will be asked to nominate between three and five participants each, and the Language Policy Division hopes that ELP contact persons will be among them. Because of the Policy Forum there will not be a European ELP seminar in 2007. Ms Panthier concluded by wishing the participants every success in their work together over the next two and a half days.

Introduction to the seminar: report on progress since Moscow; overview of programme content and working methods – David Little

The ELP seminar held in Moscow in 2005 included input, workshops and round tables on: (i) issues of ELP policy and strategy 2005–09, the annotated *Principles and Guidelines*, and ELPs for young learners (age-appropriate self-assessment grids and descriptors/checklists); and (ii) intercultural competence and the proposed *Autobiography of key intercultural experiences*. There was also a show-and-tell session, to which there were 13 contributions, and ELP projects in the Russian Federation were presented. The conclusions of the Moscow seminar were (i) that we needed some rationalisation of key ELP documents, descriptors for young learners, and non-obligatory language passport templates for young learners, and (ii) that the proposed intercultural autobiography may not be appropriate for inclusion in the ELP.

Since the Moscow seminar the key ELP documents have been brought together into a single document, language passport templates have been developed for young learners, the Language Policy Division has established a separate project to develop the *Autobiography of key intercultural experiences*, and the LPD has been working on a new mandate for the European Validation Committee (the current mandate expires at the end of 2006).

The Vilnius seminar has five main concerns: to present the language passport templates for young learners (Barbara Glowacka); to take stock and look to the future (Rolf Schärer); to discuss the challenges of ELP implementation on the basis of three case studies (Richard Wach, Barbara Lazenby Simpson, Maria Stoicheva); to hear about national and international ELP projects in the show-and-tell presentations; and to hear about the ELP in Lithuania. As usual, the exhibition gives participants an opportunity to bring themselves up to date with developments in the different member states. The working methods will be as at previous seminars: plenary inputs followed by group discussions. Feedback from the working groups will take the form of posters and questions/comments for the various round table panels.

Report on the work of the European Validation Committee – Francis Goullier

The European Validation Committee comprises nine members from nine different countries and three non-voting consultants. Before every meeting a copy of each ELP submitted for validation is sent to the committee members and consultants, each of whom prepares a written analysis of three or four models. The analyses are then shared out among the four bureau members, who prepare syntheses of them. These procedures mean that the validation process is very thoroughly prepared and based on a detailed knowledge of each model submitted. At its two meetings since the Moscow seminar the EVC has examined twenty ELPs and validated thirteen of them, with or without conditions.

In some cases the EVC has noted a tension between classroom use of the ELP and the principle that the ELP is the property of the learner. It is sometimes necessary to point out to developers, for example, that teachers should not correct learners' self-assessment. The EVC is also concerned to uphold the principle that every ELP should allow learners to document and reflect on *all* their experience of learning and using other languages, not only the experience that comes to them through education; and it continues to attach great importance to the intercultural and learning-to-learn components. The EVC

notes with great satisfaction that ELPs are becoming richer. In this connection it is worth saying that the EVC's recommendations for improvement are intended to help developers to benefit from successful innovations in other ELPs. In view of the fact that an increasing number of electronic ELPs are being submitted for validation, it is also worth saying that in the EVC's view the Principles and Guidelines are as relevant to electronic as to paper ELPs. Finally, there is an increasing desire on the part of the EVC to assist developers as well as validate ELPs. Thus when an ELP is returned to developers for further work and is not resubmitted, the EVC sees that as a failure.

The EVC is very interested in ELP implementation and ELP-related teacher development; in the articulation between the ELP and everything that happens in foreign language teaching; and in the Language Policy Division's other activities, including the recently launched project on language(s) of education.

In conclusion the EVC attaches great importance to exchange with ELP contact persons, which explains why most members of the EVC are present at the seminar. The next meeting, in November 2006, will be the last under the current mandate. It will be important to continue the work of the EVC at its present level in order not to reduce the ELP's value. There is also much work to be done with policy makers, teacher educators, and other stakeholders.

Presentation of the templates for *Language Passports* for young learners – Barbara Glowacka

The templates are not intended to challenge existing language passports. Rather, they are suggestions, open to discussion and modification.

The first step in developing them was to examine the passports of all validated ELPs for learners aged between 6 and 15 years in the light of the Principles and Guidelines, the guide for developers, and the guide for teachers and teacher trainers. Then three angles of analysis were chosen: graphic design, content and structure. It was noted that ELPs for this age group are structured in one of three ways: the three parts are physically separate from one another; the language passport is separate from the language biography and dossier, which are included in a single booklet; or all three parts are printed in the same booklet.

Three conclusions were drawn from the analysis. First, the language passport cannot fulfil its function as an autonomous document if it is bound together with the language biography; secondly, the great diversity in graphic design and structure means that language passports for young learners may no longer be easily recognisable as such; and thirdly, language passports for young learners must serve a pedagogical as well as a documentary function.

Adults are likely to use the language passport to support language-related actions, including applications for jobs, scholarships, etc. Young learners, on the other hand, can use their language passport at the beginning or end of the school year or a particular phase of learning, when changing schools or teachers, when entering for a competition or exam, or when enrolling with a language school. Their purpose in using the language passport is to identify their strong and their weak points, evaluate their language competence, learn how to document linguistic and cultural experience, achieve greater self-knowledge, organise their learning, learn how to construct their linguistic and cultural competence, and become aware of their role in the learning process.

In order to ensure that they are recognised, all language passports should have the following features in common: the same title in two languages, one of them an official language of the Council of Europe; the logo of the Council of Europe; a standard text describing the Council's function; standard titles and rubrics; the self-assessment grid in age-appropriate language (in one language for very young learners, in at least two languages for learners between 10 and 15); and self-assessment pages as close as possible to those in the standard adult passport.

To maximise the language passport's pedagogical function, links should be created with the language biography wherever possible. It should be a dynamic tool, filled in gradually over time and supporting the child's discovery of her social, linguistic and cultural identity.

"What must be done to ensure that the ELP moves forward?" Progress report on the implementation of the ELP – Rolf Schärer

The pedagogic value of the ELP has been established: there is clear evidence that it fosters plurilingualism, mutual understanding, and the development of learner autonomy and intercultural competence. The common principles inspire and stimulate development, and a substantial body of experience and know-how has been built up. What we need now is a shift from product development to process support; at the same time political and operational support must be maintained.

ELP implementation is enormously complex and we constantly underestimate the amount of time we need to make the ELP part of daily learning in school. Ireland and Spain provide two contrasting examples. The Irish project that is concerned with teaching English as a second language to migrant children in primary schools began by developing a scaled curriculum (English language proficiency benchmarks) on the basis of the CEFR, then derived ELP checklists directly from this curriculum, and put the ELP at the centre of teaching and learning. After three years the benchmarks and the ELP were revised in the light of experience and the ELP was submitted for revalidation. It is now used by several thousand learners each year. In Spain the first phase of ELP experimentation (three years) is now complete and reports are available; but the Spanish project has concluded that it needs two or three years of further experimentation with a focus on whole-school implementation.

As a European project the ELP is shaped by three sets of common principles. The first set recognises the importance of achieving unity in diversity and so proceeds via recommendations, the provision of descriptive guidance, and validation/accreditation. The second set of principles also shaped the development of the CEFR: transparency, coherence and dialogue. The third set has to do with the learner's ownership of the ELP, the value of *all* second/foreign language competence, and the importance of lifelong learning that builds on the individual's strengths within a common framework.

It was always anticipated that the ELP's development and implementation would depend on the elaboration of complex networks involving the Council of Europe, ministries, institutions, teachers, learners and other stakeholders. But the networks actually in place are more complex than anticipated and have developed in unexpected ways. For example, the EU has played an important role not only by funding various ELP-related projects but by adopting the common reference levels; and in some countries publishers have been quicker to adopt the ELP than ministries or teachers.

In considering whether the ELP is a catalyst for educational development, we need to take into consideration ownership and accountability, standards and competence, reflection and understanding; we also need to bear in mind the increasing interest in electronic ELPs and electronic support. At the same time we must pay attention to context, policy considerations and structure; goals, scope and time frame; and evaluation criteria, available resources and outcomes. We need to collect and sift information, reflect on the know-how and experience gained, and look for ways of transferring know-how, sharing tools and resources, putting experience to good use, maintaining the integrity of the Principles and Guidelines, and providing further guidance and support. The ECML's IMPEL project is currently developing an interactive website that is designed to assist ELP implementation by doing many of these things.

In applying the ELP to whole-school language policy we need to consider the following: ownership, which raises the issue of voluntary versus compulsory use of the ELP; the ELP as a tool to support foreign language learning; the ELP as an agent of change in foreign language education; the ELP as part of a whole-school language policy; the application of ELP principles without actually using the ELP; the increasing interest in learner portfolios for other school subjects; and the use of portfolios as evidence of competence. Last year in Moscow the example of Vladimir's Linguistic Gymnasium 23 showed us what can be achieved when the ELP is used as an instrument of whole-school language policy. It brought about a renewal of language education, goals and tasks for language learning, criteria for success, and forms of assessment. In the process the roles of learners and teachers were broadened.

In moving from product development to process support we must defend the integrity of key concepts and their application, providing guidance and rewards where necessary. We must also reflect carefully on the roles to be played by the Council of Europe, the Validation Committee, the European Centre for

Modern Languages, the member states, national ELP committees, national ELP contact persons, INGOs, exam boards, publishers, educational institutions, school principals, and employers.

In their discussions the working groups may like to consider the following propositions:

1. The systematic collection, screening, reflection and transfer of know-how and experience will support ELP implementation.

2. Whole-school language policies are needed if ELP implementation is to achieve critical mass.

3. School principals should be targeted as key stakeholders.

4. Good ELP practice should be rewarded.

5. The ELP has to evolve in order to remain useful.

6. Political support and guidance need to be maintained.

Group work

The participants worked in four groups as follows:

English-speaking Group 1 (chair: Barbara Lazenby Simpson; rapporteur: Silvija Karklina)

English-speaking Group 2 (chair: Gisela Langé; rapporteur: Maria Gorzelak)

English-speaking Group 3 (chair: Olga Medvedeva; rapporteur: Tatjana Vucani)

French-speaking Group (chair: Francis Goullier; rapporteur: Darina De Jaegher)

German-speaking Group (chair: Gunther Abuja; rapporteur: Hans-Ulrich Bosshard)

The working groups were invited to respond (*agree*, *disagree*, *don't know*) to twelve statements about the ELP derived from reports that ELP contact persons have submitted to Rolf Schärer. The results of this informal opinion poll were as follows:

1. *Evidence is accumulating that the ELP helps us to achieve common goals*
   Agree: 50   Disagree: 1   Don't know: 15

2. *International know-how is valuable in formulating educational policies*
   Agree: 66   Disagree: 0   Don't know: 0

3. *These common goals remain topical on national agendas*
   Agree: 48   Disagree: 1   Don't know: 17

4. *The accepted common principles stimulate desirable developments*
   Agree: 59   Disagree: 1   Don't know: 6

5. *The common principles are too restrictive*
   Agree: 5   Disagree: 50   Don't know: 11

6. *The common principles seem valid beyond foreign language learning*
   Agree: 62   Disagree: 1   Don't know: 4

7. *The level of Council of Europe support should be maintained beyond the end of the present project phase, if possible even strengthened*
   Agree: 64   Disagree: 1   Don't know: 2

8. *We need to achieve (i) an overview of the collection, screening and dissemination of know-how and (ii) a review of the ELP in relation to general educational priorities*
   Agree: 60   Disagree: 0   Don't know: 7

9. *The national ELP committees and/or contact persons should be able to reward good ELP practice in their countries*

10. *The ELP works in pedagogic practice but the positive effects are little known by groups of end-users (school principals, politicians, employers)*

    Agree: 64   Disagree: 1   Don't know: 2

11. *It is difficult to get and maintain political and financial support for implementation projects, despite positive results during piloting*

    Agree: 57   Disagree: 1   Don't know: 5

12. *School principals, often non-language specialists, play a central role in the adoption or non-adoption of the ELP in their establishments – this group of stakeholders is central to wide implementation of the ELP and should be given careful attention*

    Agree: 55   Disagree: 10   Don't know: 6

In addition the working groups responded to three open questions as follows:

1. *What can be done to ensure the widespread use of the ELP in the daily educational routine?*
   - Promote teacher understanding of the ELP via in-service programmes.
   - Develop teachers' commitment to collaborate with one another.
   - Integrate ELP in curricula; develop curricula to harmonise with ELP.
   - Develop learning tasks and materials to support ELP use.
   - Provide examples of good practice.
   - Accommodate the ELP within formal assessment frameworks.
   - Engage the interest and support of employers.

2. *What can be done to maintain official support long enough to achieve successful implementation on a large scale?*
   - Develop the role of school principals in ELP implementation.
   - Ensure that there is continued and visible Council of Europe support for ELP development and implementation.
   - Engage the interest and support of teachers' and parents' associations.
   - Persuade ministries and funding agencies that successful implementation takes a long time.

3. *How should exemplary use of the ELP in educational institutions be rewarded?*
   - Reward the ELP process, not the individual learner's product.
   - Reward teachers with better pay/reduced teaching load.
   - Award credits and certificates.
   - Organise competitions at European level.
   - Enter ELP projects for the EU's "language label" awards.

Plenary feedback (round table: Francis Goullier, Rolf Schärer, Johanna Panthier) – Chair: Eike Thürmann

The German-speaking group suggested that the Council of Europe could do more to promote the ELP and the CEFR in the world of work, perhaps by targeting multinational companies. Johanna Panthier pointed out that the Council of Europe works with governments and ministries and thus has no direct access to the world of work. The Validation Committee has had members and consultants from the university and vocational domains, and the Council can only work indirectly through such people. It is true that Europass explicitly accommodates the ELP, but the real chance to link with the world of work probably lies with adult education.

Eike Thürmann noted that in the discussion about the possibility of attaching rewards to ELP use it was pointed out that recognition of the ELP by employers and other end-users would be sufficient reward in itself. He suggested that the question of recognition of the ELP by the world of work might be explored at a future seminar. Johanna Panthier thought that things may move forward more quickly with the electronic version of Europass. She also reported that increasing numbers of people were downloading the ALTE/EAQUALS electronic ELP.

Rolf Schärer recalled that employers' associations and trade unions had declared an interest in the ELP when it was first launched: involving them in follow-up action is much more difficult. What is more, companies may use the ELP in ways that seem to diverge from our common principles. For example, they may develop portfolios that are focused on particular work situations and use their employees' success in learning as the criterion for funding more learning. In Switzerland there is a move towards making English the first foreign language learnt at school in place of the other national language; on the other hand there is some industrial interest in developing plurilingualism.

Francis Goullier suggested that companies are not more interested in the ELP because they often confuse it with the CEFR and the common reference levels. When the focus is on qualifications, more importance is likely to be attached to the language passport and the levels than to the language biography and the language learning process.

Rolf Schärer argued that business and industry will not buy something that is not useful to them; we need to bear that in mind when promoting the ELP. He noted that the Swiss Post Office used the CEFR and the ELP in a project to retrain redundant staff.

Shifting the focus to the school sector, Eike Thürmann pointed out that in the transition from primary to lower secondary, receiving schools have no idea what pupils can do in foreign languages. The ELP could be used to provide information at this point of articulation and thus help to bridge the gap. Dick Meijer reported that the Dutch ELP is being used in a few small-scale projects to manage the transition from primary to lower secondary, secondary to vocational, and secondary to higher education. The language passport plays a key role in this process. Eike Thürmann said that some German Länder are using the ELP in a similar way. Viljo Kohonen thought that it makes sense to have different ELPs for the three levels of obligatory schooling.

The French-speaking group suggested that the Council of Europe could support the use of the ELP in formal education by promoting the role of publishers, encouraging the development of electronic ELPs, and maintaining an interactive website for the exchange of ideas and experience. Johanna Panthier noted that the Language Policy Division is preparing a resolution for the Conference of Education Ministers having to do with the CEFR and publishers. She also suggested that participants should remind their ministers of education that they signed a recommendation supporting the ELP in 2001.

Noting that school principals play a key role in the adoption and implementation of the ELP, Eike Thürmann wondered whether we do enough to bring them on board. Several members of the round table supported the suggestion that seminars should be organised for school principals, in the first instance at regional or national level.

Eike Thürmann pointed out that the ELP must be implemented at two levels, locally in the individual school and regionally/nationally. Germany had tried a top-down approach to implementation, getting the principals together, persuading them, and encouraging them to make a public splash in the school. But this kind of implementation does not please teachers. We need to find ways of getting principals on our side while persuading them that they personally are not responsible for implementation.

European Centre for Modern Languages: call for proposals for third medium-term programme (2008-2011) – Adrian Butler, Director of ECML

Adrian Butler introduced the next medium-term programme of the ECML, which will be entitled "Empowering Language Professionals/Valoriser les professionels de langues". He explained that whereas Strasbourg deals with language policy, the ECML deals with implementation by helping language teachers to make change happen: developing competences, strengthening networks, enabling

teachers to make an impact, and improving the quality of language education. The new programme will have the following thematic strands: evaluation; continuity in language learning; content and language education; plurilingualism and pluriculturalism. There will be medium-term projects of 3–4 years and short-term projects of 1–2 years, and there will be a second mini-call for proposals in 2008–09. The application deadline is 1 May 2007, after which an expert advisory group will assess proposals. The bureau of ECML will draw up a shortlist of projects in July 2007 and the governing board will make its final selection of projects in September 2007.

Presentation of the new *Lingu@net Europa* site – Lid King

Lid King explained that *Lingu@net* started in 1994 as an online resource for languages with four partners and six access languages; it has now been greatly expanded. The new web site (www.linguanet-europa.org) is a resource for learners as well as teachers and complements much of what the Council of Europe has been doing, especially as regards learner autonomy.

Friday 29 September

ELP implementation: three case studies – Chair: Gisella Langé

Case study 1: *The ELP in use at the Lycée Kléber, Strasbourg, France* – Richard Wach (Principal)

The Lycée Kléber has 2 050 students, 850 of them in preparatory classes and 1 200 in second cycle preparing for the baccalauréat; two foreign languages are obligatory. There were three reasons for reorganising language teaching in the school: the heterogeneity of the students, especially those taking German as a second language; lack of motivation on the part of weaker pupils; and the difficulty of developing oral competence, allied with problems of assessment. In 2003 preliminary meetings of language teachers were held. An inspector visited the school and introduced the ELP (the French model for older adolescent and adult learners; 5.2000), but to begin with the teachers were not very enthusiastic. In particular they feared a reduction in the general level of proficiency achieved. In 2004–05 the ELP was nevertheless introduced to the 10th grade on a pilot basis; following an interim evaluation, in 2005–06 the ELP was used throughout 10th and 11th grades; and in 2006–07 it was introduced for the whole of the second cycle.

The introduction of the ELP has necessitated a complete reorganisation of language teaching in the school, which in turn has meant that all language teachers have to work together. At present 1 200 students are divided into groups as follows: 61 for English (13 teachers), 40 for German (8 teachers), 28 for Spanish (4 teachers), and 4 for Arabic (one teacher). The ELP has given a new impetus to language teaching and learning. Self-assessment is not something French students are used to, so when it is introduced it needs to be supported by the teacher. It does not replace assessment by the teacher, of course, and the difference between self-assessment and teacher assessment can be used to motivate students. So too can the use of a double level of assessment, where students are awarded marks within a particular CEFR level (it is risky to introduce the ELP without also introducing the CEFR). Effective use of the ELP requires motivated teachers, and teachers cannot be expected to transform classes in the course of a year. Encouraged by the experience of the past two years, the Lycée Kléber intends to develop its work with the ELP further.

Case study 2: *Migration, social cohesion and citizenship: the example of Integrate Ireland Language and Training* – Barbara Lazenby Simpson

In recent years there have been high levels of immigration to Ireland, from EU accession states, Africa, the Middle East, China, Brazil etc., and immigrants are now a significant proportion of the popu-

lation. Even basic everyday communication can be difficult for them, misunderstandings can have serious consequences, and there are obvious dangers of exploitation when they do not understand contracts and handbooks. There are thus compelling reasons why immigrants to Ireland should learn English.

The Milestone ELP (37.2002) is the basis on which Integrate Ireland Language and Training provides English language courses for immigrants with refugee status. Learners come to IILT with very variable educational experience, study skills, language and cross-cultural awareness, aptitude for language learning, and attitudes to formal learning. Some of them already have some level of proficiency in English, but many have very little and a few have none at all. Clearly, the pedagogical approach adopted must enable IILT's learners to develop an awareness of themselves in relation to the challenges they face as they start a new life in a new country. The ELP helps them to identify the skills that they do not yet possess but need to develop; it also allows them to articulate personal targets and objectives. For adult immigrants learner autonomy is not an optional extra but a key goal; language learning cannot be counted a success if it does not bring empowerment and a transfer of responsibility to the learner. Daily involvement in planning, monitoring and evaluating their own learning means that IILT's learners gradually develop a capacity to use English for reflection and self-management as they find their own pathways to the future. The ELP provides them with a means of demonstrating their new abilities, skills and understanding on the same basis as native speakers.

Mediating the ELP to learners is not an easy task, especially when they have little or no English. But IILT's teachers have devised ways of helping them to make decisions about what to learn and how. Learners who are beginners in English use pictures, for example, to determine the thematic and situational focus of their learning, and every aspect of the Milestone ELP is supported by activity sheets, all of which provide a basis for spontaneous classroom communication. Self-assessment is introduced from the beginning in very simple ways and is always supported; even at A1 level students monitor their own learning. Besides supporting the development of learner autonomy, the ELP has other features that are centrally important for adult migrants, especially the emphasis it places on plurilingualism and pluriculturalism and the value it gives to all language and intercultural learning, wherever it takes place.

A major challenge has been to find a way of ensuring that the benefits gained from constructive learning experiences are not negatively affected by assessment. IILT has brought pedagogy and assessment together by using the Further Education and Training Award Council's portfolio approach to certification. FETAC modules are designed for native Irish learners, and many of them are concerned with the identification and use of transferable "life skills". IILT has correlated the descriptors in the Milestone ELP to descriptors that define FETAC's specific learning outcomes. Among the FETAC modules IILT is offering in 2006–07 are: personal effectiveness, preparation for work, computer literacy, and living in a diverse society. In this way the ELP helps adult immigrants to become active participants in their assessment as well as their learning and gives them a formal qualification on which they can build in the future.

Case study 3: *Vocational/transnational ELP model in use in Bulgaria* – Maria Stoicheva

The vocational ELP that is the focus of this case study (48.2003) exists in five different language versions: Bulgarian, English, French, German and Italian. It was developed by a partnership comprising two universities, two vocational schools, three professional associations, one training organisation, and one national language agency. Its use is supported by a guide for teachers, specific vocational descriptors and checklists, language profiles for three occupational sectors (finance and banking, local administration, tourism), and training modules. It is one of two accredited ELPs in use in Bulgaria, the other being for learners at primary school. The CEFR has been translated into Bulgarian, institutional support comes from the Ministry of Education, but there is no national ELP project.

The case study concerns students at the University of Sofia. Because they have passed an entrance exam in a foreign language, they tend to think they already know enough and are not motivated to

learn more. On the other hand, as they make the transition from school to university the development of their autonomy as learners is very important. The study focuses on 156 students learning English for 2 hours a week in preparation for a profession in which they will mostly use English. They follow a task-oriented syllabus and they are expected to be plurilingual (a second foreign language is compulsory). In principle there are two ways of introducing the ELP to students: (i) give them the whole ELP and try to work with it; (ii) gradually construct the ELP in such a way that the students take responsibility for their own language learning. The second option was chosen.

The starting point is to focus on the transition from school, emphasising that not enough time can be devoted to language learning, so that it is necessary to concentrate on very specific tasks. This introduces students to key characteristics of adult language learning: the need for a formed linguistic repertoire, the possibility of exploiting partial competences, the importance of motivation related to the world of work, and the possibility of using resources outside the classroom. The language passport is introduced first as a challenge to learners to reflect on their linguistic identity and the level of language competence they have already achieved. From there they proceed to the language biography and the setting of individual learning targets. Learning outcomes are collected in the dossier and evaluated in the language biography, and that provides the basis for setting new targets.

Although students have achieved closely similar scores in the entrance examination, their self-assessments are very varied. They all have some proficiency, even if only receptive, in neighbouring languages; but only one student reflected this in his language passport, including Macedonian and Serbian in his self-assessment. There are many examples of learner reflection that become self-persuasion as they gear themselves up for particular kinds of learning.

The negotiation of learning objectives is difficult, not least because it can be misinterpreted. Traditionally it is the teacher's task to set learning objectives, which in any case are expected to be laid down by the curriculum. Defining objectives as authentic communicative tasks leads to a reconsideration of available teaching materials, especially textbooks, and creates a need for additional material. The basic pedagogical principle is that learning to perform one task successfully will also bring unexpected learning benefits. The idea of learner autonomy leads to high expectations and its realisation requires dedication from the teacher. But as a result of using the ELP students learn what it is to take responsibility for their own learning, they become more aware of what they are learning and of themselves as learners, and their motivation is strengthened.

Group work

The working groups were the same as on Thursday. They were asked to consider what particularly impressed them about the case studies and how relevant the studies were to their own contexts. They were also asked to formulate questions to be answered by Richard Wach, Barbara Lazenby Simpson and Maria Stoicheva in the plenary feedback session. These were the working groups' comments on the case studies:

Richard Wach
- It was interesting to hear a non-linguist argue the case for the ELP. It suggested that we need to organise events to convince other head teachers, so that they can lead, collaborate and advise in implementing the ELP.
- The organisation – dividing the school into learning groups – was brilliant, as was the whole-school co-operation.
- It was obviously a major challenge to involve all the language teachers in the school.
- The ELP has given a predominantly scientific lycée a new strong point.
- The idea of assessing students at two levels (CEFR level and mark) is very interesting.

Barbara Lazenby Simpson
- It was inspiring to hear about a language learning programme that empowers migrant learners, giving them life skills that help them to integrate in a new society. Cross-cultural awareness was very evident.

- The motivation of learners like these is immediate, existential and extrinsic; their learning affects their lives.
- The connection between learning (ELP) and assessment (FETAC) was very interesting.
- It was impressive to hear that the ELP has replaced textbooks and that the syllabus is centred on the ELP.
- This case study has obvious relevance for other countries.

Maria Stoicheva
- It was fascinating to hear how the ELP can be built up as you go along, making learners aware of their responsibilities from the very beginning.
- The differences that emerged between learners once they began working with the ELP were striking.
- The pedagogical procedures described are academically rigorous, yet they are a very effective way of dealing with adult learners.
- The case study provided an impressive example of continuity in language learning.
- The development of vocational descriptors seems to have been fundamental to the success of the project.

Plenary feedback (round table: Richard Wach, Barbara Lazenby Simpson, Maria Stoicheva) – Chair: Hans-Ulrich Bosshard

Richard Wach was asked how he succeeded in persuading his teachers to work with the ELP. He said that the headmaster's role is to respond positively to opportunities that present themselves. It was already clear that language learning posed a number of problems, some teachers already knew about the CEFR and the ELP, and inspectors advised how to get the pedagogical hierarchy to give the go-ahead. Despite resistance on the part of some teachers, the decision to proceed was democratically arrived at, so teachers had to either work with the ELP or move to another school. Richard Wach was also asked whether there had been a change in the working culture of the school. He explained that the original plan was to use the ELP in the 10th grade only; it was the teachers who had wanted to go further. They particularly like the new way of organising classes. It means that they have to meet and discuss students' abilities and decide which groups they should be assigned to, but they find this very satisfying. There have been no complaints from parents, so the learners must be satisfied. Fewer of them give up on language learning because they feel oppressed by the greater proficiency of other learners. Asked about the relation between self-assessment and assessment by the teacher, Richard Wach said that this is a sensitive issue. But the CEFR makes it possible to focus on different skills, and teachers must accept that the student's self-assessment is not a criticism of them. Certainly self-assessment has a positive impact on learner motivation.

Barbara Lazenby Simpson was asked about the political context of the Irish project. She explained that Integrate Ireland Language and Training is fully funded by the Department of Education and Science. It was originally established under the aegis of the Centre for Language and Communication Studies, Trinity College Dublin, in the late 1990s, but now operates independently. It teaches only immigrants who have refugee status or humanitarian leave to remain in Ireland. IILT interacts with various state agencies, including the Departments of Social Welfare and Enterprise, Trade and Employment. The fact that courses are full-time (20 class hours per week and 10 hours of self-access learning and homework) is related to the welfare payments that students receive. The Irish government has not specified a minimum level of proficiency that IILT's learners should achieve; IILT has always argued that to do so would be counter-productive. Learners rarely develop the same level of proficiency in all skills, and individual students vary greatly. Barbara Simpson was also asked about the role of the mother tongue in the Irish project. She explained that at any one time there are between 60 and 70 mother tongues in IILT's Dublin school, so there is no alternative but to deliver all classroom activities through English. At the same time use of the mother tongue is not banned. Learners are encouraged to use their mother tongue – and any other languages they know – to build up their resources, make intercultural comparisons, and so on. Students who have been in the school for some time often help with the orientation of new students, but there is not a fully developed mentoring sys-

tem. In reply to a question about the impact of the ELP as an agent of change, Barbara Simpson said that it seems to prompt an automatic move into the target language; this is something that needs further reflection. In Ireland language teaching is not at the top of the agenda, but with adult immigrants and with learners of English as a second language in primary schools IILT has developed a teaching and learning culture that is fully rooted in the CEFR and the ELP, and that is beginning to have an impact on the system as a whole.

Maria Stoicheva was asked to say more about the discrepancy she had noted between the closely similar marks students achieve in the entrance exam and their very variable self-assessment. She explained that the entrance exam is similar to SATs or TOEFL, a "discrimination test" designed to measure very specific skills; self-assessment, on the other hand, leads to more general profiling. Also, some of the tasks captured in ELP descriptors are completely new to many students. Asked how the vocational descriptors had been developed, Maria Stoicheva replied that they had originally been developed for language audits: all possible tasks in different vocational domains had been assigned to the common reference levels of the CEFR. To begin with the descriptors were used to develop training modules. What went into the ELP were "general professional descriptors", not specific vocational ones. In his presentation on Thursday Rolf Schärer described the ELP as an agent for change; in Bulgaria the development of a capacity for self-organisation in language learning is seen as the most important indicator of learner empowerment.

Show-and-tell

There were eight presentations in the show-and-tell carousel, as follows:

Support for the implementation of the ELP (impel) – ECML programme of activities 2004-2007

Hans Ulrich Bosshard

Exchange of experiences, examples of good practices and support tools.

Co-ordinator: Hans Ulrich Bosshard (Switzerland)

Project team: Gisella Langé (Italy), Dick Meijer (Netherlands), Gabriele Tänzer (Germany), John Thorogood (United Kingdom), Rolf Schärer (Switzerland)
Permanent observer: Sally Rehorick (Canada)

State of progress, September 2006

Starting point

80 ELP models had been validated by September 2006 and others were in the piloting or planning stages. The number of learners owning an ELP was estimated at over a million.
However, the methods for implementing ELP models vary considerably, which was why there was a need for support and an information platform to be made available to persons responsible for implementing the ELP.

Aims of the project

- To collect and exchange information on ELP implementation experiences.
- To collect examples of good practice
- To elaborate sets of planning, monitoring and feedback tools in order to support leaders of ELP implementation projects.

This project is being carried out in collaboration with the Council of Europe's Language Policy Division and the ECML project on "Training teachers to use the ELP".

Procedure

- The project team and a limited number of other experts (responsible for major ELP implementation projects) meet at the ECML twice a year
- A co-operative working area is made available inside the ECML
- An ECML workshop for managers of other implementation projects will be held in Graz (Austria) from 28 to 31 March 2007

- Regular reports on the state of progress are made at the annual ELP seminars held by the Council of Europe's Language Policy Division (LPD).

Expected outcomes
- Sets of planning, monitoring and feedback tools and documentation are made available on the ECML website and/or on CD-ROM
- A core group of experienced experts able to advise the leaders of other ELP implementation projects
- A large number of ELP implementation project leaders trained

Interim results
Since 2004, 13 ELP implementation projects have been studied:
- The projects led by the members of the team: Lombardy / Italy; Netherlands; United Kingdom; Switzerland; Thuringia / Germany.
- The projects led by guest experts: Austria; Bulgaria; Spain; Russian Federation; Finland; Greece; Poland, Sweden.
- Ms Sally Rehorick of the University of New Brunswick, permanent observer on behalf of the Canadian government, presented the work being done in preparation for the launch of a possible language portfolio project in Canada.

The 13 projects presented at the meetings varied considerably in structure and implementation methods. A grid was made to sort and classify information, compare implementation projects and highlight the various characteristics and parameters. To this end, a prototype questionnaire (project description) was drawn up.

Challenges
With the definition of parameters, the questionnaire and the website-based information platform, the project team believes it has found a way to reduce the complexity of the information gathered. The final challenge to be met before the project becomes operational lies in the area of information technology. Negotiations with the ECML are under way. The project's success also depends on the co-operation of the experts who have participated or will participate in the *impel* meetings and will provide organised information.

Deadlines
By the end of 2006:
- Completion of the information platform in collaboration with the ECML
- Completion of the on-line questionnaire to gather organised information

Beginning of 2007:
- Feedback from the members of the project team and other experts using the on-line questionnaire. Input to the databank
- Trial run of the internal website of the *impel* project.

28-31 March at the ECML in Graz:
- Workshop with participants from the 33 ECML member states: presentation of the results, needs analysis, exchange of information, establishment of a network.

Autumn 2007:
- End of the project and publication of the results

Useful addresses
-
- ECML website: www.ecml.at
- Project website: www.ecml.at/mtp2/impel
- www.coe.int
- Co-ordinator's e-mail address: h.bosshard@sg.ch

CROMO: an AT-IT-SI CROssborder MOdule on intercultural and metacognitive competences to supplement the ELP

Francesca Brotto and Gunther Abuja

CROMO is a two-year project (2005–07) financed by the national authorities of Austria, Italy and Slovenia. Although initially proposed and promoted by the Italian Ministry of Education, it has become a true exercise in shared and collaborative leadership among the partners. Indeed, the CROMO project "culture" enacts the "boundary-breaking" and "border-crossing" mission it has given itself to foster intercultural dialogue in this historically and culturally very "sensitive" part of Europe, while helping to implement the ELP process in all three countries. It is intended to help build bridges among our border communities in the Friuli-Venezia-Giulia (IT), Carinthia (AT) regions and Slovenia by developing a common tool in the form of an ELP supplement that helps learners reflect upon and reconsider their intercultural and interregional experiences while developing their metacognitive language-learning strategies and competences.

The Crossborder Module for ELPs for the 15+ age range is ready in its first draft stage and is the result of the joint effort of the researchers, experts and teachers from these areas, under the technical guidance of the Österreichisches SprachenZentrum (ÖSZ) of Graz, the Friuli-Venezia-Giulia Educational Research Institute (IRRE) in Trieste, and the Slovenian National Pedagogical Institute (ZRSS).

CROMO consists of three main parts subdivided into six interrelated sections, all of which can be used separately and at different times.

Part 1 – "In my experience…" explores the learner's experience with and reflections on intercultural encounters, featuring a grid and a checklist of intercultural areas, allowing the pupil to record reactions, opinions and reflections, also bringing cultural similarities and differences to the fore.

Part 2 – "How we react…" raises the learner's awareness of the use of language in intercultural experiences, with a questionnaire, a checklist on language and communication awareness and a series of communication strategies.

Part 3 – "What we learn…" is designed to lead learners to greater awareness of the various stages of intercultural competence, with a checklist of descriptors for self-assessment.

A teacher's guide in using CROMO is also in the draft phase.

CROMO will be piloted in 12 schools in the autumn-winter of 2006.

Competence in intercultural awareness is, we believe, a matter of personal growth and experience and cannot easily be measured or graded. However, we hope CROMO will be a useful tool in the language classroom as a means of fostering ELP use and as a way of making learners and teachers more sensitive and inclined to reflect on how to improve communicative competence in intercultural situations, such as those in border regions. In this way it is also a tool for promoting education for democratic citizenship.

Piloting the CercleS ELP in European higher education

Fiona Dalziel

CercleS (Confédération Européenne des Centres de Langues de l'Enseignement Supérieur/European Confederation of Language Centres in Higher Education; www.cercles.org) is a confederation of 10 national associations and several associate members from 21 European countries. Founded in Strasbourg in 1991, it now brings together 250 language centres, departments, institutes, faculties and schools in higher education whose main responsibility is the teaching of language.

The CercleS ELP was validated in 2002. It was originally produced in French and English, but the Council of Europe has recently approved translations into Czech, Slovak and Italian. More translations are being prepared at present. It has been specially designed for use in universities across Europe and is intended for both specialist and non-specialist learners. CercleS distributes the ELP through its national association network. On application, members receive a version of the ELP in pdf format, free of charge, for local dissemination.

CercleS has received positive feedback from the national associations. The ELP has been customised to suit local needs, without impairing its validity, and has been seen to enhance co-operation among teachers of different languages. Students' reactions are in general positive. They see the ELP as a way of becoming aware of how their proficiency relates to the levels of the CEF and of the processes involved in language learning. Some language centres have integrated the use of technology, for example virtual learning environments, into ELP piloting.

CercleS is now considering some further steps to promote the use of the CercleS ELP more widely in European higher education and to develop a full evaluation project. As well as the provision of additional translations, greater support needs to be offered to teachers using the ELP, and collaboration between language centres needs to be encouraged. An international conference on the CercleS ELP and its role and potential in university language learning is to be held in Dublin in June 2007.

Developing an ELP for young learners: the Ukrainian experience

Angela Gergel

When we decided to develop an ELP for young learners, we began by analysing existing ELPs. The descriptors we found made us ask the following questions:
- What are the most important things a child should be able to do in a foreign language?
- How can a child know that he/she can really do something in a foreign language?
- Even when a child can really do something in a foreign language and ticks off the relevant descriptor, he/she may forget how to do it in a week or two. So how many repetitions should a child make to be sure he/she can do something?
- What is the connection between the ELP and the child's textbooks and other school materials?
- When a child is learning several foreign languages, should he/she have a separate Portfolio for each of them?

We talked to the children and their parents, who may have travelled with their children to foreign countries or whose children may have had the opportunity to communicate with foreigners in their own country. We also consulted psychologists. These are the conclusions we came to:
- The most important things a child (and anyone else) should be able to do in a foreign language are:
    1. express physical necessities: tiredness, hunger, thirst, pain, etc.;
    2. give his/her name and address if he/she is lost;
    3. say what he/she would like to do.
- The child's analytical abilities are not developed till he/she is 10–12 years old, so a child of 9–10 cannot even understand the meaning of most of descriptors. The wording of the descriptors should therefore be adjusted.

A child's analytical abilities are on the level of operations – primitive and very short, and the smallest variation in one ability makes a difference. For example, if for a grown-up the meaning of the descriptor "I can introduce myself" is clear, in order to be understood by a child it needs to be divided into several descriptors: (i) "I can tell my name", (ii) "I can say how old I am" (not "my age"), (iii) "I can say what I like", (iv) "I can say what I don't like", etc. That is why our own list of descriptors grew so long that the ELP itself became a problem for the children. For that reason we decided to include small parts of the ELP in foreign language textbooks. When children have filled in parts of the ELP in their textbooks they can better understand its aim, because the descriptors follow the practical tasks of the textbooks.

We talked to the children, their teachers and their parents. This is what we discovered:
- The children filled in their ELPs because their teachers told them to do so and explained that it was very important. The children said that while filling in the ELP they felt nervous. Most of them said that they didn't write the truth – because they understood that someone will see their ELPs. All of the children understood the ELP as a test. Trying to answer the question: "Why do you need the ELP?" they felt nervous and tense. Some of them said, "It's a very difficult question", some had trembling hands, all of them were stressed. Only two children said, "I don't need it." They felt much better than the others.

- For good and hard-working pupils the purpose of the ELP is to show others how good they are. They don't need to keep the ELP as something of their own (as they keep toys, books, skates – which have real importance for children). When someone does something in order to show how good he/she is, that boosts his/her ego.
- When skills develop naturally they become automatic, and that makes us forget how we do this or that. The brain is free to receive more knowledge, to convert knowledge into skill, and to send the knowledge to long-term memory. In this way we can learn more and more. The ELP requires the user always to keep in mind and analyze his/her skills, so his/her working memory is always full. As a result development stops.

Lingu@net Europa

Lid King

Lid King briefly described the background and history of the Lingu@net Europa website, a virtual on-line library and guide for adult learners of languages. Olga Medvedev, one of the partners in the latest manifestation of Lingu@net Europa, explained how it worked and outlined some of the key features, for example, the guide to learning styles and advice to learners. Participants were then able to view the site and make a brief guided tour in a range of different access languages. For more information log on to www.linguanet-europa.org.

Training teachers to use the European Language Portfolio: Project C6 of ECML's second medium-term programme

David Little

The project team comprises David Little (Ireland, co-ordinator), Hans-Peter Hodel (Switzerland), Viljo Kohonen (Finland), Dick Meijer (The Netherlands), Radka Perclová (Czech Republic)

The aim of the project is to support the implementation of the ELP in Council of Europe member states by developing materials and activities in English and French for ELP-related teacher training, mediating the materials and activities in a central workshop (November 2004), supporting national follow-up events (2005–06), and making the kit of materials and activities generally available (2007).

The components of the training kit are:
1. The Common European Framework: activities, competences, levels (Hans-Peter Hodel)
2. Self-assessment in relation to the common reference levels: how do I know what level I am at, and how do I prove it? (Dick Meijer)
3. Learning to learn: a model of reflection for teacher trainers, teachers and learners (Viljo Kohonen)
4. Learner autonomy: drawing together the threads of self-assessment, goal-setting, reflection (David Little)
5. Language in the ELP: language(s) of presentation and process; plurilingualism (Radka Perclová)
6. The intercultural dimension: global simulation (Dick Meijer)
7. Integrating the ELP with language curricula and textbooks; using the ELP to go beyond the text-book (Viljo Kohonen, Radka Perclová, Hans-Peter Hodel)
8. Connecting assessment with the ELP and the common reference levels (Hans-Peter Hodel)

The central workshop was held in November 2004. There were 37 participants from 32 countries: Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, "Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom. The working methods were: plenary input, group discussion, and individual reflection. As the workshop progressed handouts and notes gradually formed a portfolio of materials for ELP-related teacher training.

In 2005 and 2006 follow-up events were held in the following countries: Finland, Armenia, Liechtenstein, Norway, Croatia, Sweden, Germany, Lithuania, Estonia, France, Latvia, Romania, Czech Re-

public, Albania, Austria, Iceland, "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia".

An update on ELP developments in The Netherlands

Daniela Fasoglio and Dick Meijer

The presentation began with a brief update on the Dutch ELP project. The Dutch ELP for young learners (children aged 10–12) was shown for the first time. This model differs from those for adolescents and higher/vocational education students as regards lay-out, levels and number of descriptors. The lay-out has been specially designed for younger learners, and "can do" descriptors have been included for A1 and A2 only. A large number of descriptors have been added so that self-assessment is easier for the target group. In order to assess themselves younger learners need more concrete examples of the contexts in which they (can) use the foreign language. By way of illustration, here are two examples of communicative situations in the classroom (A1 listening comprehension, instructions):

"Take your textbook and open it on page 25"

"Listen to the audiotape or the CD and repeat"

Next a new feature of the web-based ELP, "profile shift", was described. Because this ELP has been developed as an instrument of life-long learning, the user must be able to change his or her profile easily, for instance when moving from primary school to secondary education or from secondary to vocational education. If the user selects NEW PROFILE on the personal information page, all the information contained in the language passport (including the self-assessment grid and whatever documents have been uploaded to the dossier) is transferred to the new profile automatically. In this way users can use the same ELP during the whole of their language learning.

The Dutch national curriculum for foreign languages has recently been related to the levels of the CEFR. Examples of oral and written production have been collected in several foreign languages in order to illustrate the different levels of the Framework and to make teachers and learners aware of what these levels mean in daily school practice. Some of the examples of oral production were shown and discussed. They were recorded by language teachers, who had first been given a task description and an overview of the criteria belonging to the different levels. All of the examples will be put on a CD-ROM for use in teacher training sessions. Each example will be accompanied by a description of the criteria appropriate for the CEFR level in question and the relevant "can do" statement. It is also intended to make these examples available on the Dutch ELP website (www.europeestaalportfolio.nl).

ALICE (Accreditation of Linguistic and International Competences for Europe)

Eike Thürmann

The state school system in Nordrhein-Westphalen has ambitious schools with accredited foreign language and CLIL-programmes; a diverse landscape of exchange programmes and cross-border projects (all well integrated into the upper secondary curriculum); a flexible upper secondary course structure that allows for in-depth European and intercultural studies; talented students learning two or more foreign languages to a high level of achievement and with a deep interest in the European/international dimension; and a substantial number of highly mobile national as well as international families, mainly in the large Rhein/Ruhr conurbation areas, who want their children to be well prepared for the possibility of continuing their studies abroad

At the same time we have to admit that there is a lack of incentives for state schools to fully develop their professional potential in offering more than the minimum/average range of courses/programmes; a lack of incentives for young people to strive for excellence as they prepare for a linguistically and culturally rich professional or private life; an absence of (inter)national consensus on standards of excellence, whether for the assessment of language learning or for school and classroom development; and an absence of internationally intelligible, transparent and standardised ways of documenting outstanding achievement in language learning and international studies, whether by schools or learners

National school-leaving qualifications are mutually recognised according to European Convention No. 15 on the "Equality of Diplomas" (11 December 1953). Nevertheless, universities and institutions of

further education throughout the world still require students from abroad to provide additional certification of their language competence. So far only schools and educational institutions outside the state school system provide for internationally accepted certification of language competences. We thus feel the need to reinforce the international recognition of the school leaving qualifications provided by state schools, especially as regards outstanding achievements in the acquisition of international and language competences.

ALICE is a label of excellence for schools, a certificate that can be added to the national school-leaving qualification (baccalaureate, Abitur). It is an invitation to educational authorities and schools to participate in an international network; it aims at the international recognition of school-leaving qualifications, provided that well-defined standards of excellence are reached; and it has already made a lot of friends in the German Länder and neighbouring countries.

ALICE schools offer CLIL-programmes up to baccalaureate level; have enough qualified teachers to support CLIL-programmes and develop a reflected CLIL methodology; participate in international programmes and give learners opportunities to gather cross-border experiences; offer special courses designed to deepen learners' insights into global, international, and European affairs (mainly social/political sciences); systematically evaluate the quality of their programmes, discuss results, and implement strategies of improvement; apply to national educational authorities for official accreditation; document the aforementioned characteristics by submitting an application portfolio; agree that the accreditation process will be periodically reviewed; confirm that they will co-operate with other ALICE schools on initiatives to monitor and improve quality standards ("critical friends" approach, developing tools and procedures for internal quality management); and make use of the ELP and Europass.

ALICE is an ambitious attempt to bring together L1 as subject, non-language subjects studied through L1, L2 as subject, and non-language subjects studied through L2. It encourages the development of cross-curricular cognitive-academic language processing functions (defining, describing, explaining, concluding, discussing, evaluating, etc.) and cross-curricular cognitive strategies (reproducing, reducing, expanding, elaborating, generalising, exemplifying, extrapolating, etc.). And it entails working with a variety of media and text formats: pictures, movies/videos, statistics, diagrams, maps, interviews, reports, etc.

ALICE graduates can show that they have achieved at least B2 in two (foreign) languages additional to their native/family language; that they have successfully participated in CLIL programmes (a minimum number of hours in one, two or more subjects); that they have successfully completed academic work on international issues or the European dimension (the minimum requirement is a two-semester course or a thesis/research paper); and that they have successfully taken part in exchange programmes or cross-border projects (topic-based documentation of experiences).

The preparatory phase of ALICE will be launched in August 2007. The tasks to be completed include: defining criteria for the accreditation of schools; defining criteria for the award of the quality label; recruiting schools for the pilot phase; identifying national/regional coordinators; installing a provisional secretariat; preparing schools for the piloting phase; discussing how to deal with evaluation and quality management.

The pilot phase will be launched in August 2009. The tasks to be completed include: deciding how to deal with evaluation and quality management; discussing financial arrangements for the international infrastructure; recruiting more schools; installing the secretariat and establishing a website; organising an international contact seminar for schools; deciding on a corporate identity and securing rights; piloting instruments and procedures for internal and external evaluation; discussing the evaluation report; finalising the ALICE concept; witnessing the first graduation of ALICE schools.

Plenary feedback on show and tell: round table (Gisella Langé, José-Joaquin Moreno, Stase Skapiene) – Chair: Gunther Abuja

The members of the round table were asked to say what had most struck them about the show-and-tell presentations they had attended.

Stase Skapiene thought that the CROMO cross-border project added real value to the ELP by pooling the experience and expertise of three countries. The ELP supplement is very user-friendly and will be very useful for students living in border regions. The future of the ELP probably lies more with digital than with paper versions, so she was particularly interested to hear what Daniela Fasoglio and Dick Meijer had to say about developments in The Netherlands. The third session she attended was Lid King's presentation of Lingu@net Europa. To know it you really have to try it, but it seems to be very user-friendly and includes many languages, among them Lithuanian.

José-Joaquin Moreno had attended Barbara Glowacka's presentation of the language passport templates for primary and lower secondary learners, which offered an important opportunity to discuss the potential impact of the templates on learners and to give feedback that will influence their revision. He had also attended Fiona Dalziel's report on work with the CercleS ELP, which had prompted him to the thought that even if we know that self-assessment is a good idea, we don't always realise how powerful it can be until we see practical examples. He had been specially struck by one student's comment to the effect that teachers know only a small part of learners' linguistic experience, whereas learners themselves know the whole story. In the presentation by Daniela Fasoglio and Dick Meijer he had been impressed by the samples of productive language use that had been collected to bridge the gap for teachers and learners between what language learning is about and the CEFR. Finally, he had heard David Little's progress report on ECML Project C6, *Training teachers to use the ELP*, and looked forward to the final output of the project. Participants who missed the presentation can look the project up on the ECML website (www.ecml.at).

Gisela Langé had attended Angela Gergel's presentation explaining how she and her colleagues had started to develop an ELP for primary learners by analysing descriptors from validated ELPs. They concluded that children's needs had not been taken fully into account and worked with psychologists to develop descriptors that address children's needs; for example, they need to be able to say that they are tired or hungry, and they always want to say what they would like to do. Gisela Langé had also attended Fiona Dalziel's presentation on the CercleS ELP, which is potentially available to 250 university language centres around Europe. She had been impressed by the evolution of this paper ELP, which is easily downloaded as a PDF file. Finally, she had attended Eike Thürmann's presentation of ALICE, a project that includes the ELP in a process of internationalisation.

Eike Thürmann asked about the status of the passport templates. Johanna Panthier explained that they had not yet been approved by the Validation Committee. When they are approved they will be put on the Council of Europe's ELP website, but they will certainly not be obligatory.

Gunther Abuja wondered how we can exploit the results of practical measures taken in the member states. Johanna Panthier pointed out that the web site under development by the IMPEL project will facilitate the exchange of good practice, though the future of the web site has still to be confirmed. Hans Ulrich Bosshard explained that the IMPEL project is conceived as a companion piece to Project C6. The goal is to establish an interactive web site to support ELP implementation and the exchange of information, ideas and good practice. Francesca Brotto suggested that it is possible to exploit experience in other countries by forming "critical friendships". Egle Šleinotienė pointed out that projects funded by the EU are another way of bringing ELP projects in different countries into interaction with one another.

Discussion of action plans for ELP development/implementation in member states – Johanna Panthier

Participants reported on plans for the future as follows:
- Portugal has almost finished developing a primary ELP and schools have been selected for piloting (Maria Anália Gomes).
- Norway is starting a two-year implementation project. Support is still needed from the Council of Europe: perhaps a future seminar could be devoted to implementation (Heike Speitz).
- Austria has developed materials for use in teacher education and to help persuade, e.g., school principals. Materials have also been developed to support the integration of the ELP in teaching.

- Some of these materials will be included in the final publication of ECML Project C6 (Gunther Abuja).
- Italy has started to produce a series of downloadable booklets. The first two – "What is an ELP?" and "What kinds of ELP have we got?" – are already available and a third, dealing with good practice, will be produced later in 2006 (Francesca Brotto).
- Poland has just submitted the last in its series of ELPs for validation, a model for very young learners. It is intended to integrate the ELP into language curricula and change the attitudes of teachers, learners and principals. An ELP module is now included in pre-service teacher education. The Polish ELP web site provides information about the different Polish ELPs (Maria Gorzelak).
- The developers of the Belgian ELP for adults have received a request for permission to use their model in Canada (Chris van Woensel).
- The ELPs for adult migrants developed by Integrate Ireland Language and Training and validated in 2001 have been translated into Japanese for use with immigrants in Osaka. The Irish authorities are developing plans for a three-year whole-school project based on the ELP for lower and upper secondary learners. The combination of a scaled curriculum expressed as a series of "can do" statements and a closely related ELP has proved very successful in the teaching of English as a second language in Irish primary schools (David Little).

In the ensuing discussion Gisela Langé wondered whether it might be possible to establish a newsletter for ELP contact persons; she had the impression that contact persons do not have many opportunities to exchange information. Francesca Brotto suggested that frequently asked questions could be collected. In Rolf Schärer's view this might be very difficult to organise: very many languages are involved and the questions would be very various. But he undertook to make a list of the ELP-related web sites he has come across. He pointed out that the final report on this phase of the ELP project will be due at the end of 2007; in the meantime the Validation Committee will review what happened at this seminar and decide what additional information should be collected next year.

Johanna Panthier closed the session by encouraging participants to come forward with proposals for the ECML's next medium-term programme.

Saturday 30 September

Presentation of Lithuanian ELP experience – Chair: Stase Skapiene

Introducing this part of the programme, **Stase Skapiene** explained that Lithuania is a multilingual country and Vilnius is a multilingual city. Lithuanians are used to seeing multilingual notices in public transport. Lithuanian is the chief language of education, but there are schools that teach through Russian, Polish, English, French or German. 92% of students at school choose to learn English, which is the most popular first foreign language. The second most popular is German and the third is French. Russian is the most popular second foreign language. Only 700 students learn languages other than these at school, though the universities offer a wider choice of languages. Job advertisements frequently require English and Russian.

The ELP in Lithuania, 2002–2006 – Zita Mažuolienė and Virginija Stanevičienė

Zita Mažuolienė (Institute of Foreign Languages, Vilnius University) presented an overview of the development of the Lithuanian ELP for learners aged 15 and over.

A project team was recruited in 2002. This comprised two developers (with Lithuanian, Russian and English), two translators (German and French), a coordinator, an editor, and a piloting team of ten. It was decided to start by developing an ELP for learners aged 15 years and over for several reasons. Teachers of senior classes are more aware of the CEFR levels; Europass and self-assessment are particularly relevant to learners in this age group; upper secondary education is more in focus; and there

is more international experience in designing portfolios for adults. When it came to developing descriptors the project team began by analysing all available ELPs and went on to write descriptors in Lithuanian, English, German, French and Russian. At the same time the curriculum was brought into line with the CEFR. The piloting of the Lithuanian descriptors began in December 2002. This was a matter of checking their comprehensibility and appropriateness, and it involved ten teachers from different schools. They were given detailed instructions on how to apply the descriptors and a questionnaire that asked about the relation of the descriptors to the CEFR and the school curriculum, their relevance to the age and interests of the learners, their relation to actual language use in communicative situations, and whether they contained enough detail to establish the CEFR level.

The ELP itself was piloted in the spring and early summer of 2002; 1,200 copies were distributed to 35 schools. The chief aims of the piloting process were to test the instructions (for teachers as well as students) and the descriptors in languages other than Lithuanian, to find out how much time was needed to work with the ELP in class, and to check whether it corresponded with the curriculum. The 35 teachers involved in piloting came together to discuss the results at a mini-conference held in December 2004. Feedback from teachers included the following: the ELP gives teachers and students a clearer view of the content of teaching and learning; it helps teachers to plan their courses and students to understand the curriculum aims; its motivational function is more important than its record-keeping function; the ELP is consistent with the curriculum but not with textbooks. Other components of the ELP, the intercultural dimension and learning how to learn, were not piloted. In retrospect this was a mistake. When the ELP was prepared for validation and accreditation, it was found that there were inconsistencies in the descriptors across the languages. Also, the dossier lacked definition and instructions. In future, descriptors will be provided in Lithuanian and one other language, probably English or French. 3,000 copies of the ELP have now been printed published, of which 1,000 copies have been distributed free of charge. The remainder are for sale.

From October to December 2005 the Teachers' Professional Development Centre in Vilnius held twelve teacher-training seminars for groups of 30 teachers. Each seminar lasted for three days. The five trainers were people who had participated in ELP development, and the first seminar was given with the support of ECML Project C6 (Radka Perclová). Seven further seminars are planned, after which ten seminars will be run in different parts of the country by teachers who have attended seminars in Vilnius.

A handbook to accompany this ELP has been written in Lithuanian. It draws on Council of Europe documentation, the ECML Project C6 teacher training seminar, and the guide to the ELP for teachers and teacher trainers written by David Little and Radka Perclová. It is intended for teachers who do not have linguistic access to the original documents.

A number of lessons have been learnt from the work so far. First, the Lithuanian ELP was developed without a Lithuanian translation of the CEFR; as a result it was necessary to develop new terminology in Lithuanian (a translation of the CEFR is now in preparation). Some confusion has been caused by the fact that there are several different translations of the self-assessment grid. Also, it might have been more efficient to start by developing an ELP for younger learners, which could be integrated into the portfolio for all subjects. Piloting in the 11th grade is not maximally efficient; it should have started with grades 9 and 10 so that learners' development could be tracked. There are now plans to develop an ELP for basic school (grades 5 to 8) and one for adults, and the Ministry of Education plans to support teacher training in 2007 and 2008.

Virginija Stanevičienė then talked about teacher feedback on the ELP. She explained that she had attended the first teacher training seminar, at which Radka Perclová presented theoretical matters in very practical terms, focussing on the concept of the ELP, its aims and its pedagogical implications. Key ideas raised by the seminar were: the ELP is a tool for learning and self-assessment; teachers and students share responsibility for learning outcomes; autonomous and socially responsible learning is supported by the ELP; the ELP captures partial and specific competences; an important part of intercultural communicative competence is a tolerant attitude to ambiguity and misunderstanding; in planning educational change it is important to progress by small steps; the ELP can help to lay the foundations of lifelong learning.

When Virginija Stanevičienė presented the ELP to colleagues they responded in a number of negative ways: the ELP was not generally available; students would have to buy another book, which might evoke a negative reaction from their parents; the curriculum did not allocate enough teaching hours; the ELP would require extra preparation time; in any case it was just another experiment and not obligatory.

She integrated the ELP into her teaching by developing three special lessons – (i) working with the self-assessment grid and checklists, (ii) identifying learning styles, and (iii) using a questionnaire to prompt reflection. The students involved were 17 and 18 years old, in their final year of secondary education, and they were taking a special extended course in English. They responded to the question-naire in English. Here are some of the things they said:

On the usefulness of the ELP:
- "It's important to have great goals and achieve them."
- "Self-assessment is the first thing I liked."
- "I have to study no matter how much I know. There are no limits to learning."
- "A new way/method of studying English."
- "You can see your progress."
- "Everyone has a different way of learning."

On the influence of the ELP on their further language learning:
- "I know how much I know. I know what I don't know, so I can study English more effectively."
- "When you know at what level you are, you can get some goals for the future."
- "I'm going to use the most effective methods of learning."
- "Everything is clearer now."
- "I know how to improve my English."

On problems they encountered working with the ELP:
- "Some questions and tasks are repetitive."
- "Some questions are too complicated to understand – teacher's help or examples are needed."
- "Some questions are not useful, rather boring."
- "The levels you discover have little value, it's just a game as the ELP is not an official document."
- "You need the teacher's evaluation in the ELP but there are so many students in class for the teacher to cope with."
- "Too highly detailed questions in the self-evaluation grid."

On the teacher's role working with the ELP:
- "Can help to understand the questions we didn't manage to answer."
- "Can help to evaluate us because when you assess yourself you may be not exact (subjective)."
- "Each page must be checked by the teacher to realise students' problems and help to solve them – not all students can solve their problems themselves."

On whether students should work with the ELP at home or at school:
- "We should try to work with the ELP at home because it takes much time to answer questions."
- "We should work with the ELP at school because you need the teacher's help to answer questions."
- "If some questions were easier, students might work with the ELP at home."

The ELP assigns new roles to teachers and students. It helps students to be independent, active, responsible, motivated and confident, and this allows the teacher to be an advisor, a monitor and a counsellor. Because it gives teacher and students a common goal, the ELP makes it possible to break the old routine of teaching. Time can be found to engage students in systematic reflection; different kinds of evaluation can be used; the practice of self-assessment can lead to autonomous learning; and different teaching styles can be accommodated. The ELP emphasises the importance of cultural awareness in the student's language learning history and supports the development of tolerant attitudes and behaviour and acceptance of other traditions. In short, using the ELP means change, but "We need all schools to be involved and not just individual learners" (Rolf Schärer), and "Teaching and the ELP should go together" (Radka Perclová).

To conclude this session, **two teams of three students from Kaunas Jesuit Gymnasium Debating Club** conducted a debate in English for and against the motion: "This house would make the teaching of foreign languages in schools compulsory."

Coordinator's summing up (David Little) – Chair: Francis Goullier

David Little reviewed the work that had been done during the seminar, paying particular attention to the outcome of the first day's discussion about the future of the ELP (see pp.6–7 above). He concluded his summing up by referring to something that had particularly struck him. From the beginning there have been divergent views on the language learners should use when they work with the ELP. Some believe that they should use their first language (or language of education) in order to give as much depth as possible to their reflection; others argue that they should use their target language(s) in order to develop their reflective capacity as part of their second language proficiency. It may be that the ELP itself encourages the second of these approaches. In responding to questions about her case study Barbara Lazenby Simpson noted that the ELP seems to draw learners into reflective use of the target language; Maria Stoicheva showed an impressive array of reflective comments that her learners had written in English; reporting on the use of the CercleS ELP in her university, Fiona Dalziel also made the point that her students spontaneously wrote their reflective comments in English; and the same thing happened, again spontaneously, in Virginija Stanevičienė's classroom.

Open forum – Chair: Francis Goullier

Gisela Langé suggested that it is necessary to re-launch the ELP project in general. One way of doing this would be to summarise Rolf Schärer's report and distribute it to as many stakeholders as possible. Another way would be to organise a conference in Strasbourg for key decision makers at national and European level, including the European Union. ELP contact persons need to meet on a regular basis so that they can keep in touch with one another.

Referring to David Little's comment on the use of the target language for reflection, **Viljo Kohonen** said that colleagues in Finland are divided on this matter but he leans towards David Little's position. Recalling that one of the principles governing the ELP is that it is the property of the learner, he noted that some of the presentations at the seminar seemed to interpret this to mean individual work carried out in isolation. Dialogic communication, however, is fundamental to effective language learning.

Gunther Abuja wondered how the working groups' responses to Rolf Schärer's questions would influence the further work of the Council of Europe. **Johanna Panthier** replied that the Council of Europe will certainly take account of them in planning future activity. **Rolf Schärer** noted that there is now a large amount of information and experience at different levels. His annual reports are addressed to the Council of Europe; if we want to inform more people, it is probably necessary to adopt a different rhetoric. **Johanna Panthier** reminded participants that the Language Policy Division is obliged to report on all its projects to the Steering Committee for Education. Rolf Schärer's reports could also be exploited in an ELP newsletter of the kind suggested by Gisela Langé. **Francis Goullier** said that the Validation Committee attaches great importance to the dissemination of information about the pedagogical impact of the ELP; it is essential to brief those who are not directly involved in language education, especially school principals.

Viljo Kohonen argued that in preparing students for the workplace we need to develop their ability to assess themselves. This is something that must be worked at over a number of years. The ELP has an important contribution to make here, because it requires learners regularly to assess their proficiency in whatever languages they are learning, whether at school or outside. Self-assessment is, of course, a prerequisite for learner autonomy.

Richard Wach thought that information about the ELP is mostly restricted to specialists. It is essential to persuade school principals as well as language teachers that the ELP has much to offer in relation to assessment as well as teaching. In France the self-assessment that is central to ELP use is revolutionary, and it will take time to understand and exploit the relation between self-assessment and assess-

ment by teachers and official examinations. Self-assessment comes into its own when language learning takes place outside formal educational contexts, by immersion.

Francis Goullier recalled Lid King making the point that the ELP can solve problems; the challenge is to identify which problems most urgently need to be addressed. He agreed with David Little that we need to think more about the articulation between assessment and self-assessment.

Rolf Schärer found the wealth of insights offered by the seminar overwhelming. Virginija Stanevičienė explained how the ELP changed things for her. Is this generalisable evidence? How do we make it more widely known? How can we transfer the information and experience that we gained in these two days to the further development of the ELP? How can we transfer the know-how developed at Lycée Kléber? Perhaps at a future event students could debate the pros and cons of the ELP.

Angela Gergel said that she has made a video of her pupils using three languages and talking about the ELP. **Zsuzsa Darabos** said that it would be good to have examples of teachers of different languages cooperating in using the ELP.

Maria Teresa Bonet reported that Andorra plans to develop an ELP this academic year. Four languages will be included – Catalan, French, Spanish and English. In Andorran primary schools Catalan, Spanish and French are used as languages of education. The developers will face the challenge of preparing an ELP with appropriate descriptors. At the same time there is a project to develop a portfolio for the whole curriculum, including languages of education.

Melanya Astvatsatryan noted that we need to find a way of combining the best features of electronic and paper ELPs.

Francis Goullier agreed that there is a need for descriptors for particular contexts; also that we need to find ways of developing electronic ELPs to support and replace paper ELPs. The Council of Europe's project on languages of education may provide some of the answers to Maria Teresa Bonet's questions. Concluding the open forum, he stressed the importance of the relation between the Validation Committee, the Language Policy Division and ELP contact persons; we need to ensure that there is rapid and effective communication between them. On behalf of the participants he thanked the Lithuanian organisers of the seminar for their hospitality and efficiency.

Close of the seminar

Johanna Panthier said that in her view this had been a very successful seminar. Despite all the difficulties that confront ELP implementation, we have seen many examples of good practice. A Council of Europe survey shows that the CEFR is being used more and more in the revision of curricula. There is an enormous amount of work still to do, but we are clearly making progress. One limitation we face is that the CEFR is not designed for first languages and languages of education; that is why the Council of Europe has launched a project on languages of education, which will have important implications for the ELP. Johanna Panthier had noted the requests that participants had made of the Council of Europe. It would not be easy to meet them all at a time when there is great pressure to economise and reduce the number of committees. But the EVC must be retained because it is essential to the continued life of the ELP. We must also remember that the ECML can support the ELP. Johanna Panthier concluded by thanking the participants, who give the ELP life; the organising team, especially Stase Skapiene and Eglė Šleinotienė; the presenters; the chairs and rapporteurs of the working groups; the interpreters; Corinne Colin of the Language Policy Division for her support; the members of the Validation Committee; Francis Goullier, chair of the Validation Committee; Rolf Schärer, the rapporteur général; and David Little, seminar coordinator and rapporteur. She expressed the hope that she would see many of the participants again at the Language Policy Forum in Strasbourg in February 2007.

On behalf of the Lithuanian Ministry of Education and Science **Eglė Šleinotienė** thanked the Council of Europe for agreeing to allow Lithuania to host the seminar. The seminar had once more shown that the ELP project is one of the best examples of international cooperation. She hoped that the personal contacts established in Lithuania will never be forgotten and closed the seminar by making presentations to those who had been centrally involved in the organisation of the seminar.

Exhibition of ELPs and ELP projects

The following 25 countries/INGOs contributed to the exhibition: Armenia, Austria, Belgium, CercleS, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, France, FYR Macedonia, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom.

Photographs taken during the seminar may be downloaded from www.smm.lt/en/news/elp.htm.

Appendix 1

Evaluation questionnaire

The evaluation questionnaire was completed and returned by 20 official ELP contact persons and 25 other participants.

Participants were asked to rate the importance/relevance of the main themes of the seminar for their own context on a scale from *1* to *5*, where *1 = not at all important/relevant* and *5 = very important/relevant*. Average ratings were as follows:

	Official ELP contact persons	Other participants
Templates for Language Passports for young learners	4.0	4.0
Moving the ELP forward	4.5	4.6
Three ELP case studies	4.7	4.4

Participants suggested that the Council of Europe should take the following initiatives:

- Establish an ELP newsletter.
- Provide examples of what is currently considered good practice in ELP design.
- Commission a guide for developers of electronic ELPs.
- Co-ordinate large-scale evaluation of the ELP by learners and teachers.
- Support the integration of the ELP in language curricula.
- Take steps to inform school principals about the ELP.
- Arrange in-depth discussion for those who have the task of implementing validated ELPs.
- Provide more case studies of ELP implementation/use (including the user's perspective) and examples of good practice; aim them at different categories of stakeholder.
- Provide opportunities to discuss the CEFR and the ELP in the context of other European/international developments.
- Provide more support for teacher training.
- Involve international teachers' associations.

Participants were asked to rate the interest/helpfulness of the exhibition and the show-and-tell session on a scale from *1* to *5*, where *1 = not at all interesting/helpful* and *5 = very interesting/helpful*. Average ratings were as follows:

	Official ELP contact persons	Other participants
Exhibition	4.0	4.4
Show-and-tell session	4.5	4.3

Participants were asked to rate different aspects of the seminar on a scale from *1* to *5*, where *1 = very unsatisfactory* and *5 = very satisfactory*. Average ratings were as follows:

	Official ELP contact persons	Other participants
Preparation and organisation of the seminar	4.7	4.8
The structure and process of the seminar	4.3	4.4
Seminar facilities	4.0	4.5
Accommodation	4.8	4.7
Social programme	4.5	4.5

Appendix 2
List of participants

Albania / Albanie

Ms Tatjana VUÇANI
FL Specialist
Department for Curriculum Development
Ministry of Education and Science
Rruga e Durrësit N.23
TIRANA / ALBANIA
WL/LT: E

Tel: 355 42 25678
Fax: 355 42 32002
Tel home: 355 4 268 831
e-mail: vucanit@mash.gov.al

Andorra / Andorre

Ms Maria Teresa BONET CABALLERO
Conseillère pédagogique
Àrea de Pedagogia
Departament d'Educació Escolar i Relacions Internacionals
Ministeri d'Educació i Formació Professional
Edifici el Moli
Av. Rocafort, 21-23
AD 600 SANT JULIÀ DE LÒRIA
PRINCIPAT D'ANDORRA
WL/LT: F / E

Tel.: 376.743300
Fax: 376.743313
e-mail: aoliva.gov@andorra.ad

Armenia / Arménie

Ms Melanya ASTVATSATRYAN
Head of Chair of Pedagogy
and Foreign Language methodology
Yerevan State Linguistic University after Brusov
Toumanyan str 42
375002 YEREVAN
WL/LT: E

Tel/Fax: 374 10 53 05 52
e-mail: yslu@brusov.am /
irext1@arminco.com

Austria / Autriche

Mr Gunther ABUJA
Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum
Zentrum für Schulversuche und Schulentwicklung
Abt. III
Hans-Sachs-Gasse 3
A - 8010 GRAZ
WL/LT: E / F / G

Tel.: 43 316 82 41 50
Fax: 43 316 82 41 50-6
e-mail: abuja@sprachen.ac.at

Belarus

Ms Tatsiana LEONTYEVA
Head of Methodology Department of
Minsk State Linguistic University (MSLU)
21 Zakharov Str.
220034 MINSK
Private Address / Adresse privée
Yesenina str., 16, apt 247
Mailbox 170
220025 MINSK
WL/LT: E

Tel: 375 17 236 74 91 / 375 17 284 80 67
Fax: 375 17 236 75 04
e-mail: method@mslu.by

e-mail: tpleont@tut.by

Belgium / Belgique

Flemish Community / Communauté flamande

Ms Chris VAN WOENSEL
Ministry of the Community of Flanders
Department of Work, Training and Education
Unit Curriculum   Tel: 32 2 553 88 14
Koning Albert II-laan 15   Fax: 32 2 553 88 35
B - 1210 BRUSSELS   e-mail: chris.vanwoensel@ond.vlaanderen.be
WL/LT: E / F

French Community / Communauté française

Mme Nadine FRANÇOIS
Inspectrice des cours de langues germaniques   Tel: 32 2 468.06.59
Avenue de Koekelberg, 56
1082 BRUXELLES   e-mail: nadine.francois@cfwb.be
WL/LT: F / E

Bosnia and Herzegovina / Bosnie-Herzégovine

Ms Dzevahira ARSLANAGIC
G-dja. Dzevahira Arslanagic,
Profesor engleskog jezika
Filozofski fakultet   Tel: 387 33 268 700
Franje Račkog 1   Mobile: 387 61 161 229
71000 SARAJEVO   Fax: 387 33 667 873
BOSNIA and HERZEGOVINA   e-mail: mino@bih.net.ba
WL/LT: E / F

Bulgaria / Bulgarie

Mme Vesselina POPOVA
Chef du Département "Activité d'adhésion et priorités"
Ministère de l'Education et de la Science
Direction « Politique dans l`enseignement secondaire »
2A Kniaz Dondoukov Blvd   Tel: 359 2 9217452
BG-1000 SOFIA   Fax: 359 2 988 24 85
WL/LT: F   e-mail: v.popova@minedu.government.bg

Croatia / Croatie

Ms Cvjetanka BOŽANIĆ
X.gimnazija
Klaićeva 7   Tel: 385 1 6043823 / 385 16043823
10 000 ZAGREB / CROATIA   Fax: 385 1 37 77 994 / 385 98 386508
WL/LT: E   e mail: cvjetanka@hotmail.com

Cyprus / Chypre

Mme Efrosyni TOFARIDOU
Inspectorat de Français
Ministère de l'Education et de la Culture
Kimon and Thucydides streets   Tel: 357 99 47 77 05
Acropolis
1434 NICOSIA / CHYPRE   Fax: 357 22800862
WL/LT: F / E   e-mail: frossot@synthesis.com.cy

Czech Republic / République tchèque

Mrs Jitka TUMOVA
Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports
Department for Preschool, Elementary,   Tel: 420 257 193 785
And Elementary Artistic Education   Fax: 420 257 193 663
7, Karmelitska
118 12 PRAHA 1 / CZECH REPUBLIC   e-mail: tumovaj@msmt.cz
WL/LT: E

Estonia / Estonie

Mr Tõnu TENDER
Head of Language Policy Division   Tel: 372 7 350 223
Ministry of Education and Research   Mobile: 372 51 54 365
Munga 18   Fax: 372 7 350 220
50088 TARTU   e-mail: tonu.tender@hm.ee
WL / LT: E

Mrs Ülle TÜRK
Lecturer of English Language and Literature
Chair of English Language and Literature
Department of Germanic and
Romance Languages and Literatures
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Tartu   Tel: 372 7 375 218
Küütri 2
50090 TARTU / ESTONIA   e-mail: ulle.turk@ut.ee
WL / LT: E

Finland / Finlande

Mr Viljo KOHONEN
Professor
Department of Teacher Education   Tel: 358 3 215 6847
Tampere University   Mobile: 358 50 533 0874
FIN - 33014 TAMPERE   Fax: 358 3 215 7537
WL/LT: E   e-mail: kohonen@uta.fi / viljo.kohonen@uta.fi

France

Mme Geneviève GAILLARD
Inspectrice générale de l'éducation nationale   Tel: 01 55 55 31 45
du groupe langues vivantes
Ministère de l'Education nationale
De l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche
107, rue de grenelle
75 357 PARIS 07 SP   e-mail: genevieve.gaillard@education.gouv.fr
WL/LT: F / E

Germany / Allemagne

Mr Eike THÜRMANN
Regierungsdirektor
Landesinstitut für Schule/Qualitätsagentur
Paradieserweg 64   Tel: 49 2921 683 256
D-59494 SOEST   Fax: 49 2921 683 402/228
WL/LT: E / G   e-mail: Eike.Thuermann@mail.lfs.nrw.de

Georgia / Géorgie

Ms Marika ODZELI
Professor
ELP contact person
Ivane Javakhishvili State University, Tbilisi
Ministry of Education and Science   Tel: 995 32 23 37 96
52, Dimitri Uznadze St
TBILISI 0102
Private Address / Adresse privée
5 A, Jakob Nikoladze St
380079 TBILISI   e-mail: makodzeli@hotmail.com
WL/LT: E

Greece / Grèce

Mme Evagelia KAGA-GKIOVOUSOGLOU
Institut Pédagogique d'Athènes   Tel: 30 210 8050740
396, av. Mesogion   Tel/Fax: 30 210 6016382
GR – 15341 AGIA PARASKEVI / ATHENES   Fax: 30 210 6016388/
WL/LT: F   e-mail: ekaga@pi-schools.gr

Hungary / Hongrie

Mme Zsuzsa DARABOS
CIEF   Tel: 36 30 601 2169
Múzeum krt 4 F   Fax: 36 14 85 52 75
1088 BUDAPEST
Private Address / Adresse privée
Kútvölgyi út 11
H-1125 BUDAPEST
WL/LT: F   e-mail (home): darabos.zsuzsanna@t-online.hu

Iceland / Islande

Ms Erna ÁRNADÓTTIR
Ministry of Education,Science and Culture   Tel: 354 545 9500
Sölvhólsgata 4   Fax: 354 562 3068
150 REYKJAVÍK / ICELAND   e-mail: erna.arnadottir@mrn.stjr.is
WL/LT: E

Ms Aldís INGVADOTTIR
National Centre for Education Materials   Tel: 354 535 0400
Namsgagnastofnun   Fax: 354 535 0401
Laugavegur 166
105 REYKJAVÍK / ICELAND   e mail: aldis@nams.is
WL/LT: E

Ireland / Irlande

Ms Barbara SIMPSON
Centre for Language & Communication Studies
Trinity College   Tel: 353 1 608 2615/1560
Arts building
IRL - DUBLIN 2   Fax: 351 1 664 3726
WL/LT: E   e-mail: bsimpson@tcd.ie

Italy / Italie

Ms Francesca BROTTO
Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca
(MIUR)
Direzione Generale per gli Affari Internazionali
dell'Istruzione Scolastica
Viale Trastevere, 76/A
I - 00153 ROMA
WL/LT: E / F

Tel: 39 06 5849 3384/2280
Fax: 39 06 5849 3381
e-mail: francesca.brotto@istruzione.it /
frbrotto@libero.it

Latvia / Lettonie

Ms Inita VĪTOLA
Head of Projects Division
State Language Agency
Lāčplēša iela 35–5
LV - RIGA 1011
WL/LT: E

Tel: 371 7201685 / Mob: 9123167
Fax: 371 7201683
e-mail: projekti@valoda.lv / isd@izm.gov.lv

Ms Dace DALBIŅA
Head of Projects Division
Centre for Curriculum Development and Examination
Ministry of Education and Science
Vaļņu iela 2
LV - RIGA 1050
WL/LT: E

Tel: 371 7814480
Fax: 371 7223801
e-mail: dace.dalbina@isec.gov.lv
dalbina@inbox.lv

Ms Silvija KARKLINA
Public Service Language Centre
e-mail:silvijak@latnet.lv

Ms Rita KURSITE
Centre for Curriculum Development and Examination
of the Ministry of Education of Latvia
e-mail: rita.kursite@nelss.lv

Ms Eli LUFTA
53 Secondary school, Riga
e-mail: elita.lufta@inbox.lv

Lithuania / Lituanie

Mr. Justinas BARTUSEVIČIUS
e-mail: j.bartusevicius@pprc.lt

Ms. Nijolė BAZARIENĖ
Švietimo ir mokslo miniserija
e-mail: nijole.bazariene@smm.lt

Ms. Irena BUDREIKIENĖ
Utenos Adolfo Šapokos gimnazija
e-mail:irena.bu@gmail.com

Ms. Nida BURNEIKAITĖ
Vilniaus Universitetas
e-mail:nida.burneikaitė@flf.vu.lt

Ms. Ona ČEPULĖNIENĖ
Švietimo ir mokslo miniserija
e-mail: ona.cepuleniene@smm.lt

Ms. Laimutė JANKAUSKIENĖ
Švietimo ir mokslo miniserija;
e-mail: laima.jankauskiene@smm.lt

Ms. Aušra JANULIENĖ
Vilniaus Universitetas
Užsienio kalbų institutas
e-mail: ausra.januliene@uki.vu.lt

Ms. Jolanta JANUŠIENĖ
Public Service language Centre
e-mail: jolantajanusiene@yahoo.com

Ms. Lina JUKNELIENE
Marijampolės Šeduvos vidurinė mokykla
e-mail: linajuk@one.lt

Ms. Rūta KRAUJALYTĖ
Vilnius university
Institute of foreign languages
e-mail: krrute@gmail.com

Ms. Zita MAŽOLIENĖ
Vilnius University
Institute of foreign languages
e-mail: zita.mazuoliene@uki.vu.lt

Ms. Olga MEDVEDEVA
Public Service language Centre
e-mail: olga@vikc.lt

Ms. Tatjana PAVLOVSKAJA
Visaginas Border Guard School
e-mail: talp@tts.lt

Ms. Inga ROZGIENĖ
Public Service language Centre
e-mail: inga@vikc.lt

Ms. Stasė SKAPIENĖ
Švietimo ir mokslo miniserija
Institute of foreign languages
e-mail: stase.skapiene@smm.lt

Ms. Virginija STANEVIČIENĖ
Vilniaus Žirmūnų gimnazija
e-mail: zita.mazuoliene@uki.vu.lt

Ms. Eglė ŠLEINOTIENE
Public Service language Centre
e-mail: eglesl@vikc.l

Ms. Loreta ŽADEIKAITĖ
Švietimo ir mokslo miniserija
e-mail: loreta.zadeikaite@smm.lt t

Luxembourg

Mme Gaby KUNSCH
Centre de Langues Luxembourg
21 bd de la Foire
L-1528 LUXEMBOURG
WL/LT: F / E / G

Tel: 352 26 44 30 33
Fax: 352 26 44 30 30
e-mail: direction@cll.lu

Moldova

Mme Eugénie BRINZĂ
Spécialiste principale
Ministère de l'Education
Piaţa Marii Adunări Naţ. Nr .1
2033 CHISINAU
WL/LT: F

Tel: 373 22 23 35 45
Fax: 373 22 23 35 15 / 23 32 83
e-mail: ebrinza@yahoo.com

Montenegro

M. Dragan BOGOJEVIC
Directeur
Institut de l'Enseignement
Zavod za školstov
17 Marka Miljanova
81 000 PODGORICA/ MONTENEGRO
WL/LT: F

Tel: 381 81 40 89 02
Mob : 381 67 61 73 25
Fax: 381 81 40 89 27

e-mail: draganb@mn.yu

Netherlands / Pays-Bas

Mr Dick MEIJER
Meijboomstraat 28
NL - 7981 DC DIEVER
THE NETHERLANDS

Tel: 31 521 591609
e-mail: d.meijer1@hetnet.nl

Ms Daniela FASOGLIO
SLO
Institute voor Curriculum Development
Boulevard 1945,3
NL - 7511 AA ENSCHEDE
WL/LT: E (F / G)

Tel: 31 53 4040285
Fax: 31 53 4307 692
e-mail: d.fasoglio@slo.nl

Norway / Norvège

Ms Heike SPEITZ
Telemarksforsking-Notodden
Lærerskolevn. 35
N - 3679 NOTODDEN
WL/LT: E / G (F)

Tel: 35 02 66 81
Tel/Fax: 35 02 66 98
e-mail: heike.speitz@hit.no

Poland / Pologne

Ms Maria GORZELAK
National In-Service Teacher Training Centre
Aleje Ujazdowskie 28
00-478 WARSZAWA
Private address / Adresse privée
ul. Gimnastyczna 28
02-636 WARSZAWA
WL/LT: E

Tel: 48 22 621 3031
Fax: 48 22 621 17597
e-mail: jows@codn.edu.pl /
maria.gorzelak@codn.edu.pl

Tel/Fax: 48 22 646 55 34
Private e-mail: gorzelak@post.pl

Portugal

Ms Maria Anália GOMES
Direcção Geral de Inovação e
de Desenvolvimento Curricular   Tel: 351 21 3934581
Av. 24 de Julho, 140   fax: 00351 21 3934685
P - 1399-025 LISBOA   e-mail: analia.gomes@dgidc.min-edu.pt
WL/LT: E / F / G

Romania / Roumanie

Mrs Maria Virginia GOT
General Inspector
General Division for Preuniversity Education   Tel: 40 07 21 97 41 72
Ministry of Education and Research   Fax: 40 21 313 5547
Strata Gen. Berthelot 28-30,   Mobile: 40 21 072/97 41 72
010168 BUCHAREST SECTOR 1 / ROMANIA   e-mail: miorita_got@mec.edu.ro
WL/LT: F   miorita.got@hahoo.fr

Russian Federation / Federation de Russie

Mrs Irina KHALEEVA (EVC member / Membre du CEV)
Rector
Moscow State Linguistic University   Tel/Fax: 7095 246 2807
38 Ostozhenka Str.   Tel: 7 095 246 86 03
119 992 MOSCOU / RUSSIAN FEDERATION   Fax: 7 095 246 83 66
WL/LT: E / G   e-mail: khaleeva@linguanet.ru

Ms Kira IRISKHANOVA
Moscow Linguistic University
Ostozhenka str. 38   Tel: 7 095 245 13 60
MOSCOW 119992 / RUSSIAN FEDERATION   Fax: 7 095 246 28 07
WL/LT: E   e-mail: shleg@linguanet.ru
Private address / Adresse privée:
Novatorov Str. 14-2-142
117421 MOSCOW
WL/LT: E

Serbia / Serbie

Mme Tasevska GOLUBOVIC
Ministère de l'Education et du Sport   Tel: 381 11 36 16 293 / 381 63 59 23 08
22-26 rue Nemanjina   Fax: 381 11 36 16 293
11000 BELGRADE
WL/LT: F   e-mail: milicag.tasevska@mps.sr.gov.yu

Slovakia / Slovaquie

Mme Darina DE JAEGHER
Institut National de Pédagogie
Statny pedagogicky ustav   Tel: 421 2 49276 309
Pluhová 8
P.O.Box 26   Fax: 421 2 49276 195
SK - 830 00 BRATISLAVA   e-mail: Jaegher@statpedu.sk
WL/LT: F   lomnicka@yahoo.fr

Slovenia / Slovénie

Mr Janez SKELA
Faculty of Arts   Tel: 386 1241 1340
Aškerčeva 2   Fax: 386 1425 9337
1000 LJUBLJANA / SLOVENIA   e-mail: janez.skela@guest.arnes.si
WL/LT: E   janez.skela@ff.uni-lj.si

Spain / Espagne

Ms Yolanda ZÁRATE
Ministerio de Education y Ciencia
Asesor Técnico Docente
Subdirección General de Programas Europeos   Tel: 34 91 506 55 68
Paseo del Prado, nº 28 - 1ª Planta   Fax: 34 91 506 5689
SP - 28014 MADRID   e-mail: yolanda.zarate@mec.es
WL/LT: E

Mme Victoria HERNANDEZ
Conseillère Technique
Sous-direction Générale de Coopération Internationale
Ministère de l'Education et de la Science   Tel: 34 91 506 55 96
Paseo del Prado, nº 28 - 1ª Planta   Fax: 34 91 506 57 04
SP - 28014 MADRID   e-mail: victoria.hernandez@mec.es
WL/LT: E

Sweden / Suède

Ms Eva ENGDELL
Swedish National Agency for School Improvement
Karlbergsvägen 77-81   Tel: 46 - 8-52 77 81 51 /80 00
SE-113 35 STOCKHOLM   Fax: 46-8-5277 80 01
WL/LT: E

                                          e-mail: eva.engdell@skolutveckling.se

Ms Carin SÖDERBERG
In-service Training Department
Uppsala University   Tel: 46 18 471 7968
Fortbildningsavdelningen   Fax: 46 18 550748
Box 2137
S - 75002 UPPSALA   e-mail: carin.soderberg@ilu.uu.se
WL/LT: E / F

Switzerland / Suisse

M. Hans Ulrich BOSSHARD
Präsident der EDK-Steuerungsgruppe Sprachenportfolio
Regionalsekretariat EDK Ostschweiz
Erziehungsdepartement St.Gallen
Davidstrasse 31   Tel.: 41 71 229 34 32
CH-9001 ST. GALLEN   Fax: 41 71 229 44 99
WL/LT: F / E / G   e-mail: h.bosshard@sg.ch

"The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" / "L'ex-Republique yougoslave de Macédoine"

Ms Marija NIKOLOVA   Tel.: 389 2 32 39 022 ex 230/ 33 39 706
Ministry of Education and Science   mob: 389 70 699 768
Bul. Ilinden BB   Fax: 389 2 32 39 641
1000 SKOPJE   e-mail: nikolovam@mn.gov.mk
WL/LT: F / E   maria.nikolova@voila.fr

Turkey / Turquie

Mr Özcan DEMIREL
Hacettepe University
Faculty of Education / Eğitim Fakültesi
BEYTEPE   Tel: 90 312 297 85 50 / GSM 90 532 361 93 18
TR-06532 ANKARA   Fax: 90 312 299 20 27
WL/LT: E   e-mail: demirel@hacettepe.edu.tr

Ukraine

Ms Angela GERGEL
Ministry of Education and Science
Department of General and Pre-school Education   Tel: 38 044 599 1031
Peremohy Avenue 10   Fax: 38 044 286 1568
01135 KYIV   e-mail: gergel@svitonline.com
WL/LT: E   angelagergel@hotmail.com
Private address / Adresse privée
Lesya Ukrainka boulevard
01133 UKRAINE
WL/LT: E / F / G

United Kingdom / Royaume-Uni

Mr Lid KING
National Director for Languages
Department for Education and Skills
Sanctuary Buildings, Level 4D   Tel: 44 20 7925 6367 / 6291
Great Smith Street   Fax: 44 20 7925 6111
UK - LONDON SW1P 3BT   e-mail: lid.king@dfes.gsi.gov.uk
WL/LT: E / F

CERCLES

Ms Fiona DALZIEL
Dipartimento di Lingue e Letterature Anglo-Germaniche Tel: 39 49 8274951
e Slave   Tel home: 39 49 5212748
Università di Padova   Mobile: 39 340 7825131
Via Beato Pellegrino 26   Fax: 39 49 8274955
I - 35137 PADOVA   e-mail fiona_dalziel@fc.cla.unipd.it or
Private Address / Adresse privée   fionaclare.dalziel@unipd.it
Via Alvise Cornaro, 19
I - 35038 TORREGLIA / PADOVA
WL/LT: E

EAQUALS (The European Association for Quality Languages Services)

Mr Peter BROWN
Chair
The British School
Via Torrebianca 18   Tel: 39 040 369 369
I - 34132 TRIESTE   Fax: 39 040 76 000 75
WL/LT: E   e-mail: Peter.Brown@EAQUALS.org

Eropean Language Council (ELC) / Conseil européen des Langues (CEL)

Mme Brigitte FORSTER VOSICKI
Conseil Européen des Langues
Université de Lausanne - Centre de Langues   Tel: 41 21 692 29 21
BFSH 2 - Salle 2118 – Bât Anthropole   Fax: 41 21 692 29 17
CH - 1015 LAUSANNE / SUISSE   e-mail: Brigitte.ForsterVosicki@cdl.unil.ch
WL/LT: E / F / G

International Certificate Conference (ICC)

Mr Mike MAKOSCH   Tel: 49 6956020167 (Office)
Federation of Migros Cooperatives
41 44 277 20 32 (mobile link)
Coordination Office of the Club Schools
P.O. Box 1766
CH – 8031 ZURICHHansaallee 150   Fax: 41 44 277 20 14
WL/LT: E   e-mail: mike.makosch@mgb.ch

European Commission / Commission européenne

M. Jacques DELMOLY   **Apologised for absence / Excusé**
Chef de l'unité "Politique pour le Multilinguisme"
Direction Générale de l'Education et de la Culture Tel: 32-2-296.74.34
Commission Européenne   Tel: 32 2 295-84-06 (direct)
200 rue de la Loi   Fax: 32-2-299.63.21
B - 1049 BRUXELLES   e-mail: jacques.delmoly@cec.eu.int
WL/LT: F / E

Experts

Ms Maria STOICHEVA
Department of Modern Languages
Sofia University "St Kliment Ohridski" *
Faculty of Classic and Modern Languages   Tel: 359 889 71 53 21
125 Tzarigradsko shosse - Block 3 - Room 117   Fax: 359 2865 9878
1113 SOFIA   e-mail: maria.stoicheva@gmail.com
WL/LT: E
Private address / Adresse privée
Mladost 1 - block 104
Entrance 2 - apartment 30   Mobile: 359 889 71 53 21
1797 SOFIA / BULGARIA   e-mail: mpantaleeva@yahoo.com

M. Richard WACH
Proviseur   Tel: 33 (0)3 88 14 31 00
LYCEE KLEBER   Fax: 03.88.36.51.04
25, place de Bordeaux   e-mail: Ce.0670080y@ac-strasbourg.fr
67082 STRASBOURG CEDEX   ou/or proviseur.0670080Y@ac-strasbourg.fr
WL/LT: F

European Validation Committee / Comité Européen de Validation

M. Francis GOULLIER
President of the Président du Comité européen de Validation
Inspecteur Général de Langues Vivantes
Ministère de l'Education nationale
107 rue de Grenelle
75005 PARIS   Tel/fax: 33 3 26 83 13 66
WL/LT: F / G   e-mail: francis.goullier@education.gouv.fr

Mme Barbara GŁOWACKA
Uniwersytet w Białymstoku
Katedra Neofilologii
Liniarskiego 3
PL - 14-420 BIAŁYSTOK   Tel/Fax: 48 85 745 75 16
WL/LT: F   e-mail: glowacka@fll.uwb.edu.pl

Ms Gisella LANGÉ
Ministero Istruzione Università Ricerca (MIUR)
Ufficio Scolastica Regionale per la Lombardia   Tel: 39 335 8448449
Piazza Diaz 6   Fax: 39 02 7201 3084
I-20123 MILANO   e-mail: gislang@tin.it
WL/LT: E / F

Mr David LITTLE
Coordinator of the ELP Seminars / Coordinateur des Séminaires européens
Vice-Chair of EVC / Vice-President du CEV
Centre for Language and Communication Studies
Arts Building
Trinity College   Tel: 353 1 608 1505
IRL-DUBLIN 2   Fax: 353 1 608 2941
WL/LT: E / (F)   e-mail: dlittle@tcd.ie

Mr José Joaquin MORENO ARTESERO
Consejeria de Educación de la Comunidad de Madrid   Tel: 34 91 720 12 59
Dirección General de Ordenación Académica   Fax:: 34 91 720 12 26
Gran Vía 10, 5ª planta
28013 MADRID / SPAIN   e-mail: joaquin.moreno@madrid.org
Private address / Adresse privée   Mobile: 34 655 89 05 10
C/Gaudi 10, Portal 1, 3°D   Fax: 34 91 317 93 42
28660 BOADILLA DEL MONTE (MADRID)   e-mail: jmoren3@wanadoo.es
WL/LT: E

Mr Rolf SCHÄRER
General rapporteur of the ELP Project /
Rapporteur général du projet PEL   Tel: 41 1 715 32 90
Gottlieb Binderstrasse 45   Fax: 41 1 715 32 72
CH - 8802 KILCHBERG   e-mail: info@rolfschaerer.ch
WL/LT: E / F / G

COUNCIL OF EUROPE / CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Language Policy Division / Division des Politiques Linguistiques
F - 67075 STRASBOURG

Mme Johanna PANTHIER   Tel: 33 (0)3 88 41 20 79
Administrator / Administratrice   e-mail: johanna.panthier@coe.int

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

European Centre for Modern Languages / Centre européen des langues vivantes
Graz – Nikolaiplatz 4 – A – 8020 GRAZ

Mr Adrian BUTLER   Tel: 43 316 323554
Executive Director / Directeur Exécutif   e-mail: adrian.butler@ecml.at

Interpreters / Interprètes

Mme Punam PURI-LEGER
27bis, rue de la Belgique
FR 92190 MEUDON

Tel: 01 46 26 75 05
Fax: 01 45 34 80 78
e-mail: leger@easyconnect.fr

Mme Roopa SUKTHANKAR
4 rue de Grandville
FR 94160 SAINT-MANDE

Tel: 01 48 08 22 31
Fax: 01 43 28 43 39
e-mail: roopas@wanadoo.fr