



DGIV/EDU/HIST (2005) 13

Seminars on

*1939-1989: half a century
living with communism*

**Project “Council of Europe and EUROCLIO in international
cooperation for facilitating the innovation of the learning and
teaching of history in the MATRA Countries”**

Bulgaria
Sofia, Hotel Serdika, 6 – 7 June 2005
Rousse, Hotel Bistra & Galina 9 – 10 June 2005

Report by

**Kostadin GROZEV
Bulgaria**

Strasbourg

Contents

1. The Seminars: the background and objectives.....	4
2. The Seminars: the programme and main activities.....	7
3. The Seminars: an outline of presentations and workshops.....	8
3.1 Setting the Framework of the Cold War Period.....	8
3.2 “The Ideal World and the Real World”: solving the practical difficulties faced by history teachers	15
3.3 The working group workshops: devising lesson plans	25
4. The Seminars: results and recommendations.....	30

Appendix I

Programme of the Seminar and List of Participants - SOFIA	33
---	----

Appendix II

Programme of the Seminar and List of Participants - ROUSSE	37
--	----

1. The Seminars: the background and objectives

History remains one of the most important, but controversial and sensitive topics in present-day schools. That is why the Council of Europe has always advocated and supported the change of history education. The organisation in Strasbourg has acted as an international catalyst in promoting new thinking and new approaches on history teaching. Today we live in a period when democracy should be learned and lived on an everyday basis and history teachers play a major role in implementing the main values of European democratic citizenship.

The Council of Europe together with the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (at its session in Sofia in December 2004) decided to mark the year 2005 as the European Year of Citizenship through Education. The aim is to launch throughout the continent an intense campaign to popularise and put into practice the education for democratic citizenship policies and programmes developed within the organisation in Strasbourg. At the third Summit of the Heads of States and Governments from the Council of Europe member States (which took place in Warsaw, Poland, on 16-17 May 2005), the participants stressed their determination to reinforce democracy and human rights in Europe through, among other means, education.

Over the last decade the Council of Europe has acted as an important international catalyst in promoting new thinking about history teaching. However, while conferences, seminars and in-service training workshops can help to identify and further develop the skills and knowledge of vanguards of teachers and teacher trainers, much more needs to be done to ensure that these new ideas and approaches are effectively disseminated to all those teachers who cannot participate in these conferences and seminars. An important necessity, therefore, is to produce a series of practical and tangible end-products, making full use of new technologies but also realising the practical constraints within which many teachers still have to operate, particularly in Eastern and South-eastern Europe.

Furthermore, whilst it is important that the education on European citizenship emphasises contemporary events and conflicts, it is also essential that a certain historical approach is always under consideration (i.e. “the big picture”). That is, to try and help students understand the 'roots' of recent events, conflicts and developments. At present, they get most of their information from the mass media, which, in general, tends to restrict itself to the more immediate causal factors without the historical context that might help to explain the options and decisions which were chosen and those which were ignored. Thus, an important contribution will be made by history to education for democratic citizenship in that the emphasis will be on developing students' skills in critically analysing and interpreting information from a wide range of sources (document-based, audio-visual, photographic and oral).

It is also clear from research carried out by bodies such as the Georg Eckert Institute in Braunschweig, Germany and the EUROCLIO network, that many history educators and curriculum planners are concerned that modern European history should not just be portrayed as a series of international and national conflicts and political and

economic crises. While history educators recognise that there are certain wars and regional and local conflicts and crises about which all children and young people in Europe should have some critical historical understanding, it is also increasingly recognised that such events and developments need to be examined within their wider social, cultural and economic contexts.

As a result of all these deliberations the Education Committee of the Council of Europe at its 24th meeting (1-3 October, 2001) provided the clear framework for the development of the *Project on the European Dimension in History Teaching*. Its basic aims include:

- to emphasize contemporary history and the history of recent conflicts;
- analyse issues relating to migration and minorities;
- set European history in a global context;
- and, incorporate the "education for democratic citizenship" dimension, which means focusing on events, topics, themes or developments which are truly European, either because they happened across much of Europe or had direct or indirect consequences for much, if not all, of the continent.

By carrying out the project's activities the teachers will be encouraged to adopt a comparative perspective and not just look at national history but rather set the events in their own country in a broader European and global context. Thus it will contribute to the development of young people's historical understanding and critical skills as well as of their knowledge. The philosophy of the project is to encourage teachers and students to examine key events, conflicts and developments from a multiperspectival viewpoint.

The main focus in the on-going efforts in the field is on various key dates in 19th and 20th century history which are taught almost everywhere in Europe, and which represent significant turning points in the development of contemporary Europe. Those were the years when important events occurred, significant decisions were taken, regimes emerged or disappeared, borders changed, peoples migrated, and social and economic conditions changed, all in ways that had longterm consequences and helped to shape the Europe we live in today, e.g.:

- **1848** – the year of revolutions that helped to create the political landscape of modern Europe: the rising political and economic power of the middle classes, liberalism and political democracy, modern nationalism, the aspirations of the national minorities for their own nation states, the rising political aspirations of the working classes, the beginning of the end for the multinational European empires, and the growing economic divide between the centre and the periphery of Europe;
- **1912/13** – the Balkan Wars, the nationalist fragmentation of the former Ottoman empire, and the seeds sown of the conflicts in the region that were to recur throughout most of the 20th century;
- **1919** – the collapse of the Habsburg and German empires, the re-drawing of the map of Europe at the Paris Peace Conference, the influence of Woodrow Wilson's

- Fourteen Points, the growing demands for self-determination by even the smallest nations, the growing involvement of the USA in European politics and trade, and the seeds sown for World War Two;
- **1945** – Yalta, Potsdam and the new restructuring of Europe, the emergence of the Iron Curtain, the emerging power blocs and the Cold War, the shifting political balance within Europe, also the beginning of the end of Western Europe's colonial period;
 - **1989/90** – the break-up of the Soviet Union, the Velvet Revolution in Central Europe, the start of civil war in Yugoslavia, the Kosovo crisis, the Gulf War and shifting relations between the European powers and the Islamic countries of the Middle East.

It is envisaged that the final outcome of the Project will be a CD-ROM, accompanied by a handbook for teachers and a collection of some important works which bring together papers from the main symposia and conferences which took place in connection with such key dates. The main Symposia organised in the framework of this project were as follows: 1848, in Braunschweig, Germany; 1945, in Yalta, Ukraine; 1989, in Budapest, Hungary; and 1912-1913, in Athens, Greece. The last conference for 1919 will take place in Sèvres, France in December 2005. The dissemination of information on this project is of paramount importance among history educators in Europe.

The two seminars in Bulgaria (a follow-up activity to two similar seminars held in Bucharest and Sinaia, Romania 31 May – 3 June) were jointly organised by the Council of Europe and EUROCLIO, in the framework of the Project *Council of Europe and EUROCLIO in international cooperation for facilitating the innovation of the learning and teaching of history in the MATRA Countries* and the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Bulgaria. The participants were about (an overall figure for both seminars) sixty history teachers and experts in history, civil education and philosophy at the regional inspectorates of the Ministry of Education and Science. The seminars were led and animated by experts from the Bulgaria, France, Romania and the United Kingdom. Most of the experts participated in a similar capacity in the recently concluded Romanian seminars. Thus the team built upon its previous experience and made few shifts in the programme and organisation in order to achieve better results. In order to better disseminate the information among teachers and bring them together, the Council of Europe and the authorities in both Romania and Bulgaria joined their efforts and invited 5 history teachers from Bulgaria to the seminar in Sinaia, Romania and 3 history teachers from Romania to the seminar in Sofia, Bulgaria.

The two seminars took place in Sofia (Hotel Serdika), where most of the participants were teachers and experts from the regional inspectorates of the Ministry of education from the capital of Bulgaria and from the cities of Southern and Eastern Bulgaria (especially from Burgas, Veliko Turnovo, Vratza) and in Rousse (Hotel Bistra & Galina), where the participants came mainly from the cities in North-Eastern Bulgaria (Varna, Rousse, Dobrich). Both locations and the facilities there were a good choice and provided a nice working atmosphere for achieving the project aims and for fruitful interaction between the participants and the experts.

2. The Seminars: the programme and main activities

The seminars followed the general framework, incorporated in the preliminary draft programme of the Council of Europe for the event. There was a slight difference in the general topic (in comparison to the Romanian event) and certain changes were made to the proposed agenda in the light of the experience gained (a revised Actual Programme for each of the events in Sofia and Rouse can be found in Appendix 1 to this report). In comparing the agendas, it can be noted that citizenship in history teaching was not the main focus of discussion, although this aspect ran like a thread through much of the proceedings in Bulgaria. After a debate with the Bulgarian participants came the serious emphasis on the issues of assessment and evaluation which seemed to be an interesting approach for the debate of teaching the communist period – the evaluation of the results of teaching is one way of approaching classroom practices. Given the situation in Bulgaria at present, this emphasis seemed important and appropriate.

Both seminars were opened with greetings to the participants on behalf of the organisers of the event, followed by a brief introduction to the agenda and the overall aims of the seminars. The seminar in Sofia had a higher profile in terms of the officials present. On behalf of the Ministry of Education and Science of Bulgaria, a welcoming address was delivered by Ms Margarita PENEVA, on behalf of the European Cooperation Department at the Ministry of Education and Science. She pointed out that both seminars were a logical result of the good working relationship between the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Bulgaria and the Council of Europe especially in view of the tasks, linked with the celebration of 2005 as the Year of Education in European Citizenship. Further she stressed the needs of in-service training for history, philosophy and civil education teachers and the role the Council of Europe and EUROCLIO play in the field through such projects as the current one on the European Dimension in History Teaching.

The participants in Sofia were also addressed by Mr Emil TSENKOV, Director of the Council of Europe Information and Documentation Centre in Sofia. In his opening remarks, as well as in his presentation later on in the programme he informed the audience about the activities of the Council of Europe in the field of history teaching (training seminars, workshops, publications, grant opportunities). He pointed out the important new elements in the work of the Council of Europe in line of the enlargement of the EU and the new position of Bulgaria as a future member of the European Community with all related tasks and challenges in the field of education.

The participants in Rouse were addressed on behalf of the Faculty of History of the St. Kliment Okhridski University of Sofia. Its Dean, Prof. Dr. Ivan ILCHEV, stressed the importance of the project in terms of the historiographical significance of the theme and the needs of the teachers in terms of fresh approaches. He expressed the strong interest of his colleagues in continuing a long tradition of in-service training for history teachers at his Faculty in co-operation with other national and international partners.

Both in Sofia and Rouse the director of the seminars Mr Chris ROWE, United Kingdom made a welcome address on behalf of Ms Mechthilde FUHRER, Administrator, History Education Section of the Council of Europe and on behalf of EUROCLIO. He presented the apologies of Ms FUHRER for not being able to be personally present in Bulgaria due to urgent organisational matters in the Council of Europe headquarters. He pointed out that these seminars acknowledged the role of Bulgarian teachers in the on-going reform of history teaching in Europe and the desire of the Council of Europe to involve them in the projects and activities ahead in the very near future.

Briefly, the rationale of the programme was to have presentations (in plenary session), short question-and-answer sessions and briefing on the working group activity, workshops (two/three workshops), feedback from the working groups (also in plenary), debates on the results. Finally, a wrap-up session was organised at the end of the seminars. There was a good balance between the various types of activities and the opportunities for active participation were very useful for ensuring free communication among the participants and the feedback for the experts. The good balance between new insights in terms of contents and possible didactical approaches enabled participants to take advantage of the presentations made by the experts. The team of presenters was well balanced and highly effective. Professors Jordan BAEV and Ivan ILCHEV provided a strong academic input. Dr Svetla PETROVA provided a thoughtful outline of the important and obviously controversial issue of assessment. Presentations by Marc BERGERON, Dr Carol CAPITA, Chris ROWE and Dr Kostadin GROZEV benefited from being previously rehearsed in Romania and gave a substantial amount of practical information, knowledge and skills-oriented activities that highlighted the general theme of the seminars.

3. The seminars: an outline of the presentations

3.1. Setting the Framework of the Cold War Period

Strong emphasis was placed on academic input throughout the two seminars, presented by some leading representatives of current Bulgarian historiography such as Prof Dr Jordan BAEV and Prof Dr Ivan ILCHEV. Both of them gave talks that were focused on content-related issues which in fact made it possible for them, as for Marc BERGERON from France, to cover the major issues in the first sub-theme of the seminars *Setting the Framework of the Cold War Period*.

Dr Jordan BAEV (Professor of Contemporary History, International Relations and Security Studies at the Georgi Rakovski Defense and Staff College and the New Bulgarian University) in his presentations in Sofia and Rouse centered the attention on the new historiography of the Cold War, on the various new archival findings and approaches on cold war history based essentially on newly declassified documents. He underlined the urgent necessity of adapting to the new age of Information and the ongoing process of Euro-integration by using new interdisciplinary and interactive approaches in teaching contemporary history. He outlined the existing schools and trends in Cold War historiography, its initial and final frameworks, and focused on few

examples of still not well-known episodes of inter- and intra-bloc crises during the post-WWII bi-polar confrontation. The presentation showed the challenges of the discovery of a “vast new continent” (according to John Luis Gaddis) – i.e. the unprecedented access to an enormous set of newly declassified documentary evidences of the Cold War History both in Eastern and Western Europe. This sensitive information should be used in some appropriate ways in the history teaching of today.

A special key-point in this presentation was the end of the Communist rule in Eastern Europe and, in particularly, in Bulgaria (1989), as well as the animated disputes around the so called “Gorbachev phenomenon/factor”. The presentation was illustrated with a brand new multimedia product – an interactive bilingual documentary/video volume “Bulgarian Intelligence & Security Services in the Cold War”, published just a month ago in Sofia. Complimentary copies of the volume were delivered to each one of the participants in the two seminars.

This first overview presentation was followed by an extensive discussion with many questions and answers on Cold War history teaching. Responding to a question, Dr BAEV described the large academic network of European scholars and university professors, established in the last decade for research of the Cold War history. He gave as examples the Internet-based publications and websites (i.e. the Parallel History Project on NATO and the Warsaw Pact in Zurich, the Harvard Cold War History Project, the International Cold War History Project at the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Exchange of Scholars in Washington, D.C., etc.), which could be used by teachers and students in the college education. Some of the Bulgarian high school teachers present were very interested and enthusiastic about introducing the materials and the documents included in the CD-ROM volume to their classes. A regional high school inspector in Targovishte proposed to Dr. Baev during the Rouse seminar to lead a teaching training seminar with the regional school teachers this fall. An interest was also expressed by Mr Chris ROWE about the possibilities to use some of the new documents from the CD Volume in the final edition of the CD-ROM prepared in the framework of the current Council of Europe intergovernmental Project on the European Dimension in History Teaching. This digital product, *Turning Points?*, will be available at the end of the project in 2006.

Prof Dr Ivan ILCHEV (Dean of the Faculty of History of the University of Sofia and lecturer in 20th century Balkan History), during the seminar in Rouse, presented a broader perspective to the Bulgarian History of the 20th century. He targeted his remarks on a key question *Why the dog did not bark?*, i.e. to understand why Bulgarian people did not react to the Communists’ takeover of the country and why there was no significant dissident movement in the country up to 1989.

Prof ILCHEV appealed for using comparative historical methods and cultural-civilisation approaches in the exploration and teaching of contemporary national and regional history. In this line of thought he turned to how patriotism related to the interpretations and factual reconstructions in Balkan History and consequently to education. Patriotism had always been a must in the history education in Bulgaria ever

since the first textbooks in Bulgarian history were written. The education in patriotism had been always considered as an inalienable part of history education in Bulgaria. And this was natural. All neighbouring states (taking example of the well developed countries of Western Europe) saw in patriotism an additional resource of power, of military progress, of *élan*, that would help them in critical circumstances to fulfill the national goals at their utmost. The sources of patriotism in general were the same. All Balkan nations were proud of their short moments of medieval glory, of that rare but cherished moments of ascendance of this and that country in the region, of victories in numerous battles where the victor and the vanquished often exchanged places, of assumed rather than real examples of bravery. The philosophy of patriotism was also similar. Every Balkan nation saw itself as a victim of history in general, a victim of the policy of the Great powers and a victim of the greedy and selfish policy of its neighbours in particular. The national quality that was not openly admired but still put on the same level as qualities more frequently attributed to western political culture was that of endurance and perseverance.

In the years after the Liberation of 1878 the heroes of the liberation struggles were added to the national Pantheon – Vasil Levski, Hristo Botev, Georgi Rakovski, Georgi Benkovski, Vasil Petleshkov were the new heroes to admire. They all gave their lives for the homeland, struggling an omnipotent enemy. In fact Rakovski died of tuberculosis but somehow he was considered equal to the afore mentioned unlike Karavelov who fell victim of the same illness but somehow was pushed in the second rate position of those who also took part in the struggle but were somehow unlucky to stay alive. The Serbo-Bulgarian war of 1885 also gave a suitable educational example of a David versus Goliath combat and contributed useful examples though sometimes a little bit tarnished by political controversy – the Prince Alexander I, Olimpi Panov, Paniza etc. In the years between the World wars patriotism was embodied in the battles of the Balkan wars, in the siege of Adrianople, in the steadfast perseverance of the Bulgarian armies in the First World War who had to fight French, British, Russians, Greeks, Serbians, Romanians and even Senegalese.

The coming of communists to power after World War II brought the curtain down – at least for some time – on the outmoded if not outlawed bourgeois nationalism. Teachers had to instruct their pupils in the tenets of the new socialist patriotism. It was not difficult to construct the whole well-used process according to accustomed lines – changing only names and accents. Instead of the Turkish oppressors, the egocentric Great powers and the untrustworthy Balkan neighbours came the Bulgarian fascist oppressors and the war-minded United States. The attitude to the Balkan neighbours was dubious and hesitant but in general negative. Some names were taken off the national Pantheon – e.g. Prince Alexander I who had the misfortune to be a monarch – that was of course incompatible with socialist patriotism - and at least for some years most of the heroes of the wars Bulgaria fought in the 20th c. Instead names of communists – from leaders of the world communist movement like Georgi Dimitrov and Vassil Kolarov to thousands of names of perished or alive communists came to represent the best qualities of the Bulgarian nation.

The historical process also took on to the well-trodden paths - the struggle against Bulgarian fascists was very difficult but again the Bulgarians did not despair and leaving thousands of heroes on their way to victory managed to win in the long run, to crush the might of the oppressors with their steel will and their refusal to go along with the inhuman traits of capitalism. In a word – when all the rest were expecting submission and defeat the Bulgarians were fighting desperately keeping their religious, ethnic or national identity or social dignity. And then came a lapse, a hiatus. And a series of difficult questions: What now? Fifteen years after 1989? What kind of patriotic education we have to give to our children? And more importantly, what should we tell them of the years between 1944 and 1989?

The general parameters of the picture are the same. Some kind of a vicious circle in explaining the past or at least the place of the Bulgarians on the European scene repeats itself. According to the new paradigm, after World War II the Bulgarians were subjected to a new servitude by the Communist party which did not shun any repression to suppress any resistance helped by the generous and unselfish support of the Empire of the Evil – the Soviet Union. And again as it had happened many times before the Bulgarians managed to outwit and outlive their oppressors and now they are building their common European future. But what about examples of opposition, what about names of people who preferred to give their life away, but not to wield, not to retreat an inch before the onslaught of communist totalitarianism? Where are they? Virtually all other East European peoples who lived in a similar situation have their new icons. East Germany has its 1953 Berlin revolt, Czechoslovakia its 1948 and its Prague spring, Poland its almost unceasing clashes with communist authorities – starting with the strikes of the 1950s and ending with the Solidarity movement, Hungary its 1956 revolution, even Romania had its Timisoara. What about us? Not a ripple comparable with the waves of indignation in the other East European countries. A book appeared several months ago on the influence of the Prague spring in Bulgaria. Notwithstanding the efforts of the author to the opposite, he showed convincingly that there was no such significant impact on the society here.

The Czechs had their martyred student who ignited a wave of protest, the Poles their priest killed by the secret forces and dumped into the street; the Hungarians the leader executed by the firing-squad - Imre Nagi; the Germans had their unnamed workers who faced Russian tanks; even the Romanians had their Catholic priests. What of us? *Nikola Petkov* probably. But his is an individuality which is difficult to trim into the figure of a relentless fighter for democracy. In his desperate political strife he used democratic terms but not democratic means. Examples in this respect abound. Who else? The writer *Georgi Markov*? But he was the spoiled darling of the regime for years on end – money for his beloved poker games, privileges and laurels were pouring on him. Who else? It seems that virtually no one. The names of protesters are notably lacking from the textbooks. Several years ago the choice of names of Bulgarian dissidents to be included in the dictionary of European dissidents caused a public outcry. The persons chosen were virtually unknown to the general public. There is no doubt that most of them were dissidents and were punished for it but their protest remained on a personal level, it did not have any public impact and their influence on what happened in Bulgaria was

miniscule. On the other side most of the changes in Bulgarian society in the second half of the 1980s came as a result of the activities of Communist party members who wanted to change the system though they probably could not even imagine the scope of the changes they had started. Do we have to include their names in the textbooks?

Why did the Bulgarians not live up to the traditions of their ancestors? Why did they not unite in opposition to the regime? A convenient answer, used especially in the mass media, is the level of terror. But we are professionals and as far as we can judge the level of terror in Bulgaria was not higher and even lower than the one in the other East European countries. For the historian some suggestions why the dog did not bark in the night (as Sherlock Holmes would say) is of utmost importance. It would allow us more deeper insights in the system that was paramount in Bulgarian society in 1944-1989.

Thus, Prof ILCHEV presented some very sound arguments and explanations regarding the specifics of the international role of Bulgaria and its domestic situation during the Cold War years. He stressed particularly on: the issues of the prolonged political violence throughout the whole of the 20th century, the strange lack of organised anti-communist and dissident movements in the country in the 1960s and 1970s, the place and position of various social strata (intellectual and academic circles, students, party and state functionaries, peasantry, clergy, etc.) towards the personal rule of Todor Zhivkov.

The various factors shaping the “big picture” were:

- *Historical* The Pan-Slavic traditions, including the popularity of Russia and its people. The relative lack of anti-Russian feelings like the ones in Poland, Germany, Romania. Moreover – there was a strong impact of the Communist movement in Bulgarian society before 1939 and the anti-Nazi armed resistance in the period 1941-1944.
- *Political* A major impediment was the weakness of the liberal ideas in the country. The political elite of all Balkan countries believed in the necessity of having a strong state to achieve quick modernisation of the economy and society. The political behaviour was too paternalistic and clientelistic in its nature. All constitutional and political mechanisms were used only in order to keep power in the hands of those that were on power (see e.g. the use of state machinery in the years before 1939). Any abuse of power was done in the name of the people. That brought about violence into politics and the alienation of the broad masses of citizens from the state (especially of the peasants). That formed the political climate of the lack of information and this formed a breathing space for Communism and its propaganda which had always relied upon hear-say. That formed the environment of the Cold War years – Bulgarians were living in a closed camp without any real perception of how people lived in the other world. When some Bulgarians managed to go abroad in the late 1960's and when hard-currency shops were opened in the country the closeness was broken a bit. The Beatles were also an element of the changing climate. In Bulgaria, moreover there was no structure like the Catholic Church that was capable of igniting dissent.

The Bulgarian Orthodox Church was inactive and corruptive and not able to perform a similar role.

- *International* Bulgarians were accustomed to regard themselves as being a part of someone's sphere of influence (either of Russia or Germany). The post WWII realities were of no surprise to the mass of Bulgarians and they did not doubt those circumstances.
- *Economic* The Communist takeover had a net-effect of modernising the Bulgarian economy. Capitalism in Bulgaria was not well industrialised, many Bulgarians were poor and linked prosperity with dirty deals and exploitation. Because of its closeness to Soviet economy Bulgarian industry got modernised and society as a whole made a step forward in comparison with the pre-1944 status-quo. Unlike Czechoslovakia, that experienced a sharp drop as an industrial power, Bulgarian economy found a new market – the Soviet one which was hungry for the not so good-in-quality Bulgarian goods. Bulgaria managed to buy cheap Soviet oil and other resources (even re-selling them at higher prices to the West for hard currency) thus achieving a degree of modernisation – it was a one-sided but still a modernising economic structure. That brought about also a rise in the living standards before reaching the downfall of the mid-1980's. Today some leftist sociologists speak about the creation of a middle class in those years – that is an exaggeration, but still there is some rationale in researching those trends.
- *Social* The overall transformation of Bulgarian society after 1944 is a fact. Many social strata received new opportunities for advancement in society. The old elite was destroyed and a new one appeared. Thus in the 1960's a new elite was already in place and it was closely linked with those that ruled the country. Those people still comprise large segments of the electorate after 1989. A new intelligentsia was formed that was doomed either to become a part of the bureaucratic elite or become a marginalised under-paid strata prone to criticizing but not taking any actions.
- *Personal* During Communism, the role of personality in history was usually neglected although, if we look to the past, we will see that there were personalities in the Cold War period that played a significant role – Todor Zhivkov was one of them. Despite all cartoons-like descriptions of him as an un-educated person with peasant mentality he pretty much shaped the regime as it was. He used the carrot and the stick approach perfectly well and, thus, managed for more than three decades to avoid significant dissident activities with the result that, although a great many Bulgarians were not quite content, neither did they have many reasons to be discontent.
- *Level of political culture* Bulgarians were passionately preoccupied with their past. They tended too much to look in depth, make comparisons to 1949 or 1975, but not in width – i.e. what was happening to other countries in similar circumstances. They lived with a close pool of politicians that acted among

themselves and in dark circumstances. That was a political culture, a kind of web of personal links that overshadowed the closed atmosphere in which political decisions were taken. Having the awareness that there were the citizens of a small country, the Bulgarians knew that they were quite weak to take their destinies in their own hands. Thus came the notion that if anything in Bulgaria was to be changed the impetus would come from the USSR – that explains the big interest in Gorbachev and his *perestroika*.

- *Psychological* There were no serious moral authorities in 1944 – the old ruling elite was discredited in the course of the first half of the 20th century. The monarchy lost its authority as well – evident in the support of the pro-Republican forces in the referendum of 1946. Only the left-wing intelligentsia had certain moral authority after 1944. Many representatives even of the right-wing intellectuals collaborated with the new regime.

All those factors, according to Prof ILCHEV explained the framework of the legacy of the period under consideration and should be related to the teaching of history in the classrooms. His presentation was followed by an active discussion with many questions and views, expressed by the participants in the Rouse seminar.

The theme of multiperspectivity to key-events in the history of the 20th Century, developed at such a high academic level by Prof ILCHEV and Prof BAEV was further elaborated on the basis of the French experience by Mr Marc BERGERON from France. His presentation, which was based on his personal experience as a teacher and high-school baccalaureat examiner, touched upon a very sensitive issue – how a given political or historical event was reflected through personal memory and experience and thus becomes an element of the “objective” or “subjective” reconstruction and interpretation of historical facts. E.g. very frequently one and the same date varies quite a lot in terms of interpretation and significance in the different European countries.

The case-study of Mr BERGERON was on the importance and interpretation of the date 8 May 1945. It is quite revealing for the problems discussed that even the exact date varies, as in some countries (due to political, geographical or other differences) the date itself is a disputed one – whether it is 7, 8 or 9 May. On a more substantial (interpretative) level, for most of the French, it signifies the Liberation, the end of World War II; but for others, who collaborated with the Nazis it is a day of defeat; for the Algerians – it is the symbol of new colonial oppressions of the natives by the French colonial troops; for the countries in Eastern and Central Europe (such as Romania and Bulgaria) it marks the Communists’ takeovers; for most of the Germans it is simultaneously the end of World War II and surrender; for the Japanese – it is a prelude to Hiroshima and defeat.

Even in France alone there was a change in the interpretation during the different phases of the Cold War. After 1946, the 8 May was made a public holiday in France and was celebrated on a Sunday. After 1959, however, its importance diminished and it became a non-paid holiday, and even after the Franco-German reconciliation, it almost

completely lost its significance. In the case of Bulgaria, 9 September 1944 was glorified by the Communists as Liberation Day, but since the events of 1989 it was under discussion and discarded as a day of celebration. Thus, the same event which could sometimes change the course of history has a different meaning for different peoples and there is not one single approach, not even in the framework of national history. Students can approach such events in quite different ways and that is why their expertise should be taken into consideration. It is important that the interpretation be targeted at skills and competences - at ways in which they select historical sources, how they use critical thinking and how they focus their attention on the multiperspectivity of events and their interpretation.

3.2. “The Ideal World and the Real World”: solving the practical difficulties faced by history teachers

The second group of presentations was more related to the practicalities of teaching. They elaborated the second sub-theme of the seminars “*The Ideal World and the Real World*”: *solving the practical difficulties faced by history teachers*. Mr Chris ROWE’s presentation introduced participants to a scheme of designing lesson plans that would enable both keeping the aims of History teaching and dealing with significant key dates (including data from the period under scrutiny). Dr Svetla PETROVA’s presentation was focused on the problems related to the assessment in Bulgaria – an obviously highly controversial issue right now in the country. Dr Kostadin GROZEV made two presentations - the first one included an overview of the history curricula in Bulgaria with a short briefing on several school-based projects in which Bulgarian schools were involved and which could contribute to the development of teaching (the websites include ready-made teaching materials); the second was the final summing-up report at the end of the two seminars. Dr Carol CAPITA made a presentation on the possible uses of visual sources in History teaching. The point made was that the use of photographs, posters and paintings could enhance the effectiveness of teaching and could ensure multiperspectivity. That set of presentations were completed by Ms Roumiana KOUSHEVA on the work of EUROCLIO and Mr Emil TSENKOV on the publications of the Council of Europe’s Information and Documentation Centre in Sofia.

In his several remarks and short presentations during various phases of both seminars, the Director of the seminars, Mr Christopher ROWE from the United Kingdom, elaborated on the general philosophy of the training seminars, as well as on several specific elements of the overall theme. He set the overall framework of the Cold War period in Bulgarian history and how that framework related to the current situation of teaching history in the classrooms. Mr ROWE restated the importance of the clear formulation of the relationship between the local, regional, national, European and World approach on history teaching in the classroom (“the big picture”). He underlined the importance of certain periods of time in Modern World History, such as 1939-1945, 1941, 1944-1945, 1953-1956, 1968, 1985-1989, 1989. He suggested several practical tools – e.g. tables on using sources, building a chronological/thematic framework etc. Those were tools that would enable teachers to overcome practical difficulties related to

the planning of lessons focused on the communist past and they set the ground for some useful discussions during the workshops.

Further Mr ROWE stressed that it is very important to know *what* and *how* history is taught in the classroom. He underlined that teachers should not try to present their students all the information on a certain event and if something happens in the classroom (a student asks a question, initiates a debate, etc.) he needs to react immediately. Any history teacher should explore in the classroom all the possible links between history, geography, chronology and ICT. But the teacher should be wary of the impact of ICT devices on his students which is largely dependent on their age. Thus, Mr ROWE's presentation introduced participants to a scheme of designing lesson plans that would enable both keeping the aims of History teaching and dealing with significant key dates.

In his second presentation on *From the Local to the International: European dynamics of the curricula in secondary schools in France* Mr BERGERON explained the structure of teaching history-related subjects in French schools and then focused his attention mainly on the ratio between local, national and world history in the curricula. In France compulsory education comprises pupils from 6 to 16 years of age. Therefore, primary school goes from 6 to 11 years of age, the college, 4 years – 6ème, 5ème, 4ème, 3ème, and lycée (up to terminale).

The French education system is based on two levels, as follows:

1. L (literary): history - 2 periods/week and ES (Scientific education): history and geography - 4 periods/week;
2. S (Scientific): history and geography 3 periods/week.

In the framework of S there is a branch of medical and industrial schools, where history and geography imply 2 periods/week. The teachers in France are mainly history and geography teachers and that is why civics and European democratic citizenship education is an easier task for these educators in France. But what is the role of school in present-day France? According to the official documents the main aim of school in France is to offer the student an important amount of information on humanistic and scientific grounds. This package of information will help students to become good citizens in the future.

The approach to history as a school subject in France is based on the framework which links France, Europe and the world. In this respect, multiperspectivity and the study cases are very important. One of the most important issues is to find out the main characteristics of being a European - to choose, to doubt, to reflect before acting or voting. Thus Europe is the centre of interest for both teachers and students. At the same time, the European dimension is fundamental to the history-geography-civics curricula. Europe is a controversial geographical and political notion. But what is the Europe we really intend to study in school? Do we mean the states of the European Union? Do we mean the immense territory from the Atlantic to the Ural? Can we talk about one Europe or several Europes? Mr BERGERON insisted that there is not one history of Europe, but

rather several histories and, in fact, there is no history of Europe, but rather a European history. In this respect he mentioned that in 2005, the end-product of a Franco-German project will be published, which will take the form of a joint history textbook, the authors of which are teachers from both countries along the Rhine River.

Dr Svetla PETROVA, from the National Assessment Unit – an independent body affiliated to the Ministry of Education and Science started with her presentation a very important (and at both seminars quite heated) discussion on the role of assessment in the teaching of History and in the general framework of Bulgarian secondary education.

Firstly, she presented the “ideal world” – the normative regulation of history teaching at the secondary school level. It is outlined by the National Education Act, the Regulations for Application of the National Education Act, the Act for the Degree of Education and Curriculum, the State Educational Requirements for the Educational Content and the History syllabus. The introduction of the State Education Requirements (Standards), as part of the overall reform for the quality in education, began stage by stage in 2000 (Official Gazette, 48/13.06.2000). The standards formulate the objectives of History teaching, the levels of students’ knowledge and skills at the end-stage and a degree of education. The private aims of the History education follow the common objectives of the secondary education and in particular “teaching and creating of universal and national values, virtues and culture”. The correct formulation of the general educational aims and the setting of attainable goals are of decisive importance for the following components of the educational process. They determine the model of the teaching and the assessment. The careful reading of the educational standards shows us that they are formulated in the terms of assessment criteria, differentiating several levels of the cognitive activity of the students: from “distinguishes and identifies” through “describes, determines, characterizes and evaluates” to “applies”. The levels, on which we expect the students to know, understand and apply ideas and conceptions, to demonstrate skills and values, are described. The stress is put not just on knowledge in itself, but on the development of skills for applying the knowledge.

Observations, however, show that there is a serious gap between the requirements set in standards and the practice. The common practice emphasizes exclusively on the teaching of knowledge, not on the formation of skills. As a result, the forms of the students’ evaluation are oriented towards the lowest cognitive level – reproduction.

Secondly, Dr PETROVA quoted the “lessons of the real world” – i.e. the Bulgarian results in the international student assessment of the OECD, known as the PISA (Programme for International Students’ Assessment). They showed that a serious problem in the Bulgarian educational practice is the lack of diagnostic surveys and analysis of the students’ achievements, of their attitude towards the educational process, the syllabus and the textbooks, of the social environment, methodological and technical equipment of schools, family background of the students and their impact on the students’ performance, etc. **In summary, we are lacking a national standardised external assessment.** Thus, the Bulgarian results from the comparative international

survey are significant for the present educational policy. Bulgaria participated in the first phase of the PISA project (2001-2003) together with more than 40 other countries. Our country is also included in the present phase of the project (2004-2007). The first phase of the PISA aimed mainly at the reading literacy of the 15 year old students. The term “literacy” is understood by the authors of the project in a wide sense: the literate person not only knows the letters and binds them together into words and sentences, but is able to understand and transform certain information, connected to real everyday problems and situations. Reading literacy is fundamental. The interests, attitudes and the capacity of the person to obtain, integrate, evaluate and reflect on information are in the centre of the participation of the person in modern life.

The focus of PISA is on “reading to learn”, rather than “learning to read”. The 15 year old students are expected to demonstrate their proficiency in retrieving information, understanding texts, interpreting them, reflecting on the content in relation to their own knowledge and experience. The Bulgarian participation in PISA is managed by the National Assessment Unit. The NAU is an institution specialized in the assessment and educational measurements. The results of the Bulgarian participation are presented in the National PISA Report.

How could the PISA results influence on the educational process in Bulgaria, including history teaching? Students’ proficiency in PISA is described in terms of a five levels scale. According to the data from the comparative international survey the medium achievements of the 15 year old students in Bulgaria are at level 2 and below (40 per cent of the students are at level 1 and below; only 2 per cent of the Bulgarian students reach the highest 5 level). That means that a significant number of students, having finished compulsory educational level may not be acquiring the necessary literacy, knowledge and skills. The situation is troublesome especially in the light of the suggestion that it is difficult to compensate in later life the learning gaps in education. The results of PISA show clearly that the Bulgarian students meet serious difficulties in retrieving information, understanding and interpreting the material they have read, reflecting on the content, form and arguing their own point of view, etc. The conclusion is that their skills have not been developed in independent reading, understanding and rationalization of the unknown source of information and the students couldn’t find their way in order to make a correct conclusion and to put them into a concrete situation. The students leave the school not ready for the real life. They have no answers of the questions HOW and FOR WHAT to use their knowledge.

Thirdly, Dr PETROVA developed her arguments about **the need of developing skills and formation of competencies through history education**. The main objective of the modern education is to give the students opportunity to extend their abilities for lifelong learning. This means that education needs to be mainly orientated towards the action, consequently – towards the competences (defined as a unity of knowledge, skills, completed action as well as criteria for the self-evaluation of the results). In this sense the competences are not just a combination of knowledge and skills. They are a new quality obtained in the learning process. The relation between education and social needs is realised through competences. The education that is orientated towards competences is

equal to the education orientated towards the independent, rational, responsible and active person.

The new educational philosophy, the orientation of education (particularly History education) to competences is a serious challenge to the present status-quo in Bulgarian education. It requires important changes:

- in the history syllabus – to place the emphasis on active participation of students in the learning process;
- in the implementation of new forms and methods of class work, encourage student activity and initiative;
- in the students' and teachers' roles in the learning process – from an “object” the students have to become a “subject” in the learning process.

And lastly, Dr PETROVA touched upon several issues dealing with **the problems and perspectives on the assessment of the students' performance in History**. The contemporary Bulgarian educational practice is not acquainted with a system for assessment of the students' achievements, including in History. In the syllabus there is a special division “Specific forms and methods of the assessment”. The assessment criteria formulated in this division are too general and there it is particularly written that “the suggested assessment form and methods are of recommendatory character”. Therefore the assessment of the students in history as well, is not strictly regulated and depends on the teacher's qualification, professional abilities and personal point of view. As a result, the most frequent accusations are of subjectivism of the assessment and lack of clarity in education. This is a prerequisite for inequality of the students in the educational process.

A special *Instruction № 3 for the assessment system* was published in 2003. Regardless of its title, the document did not define the assessment system. It rather contained instructions on the number and regularity of the exams in the class. The document interpreted the term *assessment* in the sense of *giving mark to the students*. Actually, the *assessment* has a far wider sense. Due to this, the working out of the assessment system (including in History) is of vital importance. The sense of the assessment system is to formulate the assessment criteria and to transform them into concrete tasks, the performance of which could be measured. The effectiveness of the assessment system is a measure for the effectiveness of the educational policy. The orientation of the education (incl. in History) towards the formation of the competences exerts essential influence on the assessment system and on the monitoring of the quality of education as well. The specificity of the competences requires the development of the interdisciplinary and cross-curricularly complex assessment criteria and methods for determining how much emphasis should be put on the integration of knowledge, understanding and skills acquired in different subjects.

The very strong case for the rethinking of evaluation schemes in Bulgaria, made by Dr PETROVA, initiated a serious discussion among the participants and the experts, especially regarding final exams at the level of national evaluations (such as *the matura*). The lack of objective scales of measurement is only hiding the true state of education. It was an important contribution, since it enabled participants to become aware of the fact that evaluation has to be taken into consideration when designing lesson plans. Mr ROWE, Mr BERGERON and Dr CAPITA related the experience in their own country and shared some useful personal experience in the field. This would be quite interesting for the Council of Europe, now that the Bologna Process is putting a lot of stress on the educational systems, to design activities related to the transition from Secondary Education to Higher Education and the relation of this element to the vocational training.

Dr Kostadin GROZEV, a lecturer of Contemporary History at the Faculty of History of the St. Kliment Okhridsky University of Sofia, Bulgaria, made a presentation on *Aspects of the History Curriculum in Bulgaria*. In his opinion, the current Bulgarian experience in History teaching resembles pretty much some of the features throughout the region of Central and Eastern Europe. At the same time, the research on the Communist period of Bulgarian History in the last decade has brought to the surface some specific issues in challenges, than have to be elaborated in order to move ahead on the road of the multiperspectivity in studying the European dimensions of national and regional experiences.

History education plays an important role in the Bulgarian education system. Since the 1890s, history education has been considered **one of the major instruments for building Bulgarian national consciousness** and has always been a central part of all the curricula and educational programmes. The unique place of history education was emphasised by **the strict division between world and national history**, the latter always being taught in the final grades of primary and secondary education. In the past 20 years things have changed in history education in Bulgaria. However, at the start of the 1980s, **the school system became unstable due to a number of educational reforms aimed at modernising it**. However, such reforms were too premature and almost never came to fruition. During the 1990s, such destabilisation encompassed all fields of education and history was among the most affected. Since 1997, an important change affected the education in Bulgaria. History became only one of the school subjects, **the core curriculum focusing on Bulgarian language and literature and mathematics** (as separate final exams at the end of the secondary school). The third final exam became optional (History included).

History education in Bulgaria was **largely influenced by historiography**, mainly the writing of history textbooks. Textbook writers were and are still mainly university professors and researchers. Three basic new trends in the last 30 years affected history education, and all of them were linked with the gradual undermining and final disintegration of the Marxist ideology. In the 1970s–1980s **new topics were introduced**, such as the development of the Bulgarian National Question and the multi-party political system prior to WWII. After the 1990, **Marxism was overthrown but unfortunately still survives under the mask of "soft" Marxism**. At the end of the 1990s, some young

university scholars **launched new teaching areas**, i.e. the study of gender, of important issues like everyday life and childhood, of minorities with an emphasis on non-traditional sources and oral history. But this new trend still stems from the history textbooks, bar a few exceptions.

In the past 15 years, history textbooks caught the attention of the Bulgarian public opinion in several cases. However, **the interest was centred more on the procedures of textbook authorisation than on the content of the textbooks** and the media were more than eager to present all these as sensational rather than a serious analysis. In 1992, the Ministry of Education withdrew all the history textbooks from the secondary schools and for almost half a year the students were studying without any authorised additional teaching materials. Textbooks were replaced by the so-called “Notes on History” - hastily prepared and of a very low quality, not to mention the didactic aspect which was almost non-existent. This created chaos and vast public criticism which resulted in the production of a new generation of history textbooks. Since 1995 a steady stream of articles, radio and TV programmes has been trying to expose corruption in the process of textbook authorisation without any practical results and with no success. Yet, under their pressure, the procedure became more satisfactory and transparent.

The national curriculum is based on the Law for Public Education (1992). Another bill passed by the Parliament provides the main educational requirements for all school topics and for all grades. The Council of Ministers approves the national educational standards for the different groups of subjects (in our case Social Sciences and Civic Education) which define the aims and outcomes of education, for example: knowledge, development of skills and formation of attitudes. A new history curriculum was introduced in 2001.

Using history textbooks in the classroom is another issue that deserves great attention. It varies to a large extent between primary and secondary schools and between gymnasias and technical schools. Traditionally this involves a passive memorisation of the texts and the students reproducing them during class. This is still common practice and there are no indications that significant changes will be made in primary schools where the whole process of education is based on this conservative tradition. In secondary education there are two different approaches. In technical schools, where history is considered to be less important, the tradition continues as described above. However, in gymnasias more and more teachers from the younger generation prefer to introduce a model that follows more closely their university education experience, that is to say, one which focuses on dealing with historical sources as well as developing skills and formation of attitudes.

As **the strict distinction between world history and Bulgarian national history** that exists in Bulgarian historiography is followed by the curriculum and is reflected in the history textbooks, there are two completely different situations in the examination of the proportions of local, regional, national, European and global perspectives in the textbooks for secondary education. Textbooks for the 9th and 10th grades address world history, while those for the 11th grade deal with Bulgarian national

history. The global perspective is structured by continent but no continent is equally represented. There is **an emphasis on Euro-centrism** that relates to Bulgaria's place in European civilisation. This approach was characteristic even during the Communist regime and has been prevalent since the early 1990s. European history takes up 23 out of 43 units in the 10th grade, while the other well-represented continent, Asia, is allocated only 4 units (excluding the USSR-Russia), North America has 3 units, Africa has 2 units, South America has 1 unit and Australia has 0 unit. On the other hand, even important world history events, such as the two World Wars, international relations and the Great Depression of 1929-1933 (11 units) are represented Euro-centrally. This aside, Bulgarian textbooks are in keeping with the **notion that European history consists of the history of the European nation states, and not of common European events and processes**. Thus, the ethnocentric approach prevails even in the global or European perspectives. The real global or European perspective can be found only in units devoted to the history of everyday life and culture and, to a certain extent, in units devoted to the history of international relations. In world history textbooks, the national and the Balkan perspectives are equally represented with 2 units allocated to Balkan history and 3 units to Bulgarian national history. However, the problem of elaborating textbooks with the national histories of the Balkan nation states inside every unit remains as described in the case of European history. On the other hand, the Balkans are represented as being "inside Europe", as a Southeast European subcontinent, with a lot of comparison and parallels to other European countries. The same approach is followed in the units about Bulgarian national history. Regional and local perspectives do not exist in world history textbooks in Bulgaria, concerning Balkan and national units. They are considered as too detailed to be followed or presented as case studies.

The National History textbooks for the 11th grade present a totally different approach. In these textbooks **there is practically no global perspective** with the exception of the two World Wars. **The "outside" perspectives are the European and Balkan ones** and they are comparatively equally represented. With the exception of the Berlin treaty in 1878 and the two World Wars, **the picture is of a friendly Europe and not-so-friendly Balkans**, where political history is concerned. The positive notion totally prevails when dealing with intellectual influences, culture, economy etc. These textbooks also contain some regional and local perspectives, but not a systematic history of a region or settlement. Usually it is a case study and, even more frequently, it is a document that illustrates the author's idea of the text. The topic of Bulgarians and their neighbours is an important one in the textbooks. Bulgarian textbooks still represent all the Balkan countries and the Balkan peoples in an unusual way. The Balkan peoples are depicted as friendly and good neighbours, whereas their nation states are seen as a threat to the very existence of the Bulgarian state.

Sources are used on a large scale in modern Bulgarian history textbooks. Written sources totally prevail in the textbooks in the conservative tradition that dominates Bulgarian historiography. Maps and pictures, tables and schemes are also more illustrative, although the new trend is to combine them with some new information and with analytical and didactical questions in order to integrate them into the units.

At the end of his presentation Dr GROZEV showed some examples of concrete teaching materials from a CD-ROM he had worked upon within the framework of a CULTURE 2000 partnership project, financed by the European Commission about two years ago. The partners were schools and NGOs from Spain, Germany, the United Kingdom and Bulgaria that worked together on the production of the CD-ROM and a webpage on European Heritage. Unfortunately, due to the lack of financing of the project the webpage is no longer available and the now-existing end-result of the project is this CD. He demonstrated the content of a teaching unit on Transformation and Change in Eastern Europe during the Cold War period. The unit contains original texts, written by the experts of the Bulgarian partner (the EUROPARTNERS 2000 FOUNDATION, Sofia), as well as lessons plans, sources, pictures, Internet-addresses, questions on the theme of the unit. All the units of the CD were grouped in four big themes (The Renaissance, Transformation and Change, Personalities, Culture) with each partner developing a set of resources on the big theme.

Dr Carol CAPITA, from the History Department of Bucharest University gave a presentation at the seminars in Sofia and Rouse on *Images by Themselves: contextualising visual sources through written sources*. Being richly illustrated by very interesting visual materials, his lecture stressed at the first place **the importance of using historical sources in general in the classroom** – why use them, what are their limits, how do sources relate to the existing curriculum and the overall place of the historical sources in the learning and teaching process. Through sources the teacher is capable of developing an interest in History, motivating his students for work and out-of-classroom activities, challenging the students with new perspectives, ensuring multiperspectivity, developing skills and competencies, balancing critical thinking with empathy. **The limits of historical sources** were linked with several phenomena such as: the natural loss of sources (reconstructing a global tendency, there is always a past existing within the sources and a past that is missing there); the influence of historiographic trends and theories (sources relate to a certain past that exists within research); the serious social pressures (linked with requirements put by society to the past that is presented in the schools); and the prevailing educational structures, philosophy, paradigms, etc. (also influencing the past presented in the schools). Thus an element of the analysis was the adequate placing of using sources among the other history teaching methods and the relationship between multiperspectivity, the time versus space dimensions and elaborating students' skills and competences. In this presentation came explanations on **the placing of sources within the Romanian curriculum** and the requirements to skills and competencies. They were centered around the need of the students: to identify and describe a historical source (thus using information obtained from a series of historical sources), to select information provided by several sources using a given plan (i.e. to compare historical sources of different types relating to the same topic), to categorise information provided by historical sources (i.e. to use information from different sources in designing a historical investigation), to use techniques of written and iconic source analysis (i.e. to identify sources of information that can support a historical investigation. In all these the students should also use in new contexts the newly acquired terms.

Then Dr CAPITA turned his attention to visual sources in particular in an effort to contextualise their use in the classroom. One possible pattern of that approach was shown through a concentric circles diagram, i.e. having the broadest notion of **what a visual source says**, then, narrowing it to **what it implies** and finally - **what it does not say**. In the first case we have more information and less context, in the second – information equates context and in the last – less information and more context. That led him to a specific logical chart explaining a method of looking at visual sources. Looking at a source we should start with a set of questions – about the date, author and societal context of the source thus contextualizing it. Then we go to the three circular circles (what it tells, what does it imply and what does it not tell) leading us to a formal and internal analysis on what kind of source it is and to whom it is addressed. And at a further level of deepening the knowledge and competencies – trying to elaborate critical thinking skills and multiperspectivity. The knowledge is deepened by such ideas as what other sources I have, to what can I compare these particular sources, does it add up something to my previous knowledge. And the critical evaluation – what is the source about (i.e. about certain facts or about the opinions of the authors of the source). Thus critical thinking and multiperspectivity will make the students able to report on the working methods in a historical investigation and explain the results and conclusions he made.

Dr CAPITA presented all these findings to the participants by means of a very interesting multimedia presentation of well-selected and interesting visual sources. His examples were in two fields – war posters and the woman as a historical image. After running images through various historical times and locations, he made an exercise involving the participants in analysing particular visual sources, in comparing visual with written sources and making at the end certain tentative conclusions. His presentation provoked a serious discussion in both seminars (especially in Sofia) showing that this is a quite promising aspect for future seminars or for developing resource materials for use in the classroom. At the Rouse seminar, stimulated by those discussions, one of the teachers from Rouse demonstrated a series of computer based tests that also used visual sources in the concrete assessment practice. His opinion was that this attempt was a successful one as it motivated the students for out-of-class activities (developing new tests and making visual presentations of certain lessons as homeworks).

Ms Roumiana KOUSHEVA, Chairperson of the Association of History Teachers in Bulgaria (affiliated member of EUROCLIO), welcomed the participants in the Sofia seminar and addressed them on behalf of EUROCLIO. She underlined the importance of the two seminars in Bulgaria as an element of the on-going efforts of the organisers, targeted at improving the capacity of history teachers in Bulgaria. She made a short presentation on the structure and the evolving aims of EUROCLIO putting a strong accent on the opportunities for in-service training of teachers and for building-up of regional or larger international networks of teachers working on joint projects. Since its beginnings in 1992, EUROCLIO has played a major role in strengthening history education and the European dimension and has become well-known by history educators throughout Europe. EUROCLIO is currently an important organisation with 62 member organisations in 47 countries. The main bodies of the organisation are the General Assembly, which meets every year, the Board, which meets 4 times a year, a semi-

independent Secretariat, with a professional staff of 8 persons, under the umbrella of the EUROCLIO Foundation, the Controlling Committee, which meets once a year.

On this background Ms KOUSHEVA presented the activities and some recently finished or on-going projects of the Association of History Teachers in Bulgaria. Each of the participants in the Sofia seminar received a copy of the recently published manual (teaching pack/reader) on “The Shared Past. Education for the Future (Everyday Life in Albania, Bulgaria and Macedonia¹, 1945 – 2000)”. The reader was an element of a joint regional project under the same name, financed by EUROCLIO and the participants in the seminar were convinced that it would be quite helpful in their work and would encourage them to have the everyday life perspective in their classes. By those timely prepared materials the teachers would be able to put some extra European and democratic dimension in history education.

3.3. The working group workshops: devising lesson plans

The working group workshops were introduced in short by Mr Chris ROWE, who made a few suggestions about the nature of the teaching process and the requirements the teachers should have to their performance in the classrooms. In a very practical sense he elaborated upon some expectations from the “Ideal World of History Teaching”, for example:

- Planning would be flexible, always making space to respond to interest and enthusiasm from pupils at the time it happens;
- Individual lessons would always be part of an overall plan, linked to the preceding and following lessons;
- Some lessons will deal with particular issues and skills rather than others – a lesson plan should not try to include all desirable objectives possible;
- Lessons would take place in a well-equipped classroom, with access to VCR, computers, maps etc. and with samples of students’ work on the wall;
- Lessons would always exist within a clear chronological framework;
- Lessons would have pace and variety, avoiding “sameness”;
- Sufficient time would always be allowed for student participation, including class movement and “waiting time” for student responses to be worked through;
- A range of historical sources would be used - as far as possible these sources would apply to the lives of ordinary people (especially young people) at least as much as to the great and famous; and would be from a variety of perspectives;
- Lessons would allow for different levels of ability and achievement – the most able students would find it challenging but all students would find it accessible;
- Lessons would lead logically towards some kind of follow up activity, allowing students to build on their understanding;

¹ “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”.

- Lessons would also lead logically to some form of assignment or assessment exercise, allowing students to test their progress.

That “Ideal World” however, usually clashes with the practical environment of the “Real World”, where several problems and challenges exist, like:

- Not enough class time to cover the topics fully?
- A shortage of suitable textbooks and teaching materials?
- A wide range of different abilities among the pupils?
- A very centralised curriculum, making multi-perspectivity difficult to achieve?
- A lack of equipment?
- Not having your “own” classroom specifically for History lessons?
- A lack of confidence about knowing all aspects of the historical topics being studied?

Thus Mr ROWE formulated the following general guidelines for the working groups that were assigned the task of drawing the “Big Picture” of the Communist period in Bulgarian history and afterwards preparing concrete lesson plans for some key-events or years of that period. However the teachers should keep in mind some problems:

- How to ensure that lessons are tailored to the needs of the students – making sure that the needs of younger pupils are met, as well as the older, more academic students?
- How to set up a practical, multi-perspectival and chronological framework for History teaching?
- How to develop an effective model for individual lesson plans?

With these guidelines in mind the participants in both seminars were split into working groups (2 in Sofia, 3 in Rouse depending on the ability of translation and the needs of the concrete groups of teachers and inspectors). The groups were structured differently in Sofia (first day – one group of experts from the regional inspectorates and one of teachers, second day - mixed) and in Rouse (mixed) and were animated by the lecturers. Each group had two sessions – the first day discussing the practical problems and setting the framework of the period 1939-1989; the second day working and producing the real lesson plans. The atmosphere of the work was friendly and organised, although too emotional occasionally. Although few teachers were relatively pessimistic about the opportunities of using Internet and digital educational tools (due to the lack of hi tech means and training aids in some regions), most of the participants were encouraged to apply new methods and approaches, presented at the two seminars in Bulgaria. A strong interest was expressed as well in continuing of such practice of regional thematic history teaching seminars, the establishment of more active contacts with teachers and educational experts in other European countries, and in availing the opportunity to receive and use next Council of Europe and EUROCLIO educational products, textbooks, and informative materials.

The first day the work in all groups started by raising an issue for discussion: how to overcome the gap between the “Ideal” and “Real World” in history teaching? The main focus of the workshop was on:

- the practical difficulties faced by the Bulgarian teachers in presenting of the 1939-1989 history; and
- the European, national and local perspectives in the educational content of the 1939 – 1989 history.

According to the teachers they faced many difficulties in history teaching in the classroom: not enough class time; unsuitable textbooks; a shortage of teaching materials and class equipment, etc. The participants pointed out that all the problems related to the history curricula, textbooks and other teaching resources, and working methods. The history curricula consist of a lot of facts and data. The working methods of the teachers predominantly came down to “talk”, i.e. teachers doing much of the talking and interpreting. The participants considered also that the textbooks and teaching materials available in the class are very controversial what concerns the 1939-1989 history. Textbooks present the opinions and understandings of their authors that may be differed. The period is too close to present day. That may cause pre-supposed and emotional judgment. Many of the teachers shared the lack of self-confidence about knowing all aspects of the 1939–1989 history.

During the discussion, a series of priorities for teaching the 1939-1989 period at schools was identified:

- developing the skills of the history teachers for the selection of the lessons’ content of 1939-1989 history in accordance with the multiperspective approach and balance between the European, national and local dimensions in the educational content;
- developing strategies of active learning such as group work, project work, inquiry, encouraged students’ activity and initiative;
- working with the historical documents *not* for the illustrating of the lesson’s content, but as a source of information for the students;
- teachers’ training in order to be acquainted with new historiography concepts about the 1939-1989 history.

In the second session of the workshop, participants learned more about setting up a practical, multiperspectival and chronological framework for teaching the 1939-1989 period. The main accents of the workshop were on:

- How to ensure lessons are tailored to the needs of the students;
- How to develop an effective model for individual lesson plans;
- Assessment of the students’ achievements.

The participants were asked to define the chronological landmarks of the 1939-1989 period, the number of lessons and their content. The results of the very emotional discussion were as follows: Speaking about *the chronological landmark of the 1939-1989 period*, some of the participants suggested presenting to the students the main historical events and ask them to select these, which are of a significant importance for the transition process. The students need to identify key events, presented European, national and local dimension of the process. Among them were

- 1939 – the Molotov – Ribbentrop Pact;
- 9 May 1945 – the End of the Second World War;
- 1947 – the Fifth Bulgarian Communist Party Congress;
- 1953 – the Beginning of Destalinisation in USSR;
- 1956 – The April Plenum of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee in Sofia;
- 10 November 1989 – the Partu Plenum in Boyana and the Beginning of the Transition in Bulgaria.

Educational content (number of the lessons):

- 1939 – 1944: the Second World War. The Consequences;
- 1944 – 1947: the establishment of the Communist regime in Bulgaria;
- The process of Destalinisation and its impact on Bulgaria;
- The Zhivkov regime – political, economical and social context;
- The Transition in 1989;
- Bulgarian society after the Transition.

Framework for the lesson plan (for 17 year old students)

Theme: *The Transition in Bulgaria in 1989*

The aim of the lesson is to make students familiar with the essential events that happened in 1989 in the post totalitarian countries as well as in Bulgaria. Working with the historical sources, the students should form their own judgement and position.

Plan of the lesson:

- The Beginning of the Change – Perestroika in the USSR. The Impact of the external factors on the Bulgarian society;
- Preconditions of the Change;
- Comparison between the processes in Bulgaria and the other post-totalitarian countries;
- Political and Social Confrontation in Sofia and throughout the country.

The lesson plan is worked out by combining the chronological and thematic approaches.

Students' activities

The participants suggested setting tasks to the students before the lessons:

- to get an interview from their parents, grandparents or other contemporaries of the events;
- to divide into groups and research the newspapers, magazines published in 1989;
- to collect visual or oral sources on the events in 1989, family photographs, inscription on local monuments, etc.

During the lesson the students are asked to present and interpret the sources in terms of the multiperspectival approach and assess the work of the other groups with the guidance of the teacher.

The participants discussed the framework for a students' school-based evaluation. The special attention was paid on the evaluation and self-evaluation of the students' work with history sources. It was emphasised that the source's evaluation is not only a matter of literal comprehension of the words or images. The evaluation must be specific and contextual, not stereotyped. There should be an awareness of the multiperspectivity. The key questions for the evaluation could be:

- What type of source is it?
- Who originated it?
- What was the motivation or attitude behind it?
- What audience was it aimed at, etc.?

As a conclusion, regarding the results of the discussions in the working groups the participants elaborated several conclusions and recommendations. In their majority they stated that the focusing of the educational policy on acquiring certain measurable progress and competences means a new approach to the educational standards and the curriculum in order to put an accent on the active participation of the students in the learning process. That requires also the implementation of forms and methods of class work that encourage students' activities (e.g. group work, project design, multiperspective analyses of different types of historical sources, etc.), as well as some special interest in teachers' training in accordance with the multiperspective approach in the teaching of History.

Regardless of the long discussions at both seminars on the issues of assessment, the majority of the participants agreed that assessment is the third equally important component of the educational system. An educational policy aimed at high-quality education needs an effective assessment system. The assessment measures the extent to which the students' performance meets the public expectations. It provides information about the status of the educational system and gives feedback to the students, teachers, parents, authorities, etc. Thus they recommended that priority in the Bulgarian educational practice should be given to:

- the working out of an assessment system that is of great importance for the quality of education;
- the implementation of the external standardised assessment in the Bulgarian educational practice in order to measure students' achievement at the end of the educational stage and to monitor the quality of education;
- the initiation and conduct of diagnostic educational surveys and analyses.

4. The Seminars: results and recommendations

The two seminars focused on the links between history and European democratic citizenship education, on the different ways the key dates in the project *European Dimension in History Teaching* are used in the history classes in different countries of Europe, on the status of history as a school topic in the curricula of different states of Europe. That was in line with the activities of the Council of Europe in the past few years as well as of the initiatives and role EUROCLIO played in supporting the history education in Europe and disseminating the values of democracy and human rights.

The presentations of the experts showed that the international cooperation could provide an impetus for change. The results of the two seminars (as already outlined in the experts' individual reports to the Council of Europe after the event and in individual exchanges with the participants at the event) can be summarised as follows:

1. Regarding **the level of transfer of new information to the participants**: participants were able to get acquainted not only with the newest data available on the issue of the communist past, but also to receive informations related to the new trends in historical interpretation of the past. A very important factor in this respect was that the participants were provided with a wide range of publications issued by the Council of Europe and EUROCLIO, as well as by the Bulgarian hosts – The Association of History Teachers in Bulgaria, by the Cold War Research Group Bulgaria and by some local educational NGO's in Rousse.

2. Regarding **the level of teaching skills**: it is, probably, the most important result of the two activities, since the participants were introduced to new frameworks of designing lesson plans, which could enhance active learning, save time (both in terms of preparing lessons and in delivering them), and promote multiperspectivity.

3. Regarding **the level of networking**: it is one of the outcomes of such activities that are less taken into consideration; the seminars offered ample opportunity for the participants to voice their concerns, and to exchange viewpoints and practical experiences. The experts, on the other hand, were able to get a grasp on the scope and extent of the problems facing History teaching in Bulgaria. Such was the case for Dr Svetla PETROVA - as an expert in evaluation, she was able to receive information on how teachers cope with evaluation issues, and which are the main problems related to the implementations of new evaluation schemes.

4. Regarding **the regional aspect of the teachers/experts exchanges**: the initiative of the Council of Europe to organise such paired seminars (Romania and Bulgaria) with the participation of the same group of experts was a positive development – the team could fine-tune its approach and could draw significant conclusions from the differences in the responses of the participants. The regional expertise can be thus developed, and could enhance regional networking. On the whole, the activities managed to attain their objectives, and it would be interesting to have a follow-up activity (with mixed teams, that is, former and new participants).

5. Regarding **the similarities and differences in the history education of Bulgaria and Romania**: there are **several elements that are similar** in the two countries, e.g. the teaching of the communist period is still a serious problem – the access to the necessary information, the issues related to the values-related aspects of History teaching, the relation between History teaching and Education for Democratic Citizenship. **The differences** are also important: the focus in Bulgaria was mostly on the acquisition of new information on the communist past, the issue of evaluation, and the problems related to the practicalities of designing lesson plans and delivering the actual teaching.

Recommendations:

1. There is **a need for a follow-up activity**, as well as to devise a system in which participants in such seminars could act as resource persons for their peers in their own school environment (EUROCLIO could prove an important asset, since it has an extended network). Many delegates expressed the wish to have future seminars for teachers, with an even greater emphasis on practical considerations. It was clear from the workshops that there were many teachers highly receptive to ideas such as multi-perspectivity, democratic citizenship, the European dimension and improvements in teaching and learning – it was equally clear that they still require more training, above all in matching their ambitious targets to the limited time available and to a realistic assessment framework.

2. It might be important in advance **to ask participants to produce some materials** which they could present during the seminars. That will enhance their commitment towards the activities, and facilitate the exchange of positive experiences. Probably that might complicate the tasks of the organisers and experts, but it enhances the active involvement of participants.

3. It is probably helpful for **the experts to receive (from the national teams) brief informations on the educational system of the country** in which the activity will take place. That will increase the effectiveness of the experts, and will eliminate some of the misunderstandings and improves the use of available time. That can be done by EUROCLIO affiliated members in the country or by the Council of Europe liaison officers in the Ministries of Education.

4. As a result of the practice both in Bucharest and Sofia, it might prove to be better if **the venues are not in big cities**. If the venue is somewhat isolated, participants have more opportunities to exchange views and experiences, and the group is more active (a kind of confidence-building and warm-up device). The venues in Sofia and in Rousse were very well selected, and the necessary logistics were also supplied (the efforts of the local partners were acknowledged with gratitude by all participants). It is commendable that participants had ample opportunity to interact informally. It is important to mention once again the fact that the Bulgarian team managed to provide the participants with materials that they could take home.

5. The **work of the team** in animating workshops (and in informal conversations in between sessions) was especially effective, not least because of the wide range (Bulgaria, Romania, France & England) involved but also because of their energy and commitment – and because of the transparent degree of friendship and cooperation between them. Seminars like this go much better when presentations are carefully “paired” in content and timing; when there is a regular rhythm alternating sessions based on presentations with sessions designed for active participation; and when a lunch or coffee break allows time between the end of a workshop and the presentation of the reports arising from the workshops.

6. And finally, **the role of simultaneous/consecutive translation should be acknowledged**. Having participants (as well as the local experts) give the presentations in their own language breaks the ice and stimulates more productive discussions. By having local participants speaking in a foreign language either imposes restrictions on the freedom of communication or restricts the pool to a smaller circles of English speaking experts who either already have had such training or who are well qualified in these matters. The same implies to having a local expert chairing the most sensitive discussions with the Council of Europe foreign experts playing supportive role in the background.

APPENDIX I

PROGRAMME OF THE SEMINAR AND LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

SOFIA

DAY 1

09.00 – 9.15

Opening plenary session

- i. Welcome address by Ms Margarita PENEVA, Ministry of Education and Research of Bulgaria
- ii. Welcome address by Mr Emil TSENKOV, Council of Europe Information and Documentation Centre, Sofia
- iii. Welcome address on behalf of Ms Mechthilde FUHRER, Administrator, History Education Section, Council of Europe by Mr Chris ROWE, United Kingdom

9.15 – 11.15

Setting the Framework: The Context of the Cold War Era

Chair: Mr Chris ROWE. United Kingdom

Presentation: “The Cold War, some new historiography, archival findings and approaches, as well as research perspectives and comparative studies on Cold War History in former Soviet bloc countries”, by Professor Jordan BAEV, Bulgaria

Presentation: “The Significance of 8 May 1945”, by Mr Marc BERGERON, France

11.15 – 11.45

Coffee break

11.45 – 13.15

“The Ideal World and the Real World”: Solving the practical difficulties faced by history teachers

Practical workshop in working groups animated by:

Mr Chris ROWE, United Kingdom

Mr Marc BERGERON, France

Dr Svetla PETROVA, Bulgaria

Dr Kostadin GROZEV, Bulgaria

13.15 – 14.30

Lunch

14.30– 16.00 **Assessment and History Teaching: how the assessment framework relates to our teaching of History?**

Chair: Dr Kostadin GROZEV, Bulgaria

Presentation: “Assessment in Bulgaria”, by Dr Svetla PETROVA, Bulgaria

Brief presentation on “The British Model of Assessment” by Mr Chris ROWE, United Kingdom

Followed by a plenary discussion in issues, related to assessment

16.00 – 16.30 Coffee Break

16.30 – 17.30 Presentation on “Using images as historical sources” by Dr Carol CAPITA, Romania

19.00 Reception

DAY 2

09.30 – 9.45 Brief Introduction to the day. “Relating our teaching to the curriculum” by Mr Chris ROWE. United Kingdom

9.45 – 11.00 Presentation “From the local to the international: European dynamics in the curricula in secondary schools in France” by Mr Marc BERGERON, France

Presentation “Aspects of the History Curriculum in Bulgaria” by Dr Kostadin GROZEV, Bulgaria

11.00 - 11.30 Coffee Break

11.30 – 13.00 **Workshops on Devising Lesson Plans, including reference to schemes of assessment**

Animated by:

Mr Chris ROWE, United Kingdom

Mr Marc BERGERON, France

Dr Svetla PETROVA, Bulgaria

Dr Kostadin GROZEV, Bulgaria

13.00 – 14.15 Lunch

14.15 – 15.00 Reports from the working groups and discussion on the issues raised

- 14.45 – 15.45 Presentations by Ms Roumiana KOUSHEVA, Bulgaria, concerning the work of EUROCLIO, as well as on the activities and projects of the Association of History Teachers in Bulgaria
- Presentation by Mr Emil TSENKOV on the History Teaching and Civic Education projects and publications of the Council of Europe
- 15.45 – 16.15 Coffee Break
- 16.15 – 17.00 **Final plenary session**
- Summing up of the seminar by the General Rapporteur, Dr Kostadin GROZEV, Bulgaria
- Closing of the seminar by Mr Chris ROWE, United Kingdom
- Departure of the participants

SOFIA

Council of Europe experts

Mr Chris Rowe
Dr Carol Capita
Mr Marc Bergeron
Professor Jordan Baev
Dr Svetla Petrova
Dr Kostadin Grozev

Participants

Ms Mila Mineva – Regional Inspection of Education of the city of Stara Zagora
Ms Violeta Stoycheva – University of Veliko Turnovo
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rумыana Kusheva – Department for Information and In-service Training of Teachers
Ms Mariana Vassileva – Regional Inspection of Education of the City of Kurdzhali
Mr Stoyko Stoykov – Regional Inspection of Education of the city of Jambol
Ms Dorina Todorova – Regional Inspection of Education of the city of Jambol
Ms Milena Platnikova - English language School of the city of Bourgas
Ms Totka Kazakova - Regional Inspection of Education of the city of Bourgas
Mr Peter Parushev – General secondary school of the city of Bourgas
Ms Lubomira Doneva – General secondary school of the city of Bourgas
Ms Svetla Dimitrova – General secondary school of the city of Vratza
Ms Rумыana Tzvetkova - Regional Inspection of Education of the city of Vratza
Ms Tanya Romanova – Foreign Language Secondary School of the city of Bourgas
Ms Dimitrina Nikolova – Roman Language Secondary School of the city of Bourgas
Mr Branko Davidov
Ms Rossitsa Miteva
Ms Radostina Novakova – Regional Inspection of Education of the city of Kjustendil
My Boyan Aksakov - Regional Inspection of Education of the city of Sliven
Ms Rумыana Russeva – from the city of Nova Zagora
Ms Ilka Borissova – from the city of Nova Zagora
Ms Dotka Markova – from the city of Nova Zagora
Ms Krassimira Tabakova – from the city of Sofia
Ms Kina Kotlarska - Regional Inspection of Education of the city of Veliko Turnovo
Ms Margarita Peneva – Ministry of Education and Science
Ms Teodora Helju – Romania
Ms Maria Govor – Romania
Ms Rodica Mihailescu – Romania

Interpreters

Ms Tanya Kmetova
Ms Daniela Stoyanova

APPENDIX II

PROGRAMME OF THE SEMINAR AND LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ROUSSE

DAY 1

09.00 – 9.15

Opening plenary session

- i. Welcome address on behalf of Ms Mechthilde FUHRER, Administrator, History Education Section, Council of Europe by Mr Chris ROWE, United Kingdom
- ii. Welcome address on behalf of the Faculty of History, Sofia University by its Dean, Professor Ivan ILCHEV, BULGARIA

9.15 – 11.15

Setting the Framework: The Context of the Cold War Era

Chair: Mr Chris ROWE. United Kingdom

Presentation: “The Cold War, some new historiography, archival findings and approaches, as well as research perspectives and comparative studies on Cold War History in former Soviet bloc countries”, by Professor Jordan BAEV, Bulgaria

Presentation: “The turning point: why the dog did not bark?”, by Professor Ivan ILCHEV, Bulgaria

11.15 – 11.45

Coffee break

11.45 – 13.15

Chair: Mr Chris ROWE. United Kingdom

Presentation: “The Significance of 8 May 1945”, by Mr Marc BERGERON, France

“The Ideal World and the Real World”: Solving the practical difficulties faced by history teachers

Practical workshop in working groups animated by:

Mr Chris ROWE, United Kingdom

Mr Marc BERGERON, France

Dr Svetla PETROVA, Bulgaria

Dr Kostadin GROZEV, Bulgaria

13.15 – 14.30

Lunch

14.30– 16.00

Assessment and History Teaching: how the assessment framework relates to our teaching of History?

Chair: Dr Kostadin GROZEV, Bulgaria

Presentation: “Assessment in Bulgaria”, by Dr Svetla PETROVA, Bulgaria

Brief presentation on “The British Model of Assessment” by Mr Chris ROWE

Followed by a plenary discussion in issues, related to assessment

16.00 – 16.30

Coffee Break

16.30 – 17.30

Presentation on “Using images as historical sources” by Dr Carol CAPITA, Romania

19.00

Reception

DAY 2

09.30 – 9.45

Brief Introduction to the day. “Relating our teaching to the curriculum” by Mr Chris ROWE. United Kingdom

9.45 – 11.00

Presentation “From the local to the international: European dynamics in the curricula in secondary schools in France” by Mr Marc BERGERON, France

Presentation “Aspects of the History Curriculum in Bulgaria” by Dr Kostadin GROZEV, Bulgaria

11.00 - 11.30

Coffee Break

11.30 – 13.00 **Workshops on Devising Lesson Plans, including reference to schemes of assessment**

Animated by:

Mr Chris ROWE, United Kingdom

Mr Marc BERGERON, France

Dr Svetla PETROVA, Bulgaria

Dr Kostadin GROZEV, Bulgaria

13.00 – 14.15 Lunch

14.15 – 15.00 Reports from the working groups and discussion on the issues raised

14.45 – 15.45 Presentations by Mr Chris ROWE concerning the work of The Council of Europe and EUROCLIO with special reference to the practical help teachers can obtain from this work

15.45 – 16.15 Coffee Break

16.15 – 17.00 **Final plenary session**
Chaired by Emil TSENKOV, Bulgaria

Summing up of the seminar by the General Rapporteur, Dr Kostadin GROZEV, Bulgaria

Closing of the seminar by Mr Chris ROWE, United Kingdom

Departure of the participants

ROUSSE

Council of Europe experts

Mr Chris Rowe
Dr Carol Capita
Mr Marc Bergeron
Professor Jordan Baev
Professor Ivan Ilchev
Dr Svetla Petrova
Dr Kostadin Grozev

Participants

Ms Roumiana Lazarova
Ms Neli Genovska
Mr Petko Petkov
Ms Polia Postompirova
Ms Diana Ivanova
Mr Vasil Tashev
Ms Radoslva Kostov
Mr Galin Gospodinov
Ms Galia Petrova
Ms Valia Iancheva
Ms Spaska Marinova
Ms Diana Chervenska
Ms Yordanka Dobрева
Ms Ivelina Savova
Mr Nikolay Nikolov
Ms Elka Krasteva
Mr Petar Panchev
Ms Lidia Georgieva
Mr Ivan Zartov
Mr Nikolay Chakarov
Mr Viktor Savov
Ms Antoaneta Tosheva
Mr Evgeni Georgiev
Ms Lidia Koleva
Ms Kalina Vladova
Ms Margarita Mihova
Mr Yilian Gurchev

Interpreters

Ms Yordanka Nnova
Ms Veselina Obreshkova

